Master of Architecture (by thesis)
UTS course code: C03001v3

Daniel Pavlovits

In the Wake of 9/11:

Rethinking Architecture and Redevelopment

Year of Submission:

2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ASSISTANCE

The thesis being submitted was written with advice received from Prof. Andrew Benjamin acting as my Principle Supervisor / Advisor, as well as feedback on the final draft and structure by Dr. Charles Rice, in addition to comments received from Dr. Glen Hill, Dr. Peter McNeil, Dr. Charles Rice and Dr. Naomi Stead at my Confirmation of Candidature presentation / assessment.

Signature of Student

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

Contents

Chapter 3

A Theoretical Trace of the LMDC final 7

Chapter 4

Toward a Critique of the Spatiality of the State

Abstract

The aim, purpose and rationale of this thesis is to pose a philosophical interrogation and subsequent theoretical speculation on the event that came to fore in America on 11 September 2001and its relation to architecture. This argument is made by recourse to and borrowing from the understanding of the term "libidinal", as discussed in Lyotard's *Libidinal Economy*, and Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus* and *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – a Thousand Plateaus*.

The first chapter begins with an excurses on architecture in relation to the "libidinal" as drawn-out from an understanding of Lyotard and Deleuze and Guattari in order to begin to draw in an understanding of architecture into the framework of "libidinal philosophy". The second chapter turns the discussion of the key concepts of "libidinal philosophy" as discussed in Chapter 1 toward examining architecture's relation to the libidinal, and more specifically the relation of the Twin Towers to the libidinal event of 9/11, and then begins to address redevelopment from this theoretical perspective. The third chapter attempts a theoretical trace of the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation's (LMDC) final seven participants' schemes, and does so by questioning their schemes genesis of subjective construal (desire) in relation to their respective architectural production, and posits that these schemes find themselves in collusion with the politics and representation of the space of the State as Capitalism. In being as such, it is argued that they merely reiterate the semiology and iconomy of the original Twin Towers that were destroyed, and as such are destined to be caught-up in any repetition of the event. The fourth and final chapter begins to offer a resolution to how architecture might be conceived on the site of Ground Zero in response to and following the event of 9/11 as conceived as a libidinal event. Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of "smooth" space and "striated" space are examined, and a parallel examination of them made in relation to a number of architectural and urban tactics of the Situationist International. It is argued that it is through the borrowing of such tactics that architecture might be able to enter into a critique and disruption of the space and representation of the politics of the State (as I argue, the source of desire latent within redevelopment of Ground Zero), thus producing

a necessary disruption of striated architecture, or the production of anti-architecture in any redevelopment at Ground Zero – and indeed in architecture elsewhere and in general. It is argued that only through the pursuit of such anti-architecture that architectural production at Ground Zero can offer anything meaningful in addressing and then attempting to resolve the libidinal event of 9/11 by way of redevelopment.

Introduction

On the morning of 11 September 2001, a momentous event took place in New York and Washington, one that has since substantially come to define much of global politics, political discourse and action, including considerable aspects of foreign policy as well as internal politics of nation-states of the present and foreseeably of generations to come. This event, colloquially known and referred to as 9/11, has had an impact on questions as far ranging as emancipation, civil rights, women's rights, border control, immigration, and not least militarisation, specifically in the context of international conventions and treatises spelt out by the charter of the United Nations on the ethics and legal use of pre-emptive military force. In examining the intellectual footprint and fall-out of the event of 9/11, exhaustive studies could be made into all these various disciplinary areas, and are no doubt being made.

In raising the spectre of thought for a moment beyond the most obvious areas of concern which have been effected and brought into play by the event of 9/11, a speculation on the nature and context of the event of 9/11 and its resultant intellectual horizons can not but rest for a moment on a concern less obvious and significant as those listed above, specifically and namely the question of architecture.

That the event of 9/11 took place on the body and surface of architecture, or specifically the body and surface of two architectural edifices, namely the World Trade Centre Twin Towers and the Pentagon, seems an obvious enough observation. That the fall-out and intellectual footprint of the event of 9/11 as a result of this observation might be able to be extended to architectural questions of a theoretical nature as a consequence of this fact is less so.

This thesis aims to examine the intellectual ramifications of 9/11 as it might concern architecture. For the purposes of this thesis, I choose to forward such an examination through an oblique action, or in a Freudian term as articulated by Lyotard, through *durcharbeitung,*[1] that is a reworking or working through of everything that is perceived as fundamentally architectural. Such a process of working through becomes

---

[1] See Lyotard, "Re-writing Modernity, in *SubStance*, Vol. 16, No. 3, Issue 54 (1987)

a process that is characterised by linking concepts together for the purpose of comprehension to shed light on subsequent action, not a strict methodology, but a process nonetheless.

Lyotard says of Freud's "*durcharbeitung*" that "let me remind you that the clue, the only leading thread in this working through lies in feeling or, let us say, listening to feelings. A fragment of a sentence, a bit, one word, is coming up. You link it on the spot with another bit. No reasoning, no arguing, no meditation. In doing so, you are gradually getting close to a scene, the scene of something. You sketch it out, you don't know what it is, your only certitude is that it refers to the past – both the farthest and the nearest past; your own past and others too."[2] The process followed in writing this thesis and reflecting on the intellectual implications of 9/11 on architecture and redevelopment of Ground Zero rests within such a working through and sketching out.

A beginning was necessary to be made, which beginning unfolds toward realisations and articulations about the subject of 9/11 and architecture in question: "what is at stake is not the recognition of what is given; it is the ability to let things come up, whatever they are".[3] For this reason, the thesis first sets-out a plane on which architecture might be understood, namely emanating from an interior subjectivity, and then begins to speculate on the nature of 9/11 as a likewise interior, or as I borrow from Lyotard, libidinal understanding. The LMDC (Lower Manhattan Development Corporation) final nine projects by the short-listed seven architecture entrants is then critiqued in light of this libidinal valorisation, and a route forward for redevelopment is suggested in the final chapter by way of borrowing from the Situationist's legacy.

Although the thesis may seem to be fragmented and crossing a lot of disparate ground in making its argument, but this is necessary in being able to "gradually get closer" to an understanding from which action, and more importantly a particular framework of subjectivity preceding action for the purposes of architecture, might follow. It is in harnessing this approach that the thinking in this thesis is unfolded and put to use. To quote Deleuze and to reaffirm his sentiment: "As far as we're concerned, we don't

---

[2] ibid. p7.
[3] ibid. p8.

believe in any specificity of writing or even thought",[4] and it is by way of this non-specificity of a writing, by way of tearing down the stricture of methodology that this thesis proceeds. This approach to writing and thinking about an event is focused on the concern with how subjectivity is formed, and through which architecture might be pursued in consequence to the event of 9/11.

I begin my examination of the implications of the event of 9/11 on architecture with an excursus departing from a quote by Derrida on the need to "raise the question of architecture as a possibility of thought".[5] In responding to this quote, I suggest that the most fundamental question that architecture as a possibility for thought can answer, is the condition and manner in which 'placing' and 'habitation' might be able to be understood. I link this archaic question of architecture to the Deleuze and Guattarian concept of "*haecceity*", that is a subjective condition constructed from the interplay of speeds and slownesses, latitudes and longitudes of our being,[6] which first and foremost arise as an interior condition affecting itself on space and place from the inside-out. In making this argument on the precondition and possibility of architecture, I argue that if apprehending architecture and raising it as a possibility for thought is constituted by an immanent interior condition, then the "libidinal philosophical" texts of Lyotard's *Libidinal Economy* and Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus* and *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – A Thousand Plateaus* as key texts, must be put to use in understanding something central to architecture and to the possibility of raising it as a question of thought[7]. Chapter 1 continues with examining the meaning and working of the concept "libidinal economy" as articulated by Lyotard,

---

[4] Felix Guattari, *Chaosophy*, Semiotext(e), New York, 1995, p101
[5] Jacques Derrida, "Architecture Where Desire May Live" (Architetture ove il desiderio puo abitare), *Domus*, 1986, p671
[6] see "Haecceity" in Deleuze and Guattari, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996.
[7] Although the writing of Lyotard's *Libidinal Economy* might be characterized as "anti-theoretical" by some, it is arguably more "anti-philosophical" as Iain Hamilton Grant points out in the Introduction to the Athlone Press edition of 2004 (p.xix). It is anti-philosophical precisely because of the renewed interest in Nietzsche in France at the time of the emergence of the canon of post-structuralism with which we equate the work, and Nietzsche himself was known to "philosophize with a hammer". Instead of philosophy then, or even a coherent theory of sorts, how might we characterize *Libidinal Economy*, and how might it fit into an exegesis of theoretical discussion as this thesis attempts? To answer this question one must quote Lyotard himself, who characterizes the text as a "rhetorical exercise" (p. xx introduction, ibid.) in which "...writing,..., is *irresponsible*, perhaps because it flies inevitably towards the multiple rather than homing in on the one?" (p. xxii introduction, ibid.). It is thus perhaps justly characterized as anti-philosophical, but nonetheless might be able to be utilized for socio-psychological speculation (theory) on architecture as this thesis attempts.

and the related, but materialist, conception of the "libidinal" as articulated by Deleuze and Guattari, and its mechanics of "multiplicities", "assemblage", "alterity" and "event". In doing so, an understanding is hoped to be forwarded on the "libidinal" as a machination of subjectivity and its role in raising "architecture as a possibility of thought".

In having made this initial movement into the archaic substance of architecture, the second chapter draws on this analysis and turns it toward examining the historical relationship between architecture and the libidinal, and then the relationship between the Twin Towers as a specific piece of architecture and 9/11 as a libidinal event, an event which I argue resided first and foremost in an immanent interior condition of desire concomitant with a Deleuze and Guattarian understanding of events and action as outlined in Chapter 1. The relation of architecture as such to the libidinal event, and the relation of the architecture of the Twin Towers to the specific libidinal event of 9/11 are then explored. Such a reading of architecture in relation to the libidinal, at first in general and then specifically in relation to 9/11 and the Twin Towers, is only comprehensible in consequence of the excursus with which the first chapter is concerned.

In having posited a "working through" or "re-working" of the event of 9/11 and the relation of architecture to the libidinal event, the necessity for "working through" any redevelopment of Ground Zero in light of the understanding of 9/11 as a libidinal event is articulated as a requisite pursuit.

The process of "working through" the redevelopment of Ground Zero is pursued in Chapter 3 by way of a theoretical trace and then critique of the LMDC final 7 schemes. The theoretical trace of the LMDC final 7 schemes is made against the question of "psychological genesis" as articulated by Derrida, in much the same manner as how the archaic question of "raising architecture to the possibility of thought" was situated within the cradle of the "libidinal": it is another application of the Freudian term of *"durcharbeitung"*. In making a theoretical trace of the LMDC final 7 schemes, the question of the psychological genesis of redevelopment is examined through a historical-factual analysis of the socius' desire in consequence to the destruction of the Twin Towers. Such an analysis leads to linking this desire of the

genesis of redevelopment of Ground Zero to the question "just what is being desired to be resurrected?" In answering this question it is argued that a semiology of capitalist circulation replicating the doomed semiology of the Twin Towers - against which the attack arguably took place as a libidinal event – is what is desired and latent in championing redevelopment. The question of resurrecting a particular semiology is also a question of power, as Lyotard points out: "there is no sign or thought of a sign that is not about power and of power".[8]

In having arrived at an understanding that a desire for replicating the semiology of the Twin Towers is by necessity also an expression of power, an excursus is made into what or whom this power lies that is sought to be resurrected, and just what sort of semiology is being pursued in such thinking for redevelopment. In responding to this question, it is articulated that the power in which the semiologic representation of the replication of the Twin Towers lies is of the semiologic substance of the politics of the State as "striated" space, and that the LMDC final 7 schemes in so far as they pursue the semiologic substance of that which was destroyed, fail to deconstruct an understanding of the event of 9/11 in their schemes for redevelopment. In stead, they turn to valorising the same "iconomy" – taking the term from Terry Smith – of the Twin Towers, and consequentially remain within the reproduction of the representation of the "striated" politics of the State. In pursuing this line of argument the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers is then examined and a parallel made between it and the semiology of the LMDC final 7 redevelopment schemes in order to further the trace and critique of the redevelopment proposals.

The final act or resolution to the initial approach to examining the implications of the event of 9/11 on architecture and subsequent possibilities for thinking through redevelopment is made in Chapter 4. In light of the analysis of the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers, the question is pursued in what way might any redevelopment do justice to the event of 9/11 as analysed? In responding to this question, the concepts of "smooth" and "striated" space are borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari, and positioned as alternate poles around which any subsequent redevelopment might be pursued: "striated" space as that which is inherent within the representation of the

---

[8] Lyotard, *The Lyotard Reader*, Andrew Benjamin (ed.), Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, 1989, p3.

politics of the State, and "smooth" space as its antithesis and disruption of the semiology of power. Given however the analysis of the LMDC final 7 scheme's "iconomy" as residing within the "striated" space of the politics of the State, the only logical pursuit and resolution to redevelopment is argued to reside in the valorisation of "smooth" space. In this pursuit, an examination of the architecture and urban legacy of the Situationist's is pursued, highlighting the pursuit of the "smooth" in that legacy through the discussion of the key Situationist concepts of "*dérive*" and "*detournement*". The thesis finishes by articulating the opposition between "*puissance*" or "power", and "*pouvoir*" or "force", arguing that it is the force of the "libidinal" which must be valorised in any redevelopment scheme as opposed to the "power" of the "striated" or the politics of the State. The desire for *puissance* (force) over *pouvoir* (power) is as a means to create affects and figuration of heterogeneity and otherness by way of, in and through architecture, as opposed to "striated" affects.

The only address to architecture in the face of the event of 9/11 is to seek and desire an otherness from power through architecture, and an otherness for the subject inhabiting that architecture, an otherness that seeks to disrupt the affects of this power on the person's subjectivity in inhabiting and using that space in particular. This otherness and heterogeneity must be sought from the very genesis of redevelopment, its subjective construal of generation, production and creation; such a struggle, is what Foucault has termed as a "struggle for a new subjectivity",[9] and which arguably lies at the heart of any psychoanalytical process characterised by the Lyotardian term "*durcharbeitung*" or "working through". It is through making this statement that I conclude my initial aim of raising architecture to the spectre of thought as put forth by Derrida, and specifically as this might relate to the event of 9/11 and its subsequent efforts for architectural redevelopment.

---

[9] Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power", in *Art after Modernism: rethinking representation*, The New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York, 1984, p421

Prologue

The Possibility for Architecture Theory

The concern of this prologue is to schematically outline and place into context the approach to thinking through issues architectural that I take in this thesis and apply to my subject matter. By doing so, my intention is to briefly outline and justify a process by which the writing of this thesis has been approached as a context for the possibility of architecture theory that follows. My intention is to open-up a way toward understanding architecture, and in consequence to place it in a different light, a light from which a certain theorisation and the possibility of architecture theory might follow.

By way of unfolding the term 'thinking through issues architectural', I connect its understanding to a derivation of the etymology of the term "think", which according to the *Oxford Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*, denotes the action of "caus[ing] to appear to oneself".[1] To think and to think through something therefore denotes a condition of "coming forth into appearance", a process and state that is intrinsically connected to vision and sight on the one hand, and to presence on the other; one could say it is to behold a visual presence of something in ones thought. As such, the act of "thinking through something" is primarily concerned with a schema of mental conception; the route toward this mental conception of presence is arrived at through contemplation, speculation and looking at a thing, precisely that which defines the English etymology of the term "theory",[2] which could be said to be a route toward thought and thinking. To think through something therefore requires a precondition of theory to reveal and posit a presence of something; furthermore the term "theory" is derived from the Greek "*theŏrós*" meaning "spectator" - again a reference to vision, specifically, a vision on the other. To think through something and arrive at a presence of thought which can be visualised and then uttered, or written down, requires acting as a spectator. It is this relation of a spectator upon the discipline and practice of architecture, which I attempt to posit in this thesis, arriving

---

[1] See "*think*" in the *Oxford Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.
[2] Ibid., see "theory"

in turn at a theory concerning a speculation on the nature, context and possibility for redevelopment of Ground Zero following the event of 9/11 and its resultant intellectual horizons as it might relate to architecture.

The reason it is "theory" that is attempted at being pursued in this thesis as opposed to "criticism", is that as K Michael Hays writes in his "Introduction" to *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, architectural discourse since the 1960s has been concerned primarily with the construction of theory in relation to discussing issues architectural, as opposed to "criticism" - which would mean a certain definitive judgement on architecture - which it has displaced.[3] It is in the frame of architectural discourse emergent since the 1960s that this thesis follows, and therefore distinctly within the mould of attempting to "think architecture and its possibilities through" as a speculation, as opposed to arriving at a judgement. This being said however, a judgement in consequence of certain theorising is necessarily present, but only insofar as it is derived from the act of theorisation.

K Michael Hays presents an erudite articulation of the role and practice of theory in architecture since the 1960s in his "Introduction" to *Architecture Theory Since 1968*. Hays writes that "...architecture theory is a practice of mediation. In its strongest form mediation is the production of relationships between formal analyses of a work of architecture and its social ground or context..."[4] This mediation between formal analyses of actual works of architecture and a social ground or context is produced, as Hays referring to Fredric Jameson says, by "...the setting into active equivalence of two pre-existing codes, which thereby, in a kind of molecular ion exchange, become a new one. What must be understood is that the new code (or meta-code) can in no way be considered a synthesis of the pair...it is rather a question of linking two sets of terms in such a way that each can express and indeed interpret the other."[5] It is through such linking and "setting into active equivalence of two pre-existing codes" that I attempt through the drawing in of certain post-structuralist philosophical concepts to bear on the discussion of architecture, and which characterises the process by which this thesis proceeds. This process is none other than applying a

---

[3] see "Introduction", K Michael Hays, *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, p.x
[4] ibid,. p.x
[5] ibid., px-xi

philosophically oriented theoretical speculation to the process of thinking something architectural through. As Hays writes further in his "Introduction", this "mediatory function releases unnoticed complicities and commonalities between different realities that were thought to remain singular, divergent, and differently constituted."[6]

In departing from this initial excursus it is necessary to place into context the contemporary practice in architecture discourse emergent from the 1960s onwards with previous pursuits of architectural theory historically. In Peter Eisenman's 1963 PhD thesis titled *The Formal Basis of Modern Architecture*, the thesis is concluded by outlining two types of theory that have governed architectural discourse since the Renaissance as inherited from Vitruvius. The two types of theory Eisenman outlines are what he terms as "closed-ended" theory on the one hand, and "open-ended" theory on the other. Eisenman analyses the nature of theory and writing on architecture resultant from Vitruvius' *Ten Thesiss on Architecture* beginning with Alberti's *On the Art of Building in Ten Thesiss*, through to Durand and later eighteenth and nineteenth century architectural treatise authors such as Guadet and Choisy. Eisenman identifies these texts as belonging to a classical Vitruvian-Albertian tradition, in as far as they treat the subject matter of architecture in a self-referential manner, in a way that the treatises' subject and object is both architecture. Such theorisation Eisenman labels as "closed-ended", theorisation which views and discusses architecture as being unchanging and unchangeable, always referring back to itself as an end. In opposition to this lineage and type of architectural theory, Eisenman posits and argues for the polemical essay as a type and genre of architectural theory that has the ability to transform architectural discourse from the "closed-ended" schema of the Vitruvian-Albertian kind, toward one that treats the subject matter of architecture in a manner that "allows for expansion and continuous application",[7] or in other words "open-ended". It is this type of discourse and architectural writing that Eisenman labels as the basis for the polemical essay in architecture.

Following Eisenman's analysis of these two types of differing approaches to the modes of architectural discourse, speculative and "open-ended" on the one hand and judgemental and "closed-ended" on the other, it is the model of the speculative

---

[6] ibid., p.xi
[7] Peter Eisenman, The Formal Basis of Modern Architecture, Lars Müller Publishers, 2006, p343

polemical essay as theory that this present thesis adopts, and does so for the purpose of doing away with the construction, or even analysis, of a set of "closed-ended" rules and prescriptions, instead aiming to synthesise disparate texts and utilise their content for the aim of understanding something about the context of architecture in its ever-changing condition. Eisenman writes in this regard, that "to this end, theory should not be considered as a set piece, a neatly wrapped package, but rather as a continuously applicable and open-ended methodology",[8] or in other words "a possible way of approach to an architectural problem",[9] a process that thinks through issues architectural from disparate grounds.

Furthermore to Eisenman's "open-ended" theoretical genre of architectural thinking, the present thesis adopts an approach of "inter-disciplinarity", in the vein that Jane Rendell argues for in her introduction to *Critical Architecture* (2007). In this introduction Rendell writes that it is possible for various "disciplinary approaches brought together – or which have yet to be brought together – within architecture to exert critical pressure on one another; I would describe the moments, projects and practices where this occurs as inter-disciplinary".[10] Rendell further iterates in this same introduction, that the aim of bringing critical pressure to bear on disciplines is "to critique the modes of operation of those disciplines".[11] The purpose therefore of pursuing an inter-disciplinary approach to the writing of this thesis is precisely to produce an "open-ended" and polemical critique, namely and specifically concerning 9/11 and Ground Zero. The purpose of this "open-ended" polemical writing is to harness an excursion into such inter-disciplinarity toward the thinking through of possibilities for the discipline of architecture, producing theory in turn.

Such an approach is one of attempting to create "political critique",[12] as much as it is of attempting to create an architectural critique *by way of theory*. Indeed the critique of the political and a critique of the architectural in the process of pursuing architecture theory go hand-in-hand without any possibility of separation between the two. This is to say that when one thinks by way of theory, by default, one is thinking

---

[8] ibid., p353
[9] ibid., p353
[10] Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Murray Fraser, Mark Dorrian (ed.), *Critical Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon, 2007, p2
[11] Ibid., p2
[12] ibid., p1

politically, in and through multiplicitous substrates of knowledge that have accumulated and come to bare on the possibility of a disciplinary practice. It is such thinking through of both the political and the architectural, and indeed in its course through the social, psychiatric, psychoanalytical[13] and philosophical, that inter-disciplinarity reveals itself not as an affectation, but as a necessary and requisite route through which theory and subsequent critique based on that theory can unfold. As Rendell states: "the aim of such work is to question dominant processes that seek to control intellectual and creative production, and instead generate new resistant forms and modes of knowledge and understanding".[14]

In addressing the writing of critical architecture theory within the genre of critical theory, K Michael Hays asserts "that for him the term 'critical' [is] derived from critical theory and could be summed up as 'the constant imagination, search for, and constructions of alternatives'".[15] It is in this vein, that the methodology of this thesis unfolds, seemingly perhaps at times subjective and speculative in nature, but nonetheless rigorous in its search for an interpenetration of philosophy with architectural thinking and with society, an interpenetration that aims to "search for constructions of alternatives", and open-up an understanding of both architecture and society in turn.

This seemingly subjective and speculative manner of the interpenetrative use of philosophy with questions of architecture is done for the purposes of attempting to rethink and rework architectural thought and subsequent action, to think through and to show, in a manner, how architecture theory might be, or could potentially be constructed. In so far as this is achieved, the reworking enabled by a philosophically oriented architectural enquiry acts as a route toward a critical theory of architectural discourse. In this manner the method of a philosophically oriented architectural enquiry, similarly to a method of deconstruction in philosophy, aims not to demolish architectural discourse in a negative sense, but rather to circumscribe it in a positive sense. This positive circumscription of architectural discourse enabled by way of an

---

[13] by "psychoanalytical" it is meant the search for a realization of a new subjectivity, a new way of seeing and perceiving architecture, of thinking about it in a different light.
[14] ibid., p1-2.
[15] Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Murray Fraser, Mark Dorrian (ed.), *Critical Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon, 2007, p3

interpretative use of philosophy on concerns architectural attempts to show how architecture discourse might be constructed anew. Descombe writes of philosophical Deconstruction, that its aim was to "show how philosophical discourses are constructed";[16] in terms of borrowing from and applying the same methodology to architecture theory, deconstruction in architecture theory would be to show how 'architectural discourses are constructed', and in view of that how they could be constructed anew - it is this that I attempt in this thesis. In contradistinction however to Deconstruction in philosophical discourse, whereby Deconstruction "attempts to propose a 'theory of philosophical discourse'",[17] deconstruction in critical architecture theory attempts to find a new route to architectural truths and understandings for the purpose of architectural production. Just as Andrew Benjamin has stated in his *Architectural Philosophy*, "...architectural theory has to be interconnected - perhaps even inter-articulated - with the actual activity of architecture...the argument has to be that it is the...thinking in which the activity of philosophy and theory combine, that marks out the space for another formulation of architectural theory".[18] It is this combination of philosophy with theory for the purpose of "another formulation of architectural theory" that denotes the method and action of deconstruction in architecture. It is this, which is at the heart of the methodology of this thesis and a method toward the possibility of an architectural theory. For this purpose, and hence as a logical consequential necessity, the thesis embraces a philosophical disposition for the purposes of understanding something about architecture in relation to its subject topic, and then extending and extrapolating the implications of this understanding to a way about thinking about architecture in consequence of its subject topic, whilst at the same time and in conclusion, always keeping an eye-out for the practicalities of an actual utilisation of its implications for architectural production. Rendell writes quoting Derrida: "that we give up the frontier and cease drawing lines to separate design [production] and criticism[19] [theory], that we look instead to sites of contamination – perhaps of inter-disciplinarity – for these call into question existing definitions and demand instead new forms of critical and creative work"[20] –

---

[16] Vincent Descombe, Modern French Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980, p79
[17] Vincent Descombe, Modern French Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980, p79
[18] Andrew Benjamin, Architectural Philosophy, The Athlone Press, London, 2000, p104
[19] Although Rendell uses the term "criticism" in this quote, I consider criticism to be an outcome and possible extension of theory as stated earlier, something that is derived from and wholly subject to it.
[20] Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Murray Fraser, Mark Dorrian (ed.), *Critical Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon, 2007, p5

both in the genre of critical architecture theory, and ultimately in the practice of architecture as well. In other words, and necessarily so, the explicit purpose of the philosophically oriented architectural enquiry unfolded in this thesis is to shed light on possible action (and critical action at that) for redevelopment on Ground Zero following a particular philosophical understanding of the event of 9/11 as unfolded in the enquiry that the thesis attempts; it is one of keeping an eye on both theory and practice, on how theory might first evaluate and critique practice and then contaminate it to produce critical architecture in turn. As Rendell writes: "In a world that currently remains in the grips of an unjust corporate and imperialistic capitalism, critical architecture is urgently required."[21]

The texts used for this philosophically oriented architectural enquiry in the case of this thesis come from a post-structuralist line of writers, namely Lyotard and Deleuze and Guattari as primary sources.[22] The reason these philosophers work has been used is in their relevance for discussing and interpreting society and its production, including not least amongst this production, architecture. In the same manner that critical social theory utilises Marxist theory for the purposes of unfolding understandings, analysis and interpretations on society, this thesis departs from post-structuralist authors to do the same, but in relation to architecture and its context. Furthermore, it is a theory of knowledge, or a theorisation of a way to knowledge that I attempt to unfold in this thesis, specifically as this knowledge concerns architecture. The pre-occupation of a theoretical discussion of a way to knowledge is coupled with a theoretical way of understanding society and culture, the two of which (knowledge on the one hand, and society and culture on the other), can not be discussed independently of each other. This coupling of knowledge><society/culture is discussed with a view toward its concern with architectural thinking and conception, and ultimately action; it is to this valorisation that post-structuralist texts have been put to use in this thesis. It is by way of such process that architectural thinking is aimed to be rethought and reworked, and in as far as the thesis succeeds in this, the process becomes a work of architectural deconstruction. As Ben Agger writes in his

---

[21] ibid., p7

[22] Even though some authors might characterize Lyotard as postmodernist, it is his text of *Economie Libidinal* that has been utilised predominantly in this thesis, which arguably is a post-structuralist text rethinking sociology – see Introduction by Iain Hamilton Grant in Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, 2004.

article "Critical Theory, Post-structuralism, Post-modernism: Their Sociological Relevance", "critical theory and post-structuralism both generate deconstructive readings of cultural works and practices";[23] it is for this reason that the subject topic by necessity traverses post-structuralist texts in the method of critical theory and in the spirit of inter-disciplinarity. Given the nature of the philosophically oriented architectural theory that the methodology of this thesis follows, its intellectual lineage rooted in post-structuralism on the one hand, and critical theory on the other makes it an "open-ended" inter-disciplinary polemical essay in the vein of how Eisenman espouses it.

It is interesting to note that other authors have also written about the same subject topic as which I discuss in this thesis from a similar methodology. It is sufficient to look at Baudrillard's two essays on 9/11, "The Spirit of Terrorism" and "Requiem for the Twin Towers", in order to see how critical theory and post-structuralist theory might address the topic of 9/11. Other writers that could be mentioned include Gene Ray's *Terror and the Sublime in Art and Critical Theory: from Auschwitz to Hiroshima to September 11*, where the author dedicates two essay chapters to the discussion and theorisation of aspects of 9/11, both from a methodology of critical theory. Critical theory in the vein of the polemical open-ended essay therefore has both a precedence of being summoned for the unfolding and construction of theoretical statements and understanding of societal and architectural events in our recent past, as well as an academic justification for doing so. It is this precedent in academic methodology that I pursue in the construction of this thesis.

As eighteenth century French architect Boullé has stated: "the production of the mind is what constitutes architecture";[24] the way in which the context of this present thesis is outlined is what lends itself to the particular constitution of a potential architecture. Furthermore and in relation to Boullé's statement on the production of the mind constituting architecture, it is pertinent to quote Guattari as an enabling rationale and context for the possibility of the polemical "open-ended" theory: "there are two methods of receiving theoretical statements: the academic's way is to take, or leave,

---

[23] Ben Agger, "Critical Theory, Post-structuralism, Post-modernism: Their Sociological Relevance", Annual Review of Sociology, Annual Reviews Inc., 1991, p124
[24] Quoted from Bernard Tschumi, "Architecture and Transgression", *Oppositions Reader*, Princeton Architectural Press, New York, 1998, pp357.

the text as it stands, whereas the enthusiast's way is to take it and leave it, manipulating it as he sees fit, trying to use it to throw light on his circumstances and direct his life."[25] In a systematic and directed reading of texts for the purpose of shedding light on a particular subject topic, the academic method is one of "taking it or leaving it", either using what one reads for the purpose of an argument, or otherwise leaving it out of the argument desired to be made. In contradistinction to this academic method, the aim of this thesis was to take the texts that I found and then manipulate them as I saw fit, for the explicit purpose of laying-out a polemical trajectory of theory and subsequent further theory that is already emergent from the bowels of a particular pre-existent psycho-geography. By doing so, the research methodology with which this thesis has been approached is of the model of an open-ended polemical essay, in parallel with the manner an activist, or in Guattari's words an "enthusiast", might work with texts that they find: to take what is found, manipulate it as seen fit for the purposes of "throwing light on present circumstances" and then leaving it once a consequential plane of thought is arrived at, or to which one is delivered through their manipulation and use of texts, in order for action to then find a new ground, and indeed a new praxis: that is to use texts as a vehicle for action in the Marxist understanding of the term. In this way, the research serves as a tool for directing a life and directing a theoretical approach and research oeuvre toward the object of a particular concern, which in this case is the theoretical and speculative thinking-through of architecture as a discipline and practice in consequence to the event of 9/11. Such thinking through of architecture as a discipline and a practice can not be done without recourse to thinking through and critiquing society from which architecture emerges from and to which it is inexorably attached, and ultimately finds its way back to – the two facets of architecture and society must go hand-in-hand in the process of unfolding any theory about architecture; it is this that I attempt in this thesis.

It must be pointed-out in this regard, that the taking of Guattari's quote for the purposes of an argument as evidenced here is of an academic method, living it out and putting it to use is of an activist method. As Henri Lefebvre has said of his own work in relation to *The Production of Space*, this thesis "has been informed from beginning

---

[25] Felix Guattari, "Molecular Revolution and Class Struggle", in *Molecular Revolution*, 1984, p254.

to end by a project...I refer to the project of a different society, a different mode of production",[26] which in the case of this thesis aims to forward a condition where architecture "would be governed by different conceptual determinations".[27] In so far as this has been achieved, the present thesis becomes an instrument for activism.

[26] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford, 1991, p419
[27] ibid., p419

Chapter 1

The Libidinal as Economy of Form

The Path on Which Architecture Finds Itself

Lyotard's Libidinal Economy

Deleuze and Guattari's Libidinal Materialism as Economy of the Socius

Assemblage, Alterity and Event

Libidinal Economy and Architecture (the Creation of Form)

The Path on which Architecture Finds Itself

"Let us consider architectural thinking. By that I don't mean to conceive architecture
as a technique separate from thought and therefore possibly suitable to represent it in
space, to constitute almost an embodiment of thinking, but rather to raise the question
of architecture as a possibility of thought, which cannot be reduced to the status of
representation of thought."[1] This quote is taken from the introduction of one of the
late-Jacques Derrida's writings on architecture from the mid-1980s titled
"Architecture, Where Desire May Live", written at a time, and in a context, when
Derrida was heavily engaged with thinking philosophically about architecture. The
intentional resurrection and resurfacing of this quote provides a plane and offers a
possibility to reinterrogate architecture for the purposes of a theoretical extrapolation
on it. Such speculation is no more ripe than in a post-9/11 world, a world in which
architecture finds, and has found itself, to be a target for competing world-views in
the context of terrorist attacks.

---

[1] Jacques Derrida, "Architecture Where Desire May Live" (Architetture ove il desiderio puo abitare),
Domus, 1986, p671

'Architecture as a possibility for thought' raises questions as to what it actually is about architecture that might lend itself to be interrogated and arrested for thought. In rephrasing this statement as a question: what is the most basic condition that lends itself to an activity which results in architecture? In response to this question, the first implicit thread that might be surmised from Derrida's quote is that architecture as the possibility of thought requires the apprehension and interrogation of the terms 'placing' and 'habitation' in the context of the master (*archi*) builder coming to constructing (*tecture*) something: how does the master constructor (architect) come to think through the basic structure and purpose of his/her action in the context of thinking through 'placing' for the provision of 'habitation'. It is these two terms which are amongst the two core and most basic issues without which his/her activity of architecture cannot surface as a possibility for thought.

Such interrogation of 'placing' has as its least, and even then, only peripheral prerequisite the choice and use of site in the physical sense; the real substance of the terms 'placing' and 'habitation' is only revealed after the two terms have been drawn into one another and their meaning and yield for architecture examined, which is to say from a theoretical extrapolation on the respective terms: it is this displacement that offers up the possibility for architecture to be thought. It is in the interior of the terms 'placing' and 'habitation' where the path that leads us to architecture, and where the thinking through and interrogation of architecture begins. In what follows, it is this theoretical path that I wish to journey along in coming to an understanding about architecture.

In embarking upon a theoretical path, amongst the speculations that can be furthered form these preliminary remarks, is that a possession of space is taken hold of through the reciprocal engagement that placing and habitation create. Habitation is a result of the taking possession of a space resulting in a place, and it is in the consequence of the creation of a place that architecture comes about, and consequentially that architecture can then yield itself to thought. With the taking place of possession, paths are formed that constitute our finding and taking possession of such place. The taking possession of a place and consequential habitation, and the apprehension of architecture as a possibility for thought, is impossible to be realised without thinking

through the substance that our paths affect in and on a place, without thinking through what our paths manifest upon a place and how our paths manifest themselves in that place. Thus place reveals an arrival and departure in space. It is upon this manifestation of our paths that the nature of architecture and the possibility to think architecture is revealed. Equally, once habitation of a place is taken hold of, it is our paths to, on and through that place that construct the nature of what is revealed in that place: that is an architecture – an architecture created from the inside-out: the nature of architecture being constituted from the interior of these paths.

The paths of possession that stamp themselves on a place to create a possession of space are affected by 'us', which affect we may term, following Deleuze and Guattari, as *haecceity*, that is the 'thisness' of a thing or person in its entire individuated aggregate.[2] It is our lines, our slownesses and speeds,[3] or in another term our 'thisness' that cause us to create and follow paths; it is our lines, slownesses and speeds, our 'thisness' that causes space to be inhabited by virtue of being reflected back as place; it is our individuated aggregate that stamps possession on space, creating a 'thisness' or habitation, a possession that becomes a placing. Placing is an affect of us, the reflection of our entire individuated aggregate. Habitation and the paths to, in and through a place is, following Deleuze and Guattari, a resultant creation and manifestation of our *haecceity*.

A deconstruction and thinking through of architecture for the possibility of apprehending it in thought begins with paths, with examining the paths that constitute us - our *haecceity* – prior to taking place, and the unravelling of those paths in the way they come to lay out habitation. In reference to Bernard Tschumi's *Event Cities 3*, placing may depart through three different approaches: context, concept and content.[4] What must be examined in unravelling the nature of paths taken in realising architecture and apprehending it as a possibility of thought is the substance of each: the interior substance of context, the interior substance of concept and the interior substance of content.

---

[2] Deleuze and Guattari, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p262-263.
[3] ibid., p262-263
[4] Bernard Tschumi, *Event Cities 3*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2004 – see introduction.

To arrive at an understanding of the nature of context, it requires to be conceptualised. Although Tschumi discusses context in his introduction to *Event Cities 3* in terms of that which is "in situ", a given historical, geographical, social, political or economic setting, such setting is not divorceable from the paths that lead us to possession of space. Historical, geographic, social, political and economic contexts are consequences of taking place, and thus of possession. They don't so much as denote us in our individuated aggregate essence, as rather denote the outcomes of that essence having taken place "in situ". The interior substance of context thus both precedes, and reciprocally, creates the historical, geographic, social, political or economic nature of habitation, or of being "in situ". Tschumi's ascribed attributes of a place are a manifestation of our paths through a site; they come after, as a consequence of taking possession and taking place. They can only be conceived as the immanence of our *haecceity* affecting itself in space.

Moving on from an understanding of context to concept, the architectural concept can be understood as the manifestation of an internal assemblage of how we are in space and time, how the spatiality of our psychiatry affects itself in place, of the affects of space and time in and on us, prior to even setting out on any path that might create habitation, and prior to taking place. The interior substance of the architectural concept is the 'isness' of us in the world, our thoughts and desires as they have come to be constructed in and through the world, with the world reflecting itself back into a place through us. This reflection might be construed as an intellectual or mental context, this context however requires a world to be reflected back, it requires a substrate of concept, of 'isness', a substrate of psyche off and through which to refract.

What then is the substance of refraction, of the assemblage of the architectural concept, in the taking possession of place and the creation of an intellectual or mental context? Following on from an attempt to interrogate architecture as a possibility for thought, these refractions are the stamp of our inner paths, the corridors, passages, staircases and doors of our collective desire in taking possession of place. Refractions are the motivation, the will that leads us on a path to take possession of a space and recreate it as place, it is a psychiatric fall-out that cannot but affect in space something interior, an interior that is a refraction of our *haecceity*, and with it, a refraction of the

4

world back to itself. Refractions as concept are this interior, which by default, also construct a placing or context for what is to come; again it is a matter of precondition. It is a matter of understanding 'creating place and habitation' as something that is revealed, an operation that works from the inside-out, rather than one constructed from outside-in. Placing and habitation, and hence the substantive nature of architecture, is an interior condition that becomes affected on the outside, rather than an exterior condition governed by what is "in situ". It is this 'affect of the internal' which creates content.

In extending this excursus, the crossroads that lead toward, and at which we find architecture taking place, and through which we can apprehend architecture as a possibility of thought, is the intersection of the interior substance of context and the interior substance of concept. Before and prior to taking place, they are interior in their substantive nature. The crossroads of context and concept, the path or street that leads us to architecture, without which habitation cannot take place, that is its precondition, is the result of arriving at these crossroads, namely content, that is 'us' as we exist as individuated and collective subjectivities.

The interior substance of content from which all architecture proceeds is collective thought and desire – that is us – our civilisation and culture; it is, following Lyotard, our economy of libidinal investment, and following Deleuze and Guattari, our *haecceity*. The path of possession has desire operating as its economy, which assemblage is placing's economy; that is what may be characterised as an economy that is libidinal. Both architecture's content and nature is the libidinal economy of desire, following Lyotard's use of the concept 'libidinal economy' in his 1974 title *Libidinal Economy*; in order to reveal the nature of architecture and offer it up as a possibility for thought, it is the interior substance of this content that requires to be displaced and thought through. The path on which architecture finds itself, and itself can in turn to be found, the implicit precondition for habitation and placing, the possibility for architecture to be thought emanates from the inside; it is first and foremost libidinal: as Derrida has titled his essay from which we began this excursus: "Architecture: Where Desire May Live".

5

Much needs to be said about such theorisation in thinking about the precondition of habitation and placing, and any resultant architecture. Indeed much continental philosophy since the events of May 1968 in Paris has concerned itself with just such speculation. In thinking about architecture as a taking place of habitation in this vein, it is the texts of Lyotard's *Libidinal Economy*, and Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus* and *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – A Thousand Plateaus* that need to be traversed and used for thinking. These texts are arguably the core texts for what we might term as "libidinal philosophy", a philosophical understanding of the world and thought that went against the grain of Structuralism. Indeed these texts cannot be understood without a recourse to the key texts and authors of Structuralism, however this thesis will not attempt to retrace this connection, merely use the said texts to forward an argument about the relation of desire and the libidinal to architecture, and do so in the context of discussing the event of 9/11 and architecture's relation to it.

Lyotard's Libidinal Economy

Departing from this preliminary excursus on finding the substance of architecture within the affect of desire on space, which in turn creates habitation and place, upon, in and through which architecture can proceed, it is necessary to examine the philosophy of desire as it has been appropriated in recent contexts. Such philosophy of desire in which taking place rests, is termed as 'libidinal philosophy', emergent in France as a result of the Parisian events of May 1968.

Following on from, and directly affected by, the Parisian events of May '68, thought, society, political action and their inter-relationship began to be rethought in French philosophy in a way that theorises individual and societal action and affect by way of recourse to desire. The two main proponents of this philosophy were Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari on the one hand, publishing *Anti-Oedipus* in 1972, and Jean-Francois Lyotard with his 1974 title: *Libidinal Economy*. Although both authors theorised philosophy, thought, society and societal affect by recourse to desire, the two writings are in some contrast to one another, with Deleuze and Guattari staking their libidinal philosophy on a materialist, or immanent plane, whilst Lyotard remaining, or having been criticised for remaining, within an orbit of transcendental

philosophy.[5] Nonetheless, both understandings of libidinal philosophy turned their back on investing meaning in the structuralist sign, and instead valorised societal action and thought as residing in the psychiatric realm of desire. Most importantly, it is this, and the affects of the theorisation of desire, that characterise libidinal philosophy.

The first of the two authors I wish to draw upon in entering into an understanding of libidinal philosophy as it relates to thought and action, and consequently theorising it for the purposes of architecture, is Lyotard and his *Libidinal Economy*; this is due to the fact that the concept 'libidinal economy' has gained currency in discourse by recourse to his thus titled work, even though this title was published two years later, and in a way responded to, Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*.

Lyotard's concept of libidinal understanding of thought, and concomitantly with it, action (two poles between which we find everything that constitutes history, culture and civilisation, and with it architecture) relies on three distinct terms and their inter-related fusion into a theoretical system of politics. These three terms are 'systems', 'energy' and 'intensity'. As opposed to the theorisation of the sign and the signified upon which structuralist philosophy stands, libidinal philosophy sought to understand the creation of meaning as residing in desiring-affects, which in turn themselves both reside in and affect the individual and collective formation of subjectivity. The formation of both personal and collective subjectivity and the systems that 'energy' and 'intensity' unleash are inseparable from one another in the post-structuralist theorisation of libidinal philosophy.

In *Libidinal Economy*, Lyotard engages philosophy in a discourse that hinges upon understanding thought, society, politics, and with it action, as a libidinal investment and flow, or a system of energy and intensity that always redoubles on itself to continually create affect. As Williams has stated in his *Lyotard – Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, *Libidinal Economy* outlines a philosophy of the economy of desire,[6] that is an economy that is motivated and assembled through the subliminal

---

[5] Williams, *Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, Polity Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, pp.129-133}

[6] ibid., p39

(and this is Lyotard's recourse to a transcendental negativism) nature of subjectivity taking affect. This is an important distinction in understanding the nature of libidinal economy, (and with it history, culture and civilisation), namely that it is subjectivity that is valorised in the libidinal economy, and as such, the nature of the libidinal economy is always one of emanation from the interior. It is for this reason, "that there can be no outside the system",[7] "every event and every sign is potentially structure and that which escapes structure".[8] The system, and with it its energies and intensity always and constantly fold affect back onto itself, thus creating inter-related ever-morphing movements and articulations of both individual and collective subjectivity released in and through action. This release is what may be termed as the political in society, and when rising to take the form of action, the political act. It is in the interior of the political act that action takes shape.

Williams discusses a number of characteristics developed from Lyotard's *Libidinal Economy* by which the libidinal economy as concept has been theorised and can be understood. Amongst these characteristics resides the central concept which Lyotard terms as 'dissimulation'. Dissimulation can be understood as a "complex relation of senses, matter and affects"[9] that lead to new possibilities or creative movement taking place, and in doing so, subvert the assignation of the sign. Meaning, action and the political are thus divorced from the sign, to take their place instead in the inter-relationship between senses (subjectivity) and matter, creating affect. Lyotard's conceptualisation of the libidinal economy, following Williams, hence may be understood as a dynamic system of subliminal affect marking itself on matter. It is through this marking on thought and matter, that politics, and most importantly action as politics – be it architectural or otherwise – releases itself. The dynamic nature of the libidinal economy creates an exodus or politics of flight that could be characterised as "that which escapes the system, or more accurately, makes the system leak, setting it in movement towards new possibilities that demand a creative response."[10] It is in this exodus or politics of flight that Lyotard's subliminal subjectivity affects itself as a creative movement, constantly seeking out new possibilities and affect. Thus nothing is ever stable in the economy of the libidinal;

---

[7] Williams, *Lyotard and the Political*, Routledge, London, 2000, p.47
[8] ibid., p.47
[9] ibid., p.44
[10] ibid., p.44

8

flows create affect, which affects result in action and politics, which in turn redoubles to create and necessitate creative flows of affect. In short: "the libidinal economy is an unstable actual state of society"[11].

Lyotard discusses dissimulation's relation to the sign as something that "we seek to carry [them] on towards the construction of other things, texts, images, sounds, politics, caresses, and if possible, just *as productive of movement...*"[12], that is to say a "different reaction, a different reception"[13] to that which the structuralists assign to the sign's relation to meaning. And again Lyotard writes of dissimulation in relation to the sign that it is "...a sign which produces meaning through difference and opposition, and a sign producing intensity through force (*puissance*) and singularity. Libidinal intensity;"[14] The distinction between the structuralist sign and its relation to meaning and the libidinal understanding of the sign and meaning, is one of letting the force and intensity present in the sign unleash itself in order for it to be productive of movement and "to be set in motion"[15] – to see what might happen in politics through the political act in *consequence* to the sign, as opposed to shutting it off in trying to find its meaning. The libidinal economy is one of motion and of force, of receiving something differently and letting itself play out. The libidinal economy understood in this light conceives of an altogether different nature of economy and politics of the sign to that which is conceived by Structuralism.

The economy of any system be it social or otherwise – including that of thought – requires levers that both produce and extinguish matter, action and affect. Marx's political economy describes just such a system, with an understanding of its function for producing production (or the taking possession of place and affect) being valorised through the exchange of value, be it labour or goods. The libidinal economy, similarly to Marx's political economy, by necessity also valorises production however as opposed to locating production in external systems of value, Lyotard's libidinal economy locates production in the valorisation of desire, and conceptualises the levers that create production as being of a libidinal nature. Hence every action, enunciation

---

[11] Williams, *Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, Polity Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, p.41
[12] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, 2004, p49
[13] ibid., p49
[14] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, 2004, p52
[15] ibid., p50

or production, indeed the understanding of the framework of the libidinal economy's politics, resides within the function of desire as a productive agent, affecting itself in and on subjectivity, be it an individuated aggregate or collective. By recourse to Lyotard's conceptualisation of libidinal economy, capitalism is theorised not by recourse to exchange of value, goods and labour, but by recourse to the affect of the libidinal nature of desire in thought and action. The libidinal economy is an understanding of the functioning of capitalism on both a societal and individual plane that is understood through recourse to the function of desire on, through and in that plane. Without the function of the libidinal as a system of production, capitalism would implode. What keeps capitalism from this implosion (just like what kept the bubble of the 1990s tech-economy from imploding), was a libidinal investment on behalf of us, our desire, desire as the cog and wheel of capitalism, which, on a practical level, is the substance of all the indices of economic forecasting, from consumer spending to plant and capital equipment investment indices; it is desire, and conversely confidence in desire, that keeps the political economy in motion, and precipitates its expansions and contractions. Thus as Lyotard states in *Libidinal Economy*: "There is as much libidinal intensity in capitalist exchange as in the alleged 'symbolic' exchange"[16], that is to say that every political economy is libidinal, and hence every capitalist society is also one of a libidinal economy[17].

To quote from Williams: "The real source of energy [in society] is then not some raw material, or labour force, or external world. It is the set of desires that force an economy to incorporate intensities that cannot be reduced to the structures that are necessary to allow for them to be exchanged. This is Lyotard's originality: he sets himself the task of describing the positive economic role of desires and the way in which they are brought into a structure of equivalences"[18]. "Thus Lyotard's definition

---

[16] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington IN, 1993, p.109
[17] It could be said that not only every capitalist society is libidinal, but that every historic society (as opposed to pre-historic) - regardless of its idealistic form – is libidinal. It is precisely because a given populace invests its self-organization with ideals, desires and beliefs, and constructs its form by recourse to such ideals, that it exists as a libidinal aggregate subject to libidinal flow and the libidinal economy. This is as true for communist or soviet-socialist societies as it is for Islamic or Judeo theocracies such as present-day Iran or ancient Israel, as much as it is for present-day capitalist societies. Any organized society, be it a hippy commune, kibbutz or an authoritarian dictatorship at a state level – and everything in-between (as opposed to an archaic society) – is libidinal in its organization; it is the libidinal that gives it its form, without which it would not be able to function and exist.
[18] Williams, *Lyotard and the Political*, Routledge, London, 2000, p.81

of society as libidinal economy is an attempt to emphasize the role of desire in the functioning of society. Desire by Lyotard is understood as a subliminal process that involves systems and energy (the system of repetition and distance and the energy pent up by them in theory or sexual practices for instance). The libidinal economy is a flow of resources around a system where resources take the form of an energy that circulates and appears in many different, ever changing subsystems. The energy takes the form of libidinal feelings and desires (Lyotard calls these intensities). The use of libidinal here indicates an expansion of the model of sexual desire and feelings into a general model for energy in society: energy in the libidinal economy is like sexual energy. This energy is highly unstable. That is, libidinal intensities – feelings and desires – emerge in an unpredictable manner. What is more, although the economy exploits intensities, it never fully understands or controls them….thus the libidinal economy is a system driven by the energy of desire."[19]

It is around this conceptual framework that the ontology of theory, philosophy and politics, and even the ontology of content, including the production of architectural content, can be articulated by way of recourse to Lyotard's conceptualisation of the libidinal and its economy as discussed in *Libidinal Economy*. The aim however, of laying out and comprehending the libidinal and its economy is to draw a discussion of history, culture, civilisation and with it architecture into a different text, to displace or destabilise it, and to offer it new thought, a rethinking of itself. The aim of comprehending the libidinal and its economy is to erect an understanding of paths, habitation and taking of place as one that resides in the economy of desire, and hence in the economy of the libidinal. Once such an understanding of history, culture, civilisation, and with it architecture is comprehended, an entirely new plane opens up through which we can comprehend and theorise political action, of which architectural thought and resultant architecture is but just one component. It is in this comprehension that architecture and architectural thought opens up to be displaced, that is to be though through from a different origin.

---

[19] Williams, *Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, Polity Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, p.40

Deleuze and Guattari's Libidinal Materialism as Economy of the Socius

In contradistinction to Lyotard's recourse to the subliminal, that is a transcendent understanding of the source of desire and its libidinal economy, Deleuze and Guattari articulate their conceptualisation of libidinal philosophy upon recourse to a materialist immanence, that is they posit their thinking about the libidinal and its economy onto a materialist plane "where events are immanent to a world consisting of different but connected planes".[20] These events located within the substance of the world are, by default, of a materialist nature residing within the assemblage of the socius,[21] a social assemblage that in turn unfolds the affects of a libidinal economy of the political and political action present in society.

Deleuze and Guattari's materialist plane operates upon and through the substance of individuated and collective subjectivity as agent of the libidinal. In Deleuze and Guattari's libidinal philosophy, libidinal affects and politics are but a working out of subjectivity upon and through the materialist plane of the socius. The central distinction in understanding the difference between Lyotard's subliminal or transcendent source of libidinism and Deleuze and Guattari's materialist philosophy of the libidinal is Deleuze and Guattari's recourse to the substance of subjectivity as libidinal agent working its affects in and through society, a machine that receives or records and then emits or expels assemblages of subjective affect, as opposed to the libidinal residing in a transcendent source.

Guattari offers the following definition of understanding such source and workings of the libidinal in his provisional definition of subjectivity: "the provisional definition of subjectivity I would like to propose as the most encompassing would be: 'The ensemble of conditions which render possible the emergence of individual and/or collective instances of self-referential existential Territories [taking possession of place], adjacent, or in a delimiting relation, to an alterity that is itself subjective".[22] The emergence and realisation of subjectivity as a libidinal force affecting itself upon,

---

[20] Williams, *Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy*, Polity Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, p.130
[21] I borrow the term 'socius' from Deleuze and Guattari as used in *Anti-Oedipus*. Deleuze and Guattari write that "in a word, the socius as a full body forms a surface where all production is recorded, whereupon the entire process appears to emanate from this recording surface." See Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 2000, p10.
[22] Guattari, *Chaosmosis, an ethico-aesthetic paradigm*, Power Publications, Sydney, 1995, pp.8-9

and playing itself out, is thus characterised by having both its origin and machine located on a plane of self-referentiality; this self-referentiality exists in relation to difference, or what Guattari terms as 'alterity' in society. In other words, the libidinal affect of subjectivity, and hence the entire machine of Deleuze and Guattari's libidinal economy, exists in 'us as we exist in the context of the difference or alterity of this place', and 'us as we exist in the content of the affect of the difference of this place'. By consequence, the taking possession of place as politics, be it social or individual action – even architecture – finds its direct and sustained origin, and hence content, in the subjective relation between 'us' and 'place', between society and place. It is through this understanding that we can talk about politics, and the political act, and reciprocally of history, culture and civilisation (society's past, present and future) as libidinal.

Central to Deleuze and Guattari's libidinal philosophy, is that social affect and politics arises out of the formation of individual and collective subjectivities as they are affected by the workings of the socius, including that of capitalism. Indeed capitalism, and hence with it architecture as capital's taking possession of place, is both an affect and an origin of the materialist libidinal machine. Such an understanding and valorisation of subjectivity and its role in creating the economy of the libidinal relies on an interface with society as *the* territory – both origin and machine - within and upon which the libidinal and its affects are played out. "In a word, the socius as a full body forms a surface where all production is recorded, whereupon the entire process appears to emanate from this recording surface. Society constructs its own delirium by recording the process of production; but it is not a conscious delirium, or rather is a true consciousness of a false movement, a true perception of an apparent objective movement, a true perception of the movement that is produced on the recording surface".[23] It is for this reason, that production or the political act is inalienable from society, and society in turn inalienable from production and the political act. The two exist reciprocally and at the same time within one another. Capitalism as political production residing within subjective affect is also both recorded upon, and at the same time, emanates from the body of the socius as it exists in its dualistic, yet singular state, as an outcome, and at the same

---

[23] G. Deleuze & F.Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1984, p.10.

time source of the libidinal economy. In contradistinction to Marx's valorisation of exchange value in underpinning an understanding the machine of the capitalist socius, Deleuze and Guattari locate the origin of production, including capitalism and its outcome, in the libidinal affects of subjectivity.

The mechanism that energises capitalist society, and with it production, is conceptualised by Deleuze and Guattari by recourse to the same term as what Lyotard attributes it to, that is desire, desire as the machine of the libidinal economy that both records and plays itself out on the surface of the socius, which surface is immersed in its own product, namely capitalism. Deleuze and Guattari draw no distinction between the machine of desire and the machine of the socius; it is for this reason why it can be said, that the desire of the socius is both the origin and at the same time the machine of the libidinal economy, with the economy of the libidinal being the affect of this desiring-machine: "social production and desiring-production are one and the same, and that they have different regimes, with the result that a social form of production exercises an essential repression of desiring-production, and also that desiring-production – a 'real' desire – is potentially capable of demolishing social form".[24] Desire acts as the agent or infrastructure upon and through which society and its political acts, including capitalism and all its attributes, take form – society cannot be separated from the desiring-machine, and the desiring-machine cannot be separated from society and its movements. That is to say, that "there are no desiring-machines that exist outside the social machines that they form on a large scale; and no social machines without the desiring machines that inhabit them on a small scale".[25] "Desiring machines are the fundamental category of the economy of desire".[26] The libidinal economy *is* society, and society and all its affects *is* by default and at the same time libidinal: every action performed by us resides in the economy of the libidinal – even architecture. Collectively this action is called politics, ranging from the micro, involving relations between individuated aggregates, to the macro, involving the formation of society and civilisation – including capitalism.

---

[24] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1984, p.116
[25] ibid., p.340
[26] ibid., p.32

14

Beyond the operation and significance of desire in machinations of the libidinal machine, there is a further element that Deleuze and Guattari name in the valorisation of desire, which sets the desiring-machine into production, namely lack (*manque*). "Lack (*manque*) is created, planned and organised in and through social production. It is lack that infiltrates itself, creates empty spaces or vacuoles, and propagates itself in accordance with the organization of an already existing organization of production."[27] Lack is the grease of the libidinal without which the machine and its desire would not take place. When taking possession of place, or in other words, when setting politics into motion, it is our lack that causes the production of possession to take place, and in turn kick-start the desiring-machine of the libidinal economy affecting itself through our actions, whatever they may be. "The truth of the matter is that *social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions.*"[28] Amongst these determinate conditions is the presence of lack.

As can be extrapolated from this brief overview of Deleuze and Guattari's libidinal philosophy, we are all caught up in the economy of the libido, none of us can escape it: "We can no longer even speak of distinct machines, only types of interpenetrating multiplicities that at any given moment form a single machinic assemblage, the faceless figure of the libido. Each of us is caught up in an assemblage of this kind, and we reproduce its statements when we think we are speaking in our own name; or rather we speak in our own name when we produce its statement."[29]

Assemblage, Alterity and Event

Having then very briefly laid out a cursory examination of the content of both Lyotard's and Deleuze and Guattari's libidinal philosophy, it is necessary to unfold the substance and levers of the machine of desire, the substance and levers by which the desiring-machine, and with it the entire concept of the libidinal economy, operates through us and in and through society and in all our actions, including architecture and the act of habitation through taking possession of place. In this regard, Deleuze and Guattari name an ensemble of conditions through which the desiring-machine is

---

[27] ibid., p.28
[28] ibid., p.29
[29] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p.36

put into action, amongst these are 'assemblage', 'alterity' and 'event' as three distinct cogs in the machine of desiring-production. It is around the playing out of these three concepts, that politics, history, civilisation, the affects of the social body and form come about and in which we find action as politics to exist, including architecture as a possibility for thought and subsequent act.

The first of these conditions to examine is the concept of 'assemblage', which Deleuze and Guattari connect to their concept of 'multiplicities'. 'Multiplicities' are conceptualised by Deleuze and Guattari as having "neither subject nor object, only determinations, magnitudes and dimensions...",[30] that is they are the substance of a flow of affect taking place facelessly within and upon the body of the socius disconnected from any object of enunciation and any performative subject; multiplicities are the interior condition and immanent plane of the machine of the libido as it acts itself out upon and among us. When these multiplicities that flow within the interior substrate of immanent subjectivity and desire increase in their dimensions, a change in their nature occurs; Deleuze and Guattari call this changed, morphed or expanded form of immanence taking place within the desiring-machine as 'assemblages'. Multiplicities belong to the interior substrate of desire and subjectivity, to then emerge in taking form as assemblages.[31] Assemblages are thus the taking of form, or the formal property of multiplicities post having expanded in their connections to create, and in having created affect.

Deleuze and Guattari valorise and relate the workings of the libidinal concept of 'assemblage' to the entire strata of societal production, be it enunciation, content, expression, exchange, language, signs, the unconscious or the war-machine. In light of the formation of assemblages from the immanence of multiplicities' determinations, magnitudes and dimensions, social production cannot but be seen as a taking place (or form) from within, and emanating from, the immanent flows of the collective unconscious. Assemblages are the revolutionary component of societal production (including architecture) and the political act, in turn energising the cogs of the libidinal economy. As it has been stated earlier, "*social production is purely and*

---

[30] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p.8
[31] ibid., p.8

simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions".[32] The operation of multiplicities and the resultant conceptualisation of their expanded connections as an 'assemblage' runs through all possible territories of societal production, producing social affect, social production or political action in their wake. Social production (including architecture as a manifestation of civilisation) is but a consequence of the determinations, magnitudes and dimensions of multiplicities taking place as assemblages. The playing out of multiplicities through their formation into assemblages defines the libidinal structure of all action within society, defining its root within the collective unconscious desiring-machine of us as individuated aggregates, or what Deleuze and Guattari term as *Homo natura*.[33] The concept 'assemblage' is thus undivorceable from comprehending the individuated subjective aggregate and all that it produces, be it architecture or anything else, as residing within the desiring-machine. Assemblages are a lever of the desiring-machine that bring immanence to surface into production. The concept of 'assemblage' is thus a central component to understanding the mechanism of the libidinal and its economy as it plays out through and in us, both individually and societally, including in architecture-production.

In turn, assemblages themselves produce affect, a creation of form that causes the socius and its substance to alter. This affect of assemblages may be termed as 'alterity'. The alterity that assemblages produce is what may be understood or termed as difference: that is the motivation and result of the political, or politics. The political as societal production only comes about when there is an emergence of difference formulated through multiplicities expanding to assemblages causing an affect of alterity, an alterity that takes place, or inscribes itself, upon and within the body of the socius. Assemblages taking form, thus directly lead through alterity and politics to the formation and form of history. History, and with it culture and civilisation (including architecture), is the plane upon which the desiring-machine of the libidinal economy deteritorialises and reaches its fulfilment through and upon us as vessels of the collective body of socius. Alterity takes form in politics, which having arisen out of difference produces a sequence that from afar, and looking back through time, one might term as history, together with its concomitant nature of civilisation and culture,

---

[32] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1984, p.29
[33] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1984, p.33

including architecture. Civilisation and culture carries within it the affects and form of alterity. Indeed, history, culture and civilisation as resultant affects of alterity are in fact the form that alterity takes and through which it expresses societal production in matter, or in the body of the socius. The collective body of individuated aggregates, that is us, forming the socius is what Deleuze and Guattari term as *Homo historia*,[34] upon and in which the alterity of difference as history is inscribed, and in which the individuated desiring-machine of *Homo natura* takes place and exists.

There is however one element between the production of alterity and history taking form: this element is what may be termed as the 'event' or in other terms a 'transcendent plateau'. Alterity produces events that cause politics or societal production (including architecture) to take place, in which sequence of taking place we can locate the writing of history. Conversely, events may also arise from outside of a given societal body, such as from geomorphic substrates such as volcanic eruptions or other natural phenomena, however when arising in such manner, their affect on the body of the socius is the same as though arising from within, they too result in alterity and difference taking place within and upon the social body. Events are thus the surface upon and through which the libidinal economy affects itself. It must be noted however, that in a globalised socius, be it capitalist or not, events are always inter-connected to internal past events, such interconnection is exampled by the domino effect reverberation created by the Central-Eastern European events of 1989 and the resultantly declared 'New World Order' and liberal economic policies of the West that ensued. The libidinal economy in a globalised system is always inter-connected, which interconnection may not surface necessarily as a reaction at the same point in time as one event has occurred, but which inter-connection nonetheless will always cause a reverberation at a possible other time, thus closing, and at the same time opening up again the formation of history, culture and civilisation, including architecture.

Deleuze and Guattari formulated their discussion of the libidinal economy in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – A Thousand Plateaus* around the understanding of events or transcendent plateaus as laid out above. These events or transcendent

---

[34] ibid., p33

18

plateaus may be individual, social or natural. Deleuze and Guattari also call these transcendent plateaus as 'eruptions of intensity', which could be another term by which one could call 'events'. In all cases, events, as opposed to multiplicities, are concrete phenomena taking place in space and time; Deleuze and Guattari gave dates to such occurrences, thus further signifying their material nature, be it individual, social or natural. To name just a few of these eruptions of intensity through which Deleuze and Guattari unfold their libidinal philosophy of history and society, it is enough to give their dates and locate the events those dates signify.

One specific date that Deleuze and Guattari site is November 28, 1947, the day on which Artaud declares war on the organs, the date signifying the event from which Deleuze and Guattari formulated their chapter titled 'How to Make yourself a Body Without Organs'. Artaud declared on this day "to be done with the judgment of God, 'for you can tie me up if you wish, but there is nothing more useless than an organ'". This statement of Artaud, was an individual event arising from the individual assemblage taking place within his own individuated subjective aggregate toward the very end of Artaud's life, a few months before his death, and in direct relationship to it. Another plateau of intensity or event Deleuze and Guattari site is 1933, which is a social plateau or event of the desiring machine. 1933 is the date given for their chapter 'Micropolitics and Segmentarity', which event's catalisation was the outcome of general elections in Germany whereby the Nazi party emerged as the largest coalition party in the Coalition Government of the 'National Alliance' resulting in the elevation of Hitler to the position of Chancellor, resulting in a historical, social and cultural alterity that changed the face of twentieth-century history. A further date Deleuze and Guattari signify is 1227 to which they gave the title of their chapter 'Treatise on Nomadology – the War Machine', which date signifies the death of Genghis Khan and the partition of his empire between his four sons, thus becoming an event at which nomadolgy as war machine reached its zenith and furthest deteritorialisation.

Events are both catalysts and intensive immanent eruptions in history arising from difference or alterity, energised by assemblages. A plateau of intensity is always reached at the culmination of lines, be they personal, social or biological, which conversely signal the beginning of something, either of a decline or of a newfound expansion – or both at the same time but in different directions. A plateau thus acts as

an event, as a mark both produced by and at the same time creating social-production in the socius and/or the individual; a mark that condenses everything that went before it, and relaunches that condensation into a new trajectory, be it one of diminution of past alterity or ascension of a new alterity. Events as plateaus are space-time historical markers of the libidinal economy in action; the event is the Deleuzian plateau at which point immanence encapsulates form in social matter, be it architectural or not.

"We can say that social production, under determinate conditions, derives primarily from desiring-production: which is to say that *Homo natura* comes first. But we must also say, more accurately, that desiring-production is first and foremost social in nature, and tends to free itself only at the end: which is to say that *Homo historia* comes first."[35] Desiring-production as the machine of the libidinal economy thus always first appears in the socius, and then oscillates between the context of history, culture and civilisation, and the thus inflected content of our *haecceity*, in bringing about action. Desiring-production affects itself when these two planes collide to produce alterity resulting in political events. The event is the pivotal concept which mediates between *Homo natura* and *Homo historia*. The event as a reverberation of multiplicities, assemblages and alterity is the catalyst for the assemblage of *Homo historia*, and at the same time for *Homo natura*'s deteritorialisation from it. *Homo natura* is both the source and a consequence of *Homo historia*, and in the end, that that is all she is or can be: "There are no individual statements, there never are. Every statement [or political act] is the product of machinic assemblage, in other words, of collective agents of enunciation".[36]

It is important to note, that when denoting "history, culture, civilisation", it is architecture and the process to architecture, amongst other things, that we are discussing. Architecture always travels upon and through "history, culture, civilisation", and therefore the discussion of the mechanics of the concepts multiplicities, assemblages, alterity and event to discuss "history, culture, civilisation" also relates to and discusses architecture, as it would the coming about of any other social formation or action.

---

[35] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1984, p.33
[36] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p.37

20

Libidinal Economy and Architecture (the Creation of Form)

Deleuze and Guattari "maintain that the social field is immediately invested by desire, that [the social field] is the historically determined product of desire, and that libido has no need of any mediation or sublimation, any psychic operation, any transformation, in order to invade and invest the productive forces and the relations of production. *There is only desire and the social, and nothing else.*"[37] In thinking about the social field as an immanent plane for desire, it is, following Deleuze and Guattari, possible to say that every production taking place within and upon the social field – be it social, cultural or material, leading to historical production and the formation of civilisation – is connected to the machination of desire and its affective blossoming on the socius. The production and valorisation of thought therefore, be it related to social, cultural or even material concerns, resides within the desiring-machine taking affect in the social body resulting in action; this action is what may be termed as the political act, which politics when manifest creates form, regardless of what strata that form manifests itself in, be it social or material.

In understanding society as libidinal, form is thus intimately connected with politics; indeed it could be said that the emergence of politics *is* form, and conversely that form *is* political; the creation of form is a consequence of the political act, whether it has a social dimension or not. In order then to unravel the nature and substance of form – be it social or material – as the libidinal economy brings it about, it is necessary to draw the understanding of form into an understanding of politics.

In understanding the mechanics of society and all resultant action as libidinal, all politics emanates from alterity taking form by recourse to difference. Politics and form is the outcome of the libidinal economy in motion: everything, every multiplicity and resultant assemblage when confronted or catalysed by an event results in politics, be it slow and orderly, sequential, gradual, sudden or violent. It could be also stated that every multiplicity and resultant assemblage when confronted or catalysed by an event results in form coming about, whether it be social or material. Politics may be understood as the realisation of Nietzsche's 'will to power',

---

[37] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1984, p.29

21

that is politics resides within the desiring-machine taking affect and resulting in form of some kind. This creation of form is what valorises culture and civilisation on the social plane, leading in certain outcomes to a material manifestation of form, such as parliaments, judiciaries and structures of the state and economy. Hence the nature of any material formation such as architecture and its catalytic source of architectural thought is a direct outcome of the desiring-machine taking affect on alterity, and producing form in matter. This is to say, that architectural thought and resultant form is first and foremost libidinal in nature, and observes the libidinal sequence of coming about by recourse to multiplicities and assemblages in the same manner as social form adheres to such a process. In this understanding, 'form' – including architectural form as a taking of place within context, that is content, has a direct relation with immanence found within the interior structure of libidinal economy. The conceptual understanding of form as such is applicable to whatever dimension of the libidinal economy one wishes to investigate, be it social or material. Architectural thought as thought and action conveying cultural form cannot be divorced from libidinal politics and the political act: all production in and upon the social body – be it material or not, and following on from the thought of Deleuze and Guattari – is beholden to the desiring-machine affecting itself on the body of the socius as politics.

When confronted with the architectural task of formulating a material outcome in form, all that architectural thought as it exists in the individuated subjective aggregate has to draw from, is one's *haecceity* as it exists in the bosom of collective social subjectivity, or the body of the socius. Thought and action can not happen outside the parameters that the desiring-machine has laid-out for us both individually and collectively. Hence any architectural thought and action, cultural consideration or material manifestation of civilisation, is a result of the desiring-machine affecting itself in matter, and as such constitutes the valorisation of the very politics that flow through the entire body of the socius and its libidinal economy. Architectural thought and its realisation is but one manifestation of politics within the structure of the libidinal economy. All material form of architecture therefore is by necessity also political, and comes about in the same libidinal manner as politics does on the social plane. As far as architectural thought is concerned, material form is beholden to the libidinal economy and can not escape it. The economy of material form as immanent in architectural thought and production relies on multiplicities affecting themselves as

22

assemblages to bring about politics on the material plane, the politics of which is the architectural act. Material form, or in other terms the outcome of architectural thought and production is but a manifestation of political thought within the context of the libidinal economy. Political action and architecture exist on the same plane, indeed could be said to be one and the same manifestation of the libidinal economy. Architectural thought and material form are but a political manifestation of the political economy as invested by desiring-machines. All architectural thought and resultant architectural form is thus a consequence of libidinal movement within the individuated subjective aggregate of *homo natura* as affected by *homo historia*: all architecture as action is also political, a political manifestation of the emergence of collective desire as it exists within us as members of the socius. It is perhaps this understanding what Derrida might have alluded to in calling for "raising architecture to the possibility of thought".

This politics in which we find architectural thought affecting itself is one that is played out upon and in response to the libidinal formation of culture and civilisation. As it has been stated, culture and civilisation are but a result of form taking place through politics on the social body. Any thought or action connected to such social form by default is engaged in its very actualisation as politics; it is valorised by the political residing in the form of culture and civilisation, even history. Architectural production therefore partakes in the libidinal politics of culture and civilisation, and can not escape it; it can merely infuse culture and civilisation with desire emanating from multiplicities resulting in assemblages to bring about politics and form in relation to its (political) engagement with alterity and difference. Every architectural movement and conception from the Renaissance to the Modern Movement to the present was, and is, a manifestation of such politics playing itself out as an assemblage of thought leading to action in and upon the alterity of the form of culture and civilisation. What this politics created, and continually continues to create, is the emergence of new form that arises from, and in turn is reinvested, in the social body. Architectural thought as multiplicities and assemblages operate as desire breaking forth: "When desire is present, it exists as a process that changes the connections and social relations of society, transgressing all fixed boundaries. Desire is revolutionary in its essence, not because it wants revolution, nor because it may be provocative to express liberated sexuality, but because it affects and changes every established order

of society."[38] It is in the affect and change that desire produces in us, that the vanguard of architectural thought and any consequential material form resides.

Architectural thought as an act of politics is *homo natura*'s and *homo historia*'s taking possession of place in time and space. When place is being taken possession of, the paths that lead to that place are already motivated by the desiring-machine and its will to power; as Goodchild points out "power derives from desire, and turns to 'repress' desire",[39] therefore the taking possession of place and any resultant architecture constantly finds itself in a political struggle between desire and power. The context that architectural thought is germinated in, and which it cannot escape, is our collective and individual desire; the content of architectural thought is also but an extension of our collective and individual desire. The streets and paths that lead to architecture and on which architectural thought can be found are the streets and paths of desire, the streets and paths of which lead toward an economy of desire taking possession of place and creating form. The paths and streets that lead toward architectural thought, and in which architecture takes place, can be found within the manifestation of a politics fuelled by the desiring-machine, and affected by the levers of that machine, namely multiplicities, assemblages, alterity and event. It is as a result of the desiring machine and the paths it leads us on, that architecture becomes a manifestation of a political act in taking possession of place. Nothing can be created or brought into production that is not beholden to the collective unconscious of the social body (desire) as manifested by the *haecceity* of *homo natura*'s action.

The task laid out in this chapter has been to give an account or reading of the economy of desire, and in doing so, to understand how the desiring-machine operates, and how and what it produces, in order to be able to draw an account of the libidinal economy and through it the nature of history, culture, civilisation and concomitant political action, up to and including a deliberation on the making of form and architecture. That is, the task laid out is to point out that the making of form and architecture, or political action in other terms is the outcome of the economy of desire and relies on multiplicities, assemblages, alterity and event affecting themselves; it

---

[38] Goodchild, *Deleuze and Guattari: an introduction to the politics of desire*, SAGE Publications, London, 1996, p.74
[39] ibid., p.73

relies on form taking possession of place as the substance of content. The aim of this chapter "is to try and grasp subjectivity in the dimension of its processual creativity",[40] and valorise the understanding of that processual creativity in rethinking architecture on a plane of events and the political. It is the aim of this chapter to draw out the structure of the dimension of processual creativity of the libidinal economy in all of its affects, including that of the political, without which it cannot be apprehended, and in doing so, answer the call to raise architecture to the possibility of thought.

[40] F. Guattari, *Chaosmosis, an ethico-aesthetic paradigm*, Power Publications, Sydney, 1995, p.13

A (re)-reading of architecture in relation to the Libidinal

A (re)-reading of architecture in relation to the libidinal

The Twin Towers and the Libidinal Event of 9/11

Working through Redevelopment and the Libidinal Event of 9/11

A (re)-reading of architecture in relation to the libidinal

In having traversed through an understanding of libidinal philosophy and its implications on "raising architecture as a possibility for thought", one might comprehend and begin to think about architecture as a machine of production residing in desire and hence operating from the inside-out as an imminent taking possession of space which reflects ourselves back to the world. In what follows, I wish to make an initial argument that will examine the relationship between architecture-production and a conception of architecture through recourse to the conception of the libidinal.

Lyotard talks about the libidinal band as being a moebius strip,[1] that is a surface which has neither inside nor outside. The moebius strip of the libidinal band may be seen to co-opt and interiorize elements of consciousness and subjectivity – including their respective materialisations and formal investments – that seemingly fall outside its realm and reach. Any and all subjective investment is laid bare in front of the reach of the libidinal band to be co-opted and interiorized into the economy of the libido. It is in understanding this co-option and interiorization through the formal properties of

---

[1] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington IN, 1993, p3

the moebius band that we can speak of the body of the libidinal economy as a "multiple conducting body, a multi-directional polymorphous area",[2] a two-dimensional surface area that extends out into the realm of any and all subjective affect to envelope multi-faceted disparate constructs and interiorize them within the band of its economy and surface. Architecture, as the construct and outcome of thought and desire-investment, as a surface and construct that bears within it libidinal investment through the consequence of the nature of taking place and taking possession of space, is not immune from this.

Throughout history, intensities constituting the libidinal economy and the constructs in which desire and intensity are invested, such as architecture or any other material phenomenon, have been inseparable from one another as two sides of the same surface in which libidinal affect has come to pass. This is a characteristic of the libidinal band of politics playing itself out in a three-dimensional material world, namely that libidinal affects come to surface on and through material form, either through the erection of something material (one can think of Titus' column in Rome, or Napoleon's Arc de Triomphe, a flag, a slogan or a social entity such as a nation and its material manifestations for that matter), or alternatively the destruction of something material (and/or social, which terms are often co-joined), such as the LA riots following the treatment of Rodney King. In this way, matter is co-opted into the machinations of the libidinal band as a surface of and for the manifestation of politics, acting as a surface through which desire and thought is valorised, to in turn materialise desire as a signification of the libidinal economy in motion – the co-option of material thus becomes the ultimate affect of the presence of desire, and thus an inherent part of the process of taking possession of place.

In discussing the co-option of material into the libidinal band, one need only read Alberti in light of Lyotard. Western Architectural thought since the publication of Alberti's *Ten Books* can be boiled down to be premised on one multi-layered facet: that is the erection of signs that have the capacity to act as potential tensors through investment of those signs with cosmological meaning. To elaborate on Alberti in light

---

[2] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington IN, 1993, p.260

27

of Lyotard, it must be made clear, that a tensor is "any event which is associated with intensity and therefore has the potential to mark the mingling of different forces"[3] – such an event may be in consequence or in lieu of material or not. This cosmological meaning has always aimed at producing a cosmopolitan reading, one that citizens of a shared universal may be able to interpret and all read in a similar way – and then act from it, bringing politics full circle. The assessment of the relation between the investment of the intensity of a cosmology and cosmopolitanism, it must be added, is as true for Western architecture as it is for Islamic, Khmer or Chinese architecture, only the cosmology is different.

Architecture as an art and science concerned with the erection of tensors, tensors in which intensities have the potential to play themselves out leading to events is – by its very nature – beholden to libidinal affect. Architecture as an art of the tensor, as a libidinal sign, is concomitant with a libidinal flow of desire and thought, and thus partakes in the enabling and communication of a libidinal investment, and as such, in politics. Taking possession of space to create place is nothing but this politics and desiring-machine playing itself out. Architecture seen in this light is nothing other than a physical-political manifestation of intensity (desire), a semantic signification of multiplicities leading to physical articulations of assemblages, constructs of surfaces on which the libidinal band erupts in varying frequency and varying intensity. If architecture exists on such a libidinal plane, it can not escape being drawn into the band of the libidinal economy and partake in the politics thrown up by the libidinal economy of the socius, as the intensities which course through architecture, and more importantly architectural thought, are part of and latent within a broader libidinal economy.

The relationship between the libidinal economy and architecture is most evident in the examples of will-full destruction of architecture whereby the destruction of it aimed to serve as a means of politics. The most immediate and large-scale example of such will-full destruction of architecture is the Tatar (Mongol) invasion of the Chinese heartland in the thirteenth century, where whole towns were sacked and reduced to

---

[3] Williams, *Lyotard: Towards a Post-Modern Philosophy*, Polity Press, Cambridge MA,1998, p.96.

rubble. Other examples in history might be the Roman's demolition of Solomon's temple, the Turk's transformation of Hagia Sophia (even if it wasn't demolished, it was rearticulated and re-subjectified), the French storming and later demolition of the Bastille in Paris, and in more recent times the destruction of temples and churches during the cultural revolution in China, the implosion of the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex in St Louis, the demolition of the Berlin Wall, at first in an ad-hoc, makeshift way by protesters and then by the State itself, or the clearing of so-called shanty towns in present day Zimbabwe. In all of these examples, architecture acted as a surface for the libidinal event, an event existing of intensity and desire, which found its surface-eruption on the face of material-architecture.

The Twin Towers and the Libidinal Event of 9/11

In following on from these brief examples of the libidinal economy's affect and co-option of material manifestations and architecture, and in addressing the event that came to for in New York and Washington on 11 September 2001 , 9/11 might also be comprehended as such a libidinal eruption, an event leading from multiplicities to assemblages through alterity to an event, taking place as such on a libidinal moebius strip as coloured by the subjectivity of a particular segment of the global socius. In relation to the libidinal event of 9/11, architecture found itself co-opted into the libidinal framework of a particular segment of this global socius, and it is for this reason that 9/11 must be situated as a socio-architectural event.

It could be surmised, that by virtue of the terrorist attack of 9/11 taking place as it did, upon and across the surface of architecture, architecture became the surface, or at least one side of the surface upon which the libidinal economy of the terrorist attack of 9/11 erupted and took place. At the moment that the planes respectively pierced the envelope of the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, the desire and pleasure (lust-libido)[4]

---

[4] Freud construes the term *"lust"*, translated in the English edition of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* as "libido", denoting a meaning of either desire or pleasure (see footnotes to the meaning of the term 'libido' in the 1910 edition of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, republished by Vintage, London, 2001, p135), that is in using the term "libido" as derived from Freud and construed by Lyotard in *Libidinal Economy* as the concept "libidinal economy", we necessarily talk about the economy of desire, and the pleasure associated with that desire.

of the terrorists was achieved; their desire was in a direct reciprocal relation with the surface (architecture) of the targets that they wished to destroy.

Architecture – and specifically the architecture of the Twin Towers – in its semantic-politico-signification machine cannot but be therefore drawn into a reciprocal relation with the underlying force through which the multiplicities leading to assemblages through alterity and into an event registered. In light of the event of 9/11, the Twin Towers, and through it the libidinal structure invested in modern architecture thought might only be understood through recourse to a libidinal deconstruction of it. The reason it is important to distinguish modern architectural thought from modern architecture, is because it is in the thought invested in architecture, in its substance and structure, where the libidinal comes into play; the outcome of an architectural modernity that the Twin Towers embodied is simply the emanation and immanence of that thought.

9/11 as an event rippling through two or more reciprocal, yet co-joined, libidinal surfaces, calls for an interrogation of the surface of architecture, that is subjectivity by which architecture is construed and takes place. For this reason, and going beyond merely identifying 9/11 as a socio-architectural event, the political act of 9/11 must be construed as an architectural act inherent within the architectural thought-surface that the Twin Towers embodied: the libidinal investment (surface of thought) present within the Twin Towers' architecture was the source of its eventual demise, a source that became co-opted into the libidinal economy of the attack. This could be stated conversely and quite bluntly: the attack on, collapse and destruction of the Twin Towers was the final architectural accomplishment of its conception, an architectural accomplishment precisely, because it was the surface (thought) of its architectural conception, the libidinal investment of architectural thought inherent with it, that became the architecture of its destruction. This architecture was a libidinal structure invested in the conception of the Twin Towers' form and signification, an architecture

30

that became caught up and re-invested in the excretion of the libidinal force and intensity that surfaced on 9/11.[5]

In expanding on this, the conceptual directive for the design of the World Trade Centre as a living monument to World Peace was spelt out by the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association at the time of commissioning the World Trade Center project. It was envisaged – by the architects or those responsible for commissioning them - that such a concept of World Peace can best be embodied in a sign that heralds a triumphalist freedom of ability to trade, hence a desire to erect a monument that would symbolise world peace through the function of trade. The architect of the World Trade Center attested to this in a book by Anthony Robins titled *The World Trade Center*,[6] by saying the purpose of his design was to be "symbolic of its great purpose, of the working together in trade of the Nations of the World...." What resulted in the signification and symbolism of the Twin Towers therefore, was a monument to a unilateral world-order governed by capitalism, conceived in and for the benefit of capitalists, a world-order that conceptualised peace in the ability and practice of trade (even to the point of masquerading exploitation as trade), and the support of corrupt political regimes open to such trade – a quasi command politics of the first-world, dictating to that of the second and the third; as Baudrillard writes: "The fact that there were two identical towers *signifies* the end of all competition, the end of every original reference."[7] Such sentiments were embodied by Yamasaki and his fellow architectural proponents through a modernist iconotype; as libidinal structure invested in the idea of that iconotype it was the embodiment of desire and thought invested in it, which lent itself to the event of 9/11, which libidinal framework

---

[5] The locus of understanding 9/11 following on from the analysis made into the conceptual nature of "events" in Chapter One, necessarily shifts an understanding of the event of 9/11 from a simplistic framework of terrorism or extremism, into a conceptualisation of subjective intensities and affects working their way through the body of the socius. In working their way around the body of the socius, this collective and individuated subjectivity came to surface at a distinct point in time; it is only at their surfacing that we can speak of an event, and speak of it in historical dimensions. In saying this, it is not meant to negate, equivocate, or in any way condone the acts of terror unleashed in 9/11, but rather meant as a means to analyse the substance of their precondition, their origin and architecture as will, thought and ultimate action, to set out a plane through which the acts of terror surfacing on 9/11 might be conceived of conceptually and theoretically.

[6] Anthony Robbins, *The World Trade Center*, Englewood, Fla. : Pineapple Press ; Fort Lauderdale, Fla. : Omnigraphics, Inc., c1987.
[7] Baudrillard, *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, Sage Publications Ltd, London, 1993, p69

permeated through to its actual design conception. It was the idea of modernity and peace as founded on global trade that became the libidinal embodiment of the Twin Towers, and captured through Modernism's erection of not one, but two - that is a reiteration and emphasis - of this sentiment's unchallengeable force, and as such, consequential statement of imperialist stance. Again quoting Baudrillard: "The two towers of the WTC are the visible sign of the closure of a system."[8] It was the context of this ideological closure and consequential libidinal force embodied by the Twin Towers architectural thought-horizon that unleashed and then intermingled with the force of desire opposed to such world-order latent within the radical fringe of the Islamic world that led to the event of 9/11 being the Twin Towers' ultimate architectural statement. What I am saying is this: without the Twin Towers, or anything like it existing, an event such as 9/11 may not have happened at all, or might have happened differently, without recourse to architecture.[9]

Such an understanding leads us to conceptualise 9/11 as a surfacing of intensities and affects, intensities and affects valorised by multiplicities and assemblages of desire, which formed an event-horizon on the surface of the Twin Towers for the libidinal economy of a certain segment of the global socius in the occurrence of the attack. It was this surfacing and excretion of the libidinal economy's already pre-existent intensities and affects of desire that has been named, and will come to be called historically, as 9/11. It is interesting to note, that in Arabic, Turkish and Persian the same word "*tarih*" stands for both date and history. The intensities and affects of the libidinal band of desire – creating a libidinal event – that surfaced on the date of 9/11, by virtue of having surfaced into an event is written into and given meaning (a place) in history by virtue of their being named as a date. The event of 9/11 encapsulated and given meaning by a date – at the point of surfacing into a date – at the same time becomes a libidinal event of history, the culmination and redispersal of libidinal forces that create history through dates: such are the dates of Deleuze and Guattari that name their respective chapters of libidinal events in *A Thousand Plateaus*. It is in

---

[8] ibid., p70
[9] For further reference to 'predestination' and the WTC, see Terry Smith: "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center" in Architecture Theory Review (ATR), Volume 7, No.2, 2002, particularly the section titled 'An Architecture of Predestination?' p.30

the surfacing of libidinal intensities and affects that history as a sequence of libidinal events comes to be formed, of which a more recent and particular one is 9/11. Instead of a politics of war, or a politics of a "war on terror", we must begin to think and talk of 9/11 as an immanence of a politics of subjectivity, and with it, an immanence of latent desire.[10]

In understanding the event of 9/11 and its relation to the the Twin Towers in this manner, what that the Twin Towers embodied and signified through its architectural conception and libidinal investment of thought, was the sign, or in Lyotard's framing, the tensor upon which the libidinal intensities present in 9/11 reached their culmination as an event – in the Deleuze / Guattarian understanding of the term. The aeroplanes' piercing and shattering of the skin of the Twin Towers was the moment the intensities latent in the libidinal economy of a certain part of the population of the world expressed itself as tensor. These forces were those construed by desire on the one hand, and by what that desire was channelled towards on the other, and embodied by the Twin Towers – it is in this understanding that we can view the co-option of the architecture of the Twin Towers into the tensor that constituted 9/11. In fact, it is impossible to separate the forces that registered in the event of 9/11 into two distinct facets, as they can not be taken or spoken about as a cause and effect, but rather as a set of complimentary forces that gave rise to the thrust of the event together and in the

---

[10] The libidinal tide erupting into consciousness on 9/11 was aimed at unleashing force on the libidinal construct of the United States and the prevailing global-libidinal structure governed by it and all that it stands for, both politically, militarily, socially and financially. It is on this theoretical plane that the libidinal economy and the manifestation of that desire must be understood and rethought. Such misconstrual of events has occurred in the recent past: the collapse of Communism, despite the rhetoric of the West, was, similarly to the event of 9/11, a subjective event-horizon of force coming to fore. Despite what American and Western propaganda might have its constituents believe, the West did not defeat Communism, rather the population of Soviet Socialist states in Central and Eastern Europe underwent a subjective and internal transformation - it must be said, in part mediatised, and in part resultant from internal policy – a transformation that led to a.subjective event-horizon that unleashed in its wake a global event in due course, namely the demise of the legitimacy of Marxist-Lenninist state politics and social organisation; this event came to be conducted across the globe, across the libidinal band, to a degree that Communism, or Soviet Socialism for a better term, became illegitimized as a form of government and social organisation. Guattari called the events of the late-80's in Hungary and Poland a 'collective existential mutation...the crystallisation of an immense collective desire annihilating the mental substrate of the post-Stalin totalitarian system' (see *Chaosmosis*, Power Publications, 1995, p2), a force that was libidinal, residing within desire, which desire reverberates to this day in the election and re-election of right-wing, right-leaning, or centre-right, quasi anti-communist, or more precisely communist-antagonist political representation in many former Soviet Socialist nations, now democracies.

one instance; as such they constitute the one and the same substrate of assemblage. The socio-architectural, and hence libidinal event of 9/11 should be read in light of the theoretical term of 'tensor' and what it suggests for rethinking and deconstructing architectural thought in light of the currents of a libidinal economy. Architecture in the form of the Twin Towers could be argued to have been caught up in a communicative arrangement with libidinal global forces residing within desire. It is arising from this communication that architecture needs to be deconstructed as sign and semantic articulation of libidinal affect and desire in order to comprehend what was attacked, and how one might go in redeveloping its site. It is this understanding which offers a route toward rethinking the project for redevelopment; that is the substance, content and nature that the project of redevelopment ought and needs to take as a critical response.

Working through Redevelopment and the Libidinal Event of 9/11

Raising then the question of architecture in relation to the libidinal band and construing the architecture of the Twin Towers as partaking in this libidinal band causing the event of 9/11 to take place as it did, it is necessary to begin to address the question of just what route redevelopment of any architecture on the site of Ground Zero might take given the subjective construal of architecture thus far raised, one that thinks through and apprehends the desire latent within redevelopment, and then critiques that desire for the purpose of articulating a different way to redevelopment, one that might do justice to the attacks.

As a response to a subjective construal of architecture in light of a libidinal reading of 9/11 and the relation between architecture and the libidinal band, it is inadequate to suggest as a response to architectural consciousness that it merely requires a complex system of security features, surveillance and so-called counter-terrorism measures to be considered and adopted into future planning and design decisions, as some of the New York League of Architects' submissions suggested in the wake of 9/11.[11]

---

[11] New York League of Architects, 2005, After September 11: An Open Meeting, see: www.archleague.org/nyc/nyc.html

34

Amongst the few worthwhile architectural evaluations of the attack of 9/11 in relation to architectural thought, Reinhold Martin's analysis stands out as one more thoughtful. In his essay titled "Architecture at War – a report from Ground Zero" Martin poses the questions of "historical conditions" and the "historical (and political) dimensions"[12] which led to 9/11. Such a questioning and approach of thought provides an entry into analysing the substance of 9/11 as an architectural event rooted in a milieu of political action fuelled by subjectivity. Even though Martin doesn't offer an analytical or theoretical response to this question in particular, the absence and silence that follows the posing of this question offers a thoughtful entry into an interrogation of the substance of 9/11. It is the silence following the posing of this question that begs for it an analysis that might view the event of 9/11 as something that goes far deeper than a random terrorist attack on ill-defined 'freedoms' or a propaganda of 'the free', and opens the possibility to articulate a response to it that resides in libidinal philosophy: it is from the root of this question that we can attempt to valorise the substance of the dual architectural-politico event of 9/11 as something that was libidinal and which resided in desire. We may reshape this question and ask not "what led to 9/11" but instead "what was the substance of the architectural event of 9/11 and what responses might that substance muster", which answer to the question might suggest that it was a partial culmination of multiplicities leading to assemblages culminating in an event that unleashed libidinal forces. The more important question one might extrapolate from the silence following Martin's interrogation is: what does the libidinal substance of the socio-architectural-politico event of 9/11 lend to rethinking architectural thought and how might that lead to a responsive[13] architecture in its wake?

Martin's response to this second question – preliminarily entered into by him in his essay through his analysis of the United Architects.proposal, and other projects, which

---

[12] Martin, "Architecture at War – a report from Ground Zero", in *Angelaki* Vol.9-No.2 August 2004, p.219 and 223

[13] I emphasize the term "responsive" architecture in this instance, which is one of deconstruction and rethinking, as opposed to "progressive" architecture that was the call of *New York Times* architecture critic Herbert Muschamp in response to the redevelopment effort. See: Herbert Muschamp: "Filling The Void: A Chance To Soar", *New York Times*, 30 September, 2001.

formed the LMDC (Lower Manhattan Development Corporation) short-listed nine projects for the redevelopment of Ground Zero, is worth reiterating here. Martin dismisses the nature of architectural thought called on and championed by *New York Times* architecture critic Herbert Muschamp - and responded to by United Architects and others either consciously or not – as an exercise in "aesthetics as politics",[14] namely that "by enthusiastically accepting such protocols 'progressive' architects showed themselves unprepared and perhaps unwilling to unbind the chains that link their production to the cultural logic of regressive power".[15] Martin makes this analytical claim in light of United Architects' use of military-capitalist-politico terminology accompanying the rationalisation of their design proposal, such as "performance", "instrumentality" and Greg Lynn's own term of "to collapse the boundary between global military conflict and everyday life" as a theoretical justification for their scheme.[16] Such terminology of justification positions the architectural and ideological response to 9/11 as exhibited in the LMDC final 7 as a "gesture made *in the service of* an emboldened sense of empire and war on all fronts, and not against it."[17] Such an assessment is quite damning on the architectural thought represented by the élan of architecture practice chosen for the LMDC final 7.

What the analysis of the approach and thought of United Architects' proposal's evaluation – and other proposals - testifies to, is that architects themselves, like society at large, became caught up in the libidinal assemblage of desire voiced by the US administration, many commentators and the public alike following the attack of 9/11. A libidinal event never dissipates into entropy, but rather conversely, sets off at right angles into further reverberations and libidinal production - it redoubles itself and spreads through the multi-directional polymorphous body of the socius to create politics. This is the substance of the libidinal event as politics, the substance of politics as such, of how politics is propagated by an event, and architects – as it seems from Martin's analysis – were not immune to partaking and giving voice to the

---

[14] Martin, "Architecture at War – a report from Ground Zero", in *Angelaki* Vol.9-No.2 August 2004 p.224}
[15] ibid., p224
[16] ibid., p219
[17] ibid., p224

reverberated assemblages set off by the event of the attack presented to us, and embraced by society at large.

Conversely to the elevation of micro-fascisms onto a global political and consequential architecture arena, what is required is not a retreat into defensive and retaliatory politics of form in collusion with the State, as United Architects' proposal might suggest in light of Martin's analysis of it, but rather an open rethinking of the implications of the libidinal economy on thought and action, in particular architectural thought and consequential action (taking possession of place / coming into form / coming into appearance), especially in light of a libidinal event's such spectacular co-option of architecture as what 9/11 was. What is important and necessary, is to examine the possible micro-flows of movement within thought and desire as emanating from 9/11, and deconstruct the way to a possible thought and consequential action (politics) that makes sense of it – and of us, of our beliefs and of our desires – and the essence of architecture – in light of the attacks.

Following Deleuze, a flow or micro-flow and any micro-politics that may result from it, is "always of belief and of desire".[18] What we (in America or the West more generally) collectively encountered as a result of 9/11 was an attack and then apprehension of our belief and desire vested in our society as represented to us by the State and its values; our micro-flow of value, that by which we are signified and represented, and by which the world – our world – is reflected back to us, that is Us – was confronted. This confrontation of a micro-flow sets-off a libidinal micro-politics of desire – again following Deleuze – at what might be considered a molecular organisation. For the collective "us", 9/11 brought into question the structure and foundation of our micro-politics – and shattered it; (as iterated above, 9/11 should be viewed as a war on subjectivity, rather than a war on terror). In the least, 9/11 should have caused the collective Us, to sit-up and take stock of ourselves as we are vested in our belief and in our desire – and in turn the substance and essence of that vested in architecture and in our taking place – it should have unleashed a requisite reorientation of our belief and desire in an omnipotent macro-politics as represented

<hr>

[18] G. Deleuze & F. Guattari, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia – A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, 219

37

to us by the State and its institutions, and began a questioning of just how we begin to take possession of space and create a placing for the site of Ground Zero given the nature and substance of the event of 9/11. The State of course took another tack and represented the event of 9/11 to us as the first salvo of war. It is in this light, that we can appreciate Martin's analysis of United Architects' proposal as being "unwilling to unbind the chains that link their production to the cultural logic of regressive power" (in the same manner as how many architects are unable and unwilling to unbind the chains of the market and capitalism from their architecture), in as far as United Architects' proposal failed to deal with the re-evaluation and deconstruction of the foundation and structure of our collective micro-politics, that is our collective (Western) belief and desires and everything that flows from it – including into architecture – and at which we find the basis of all architectural thought and action. Instead, as Martin rightly points out, United Architects – despite encompassing some of the most distinguished individuals to emerge on the architecture scene in the past decade – re-articulated in their scheme the response that the State took to 9/11, and what the State might have desired to be seen by and in any architectural response to it's stance and the event; United Architects' politics and consequential action fell in line and became a quasi spokesperson for the Macro, rather than deconstructors of the micro, as what any creative intellectual response ought to have been; Martin eludes to the necessity of deconstruction following the architectural event of 9/11 through his terminology of "historical and political dimensions", even if he doesn't call it the beginnings of deconstruction of the event of 9/11 by name. The event of 9/11 as it bears on architecture requires just such a deconstructive process of micro-politics, that is of our and the world's libidinal economy – desire and belief – that the LMDC final 7 failed to take. It is in this deconstructive approach taken to the desire and belief that forms our libidinal economy – that is thought – that thought can be brought forth anew as a result of 9/11 through us for architecture.and for further fields of action also, and in general.

What is meant by a call to such deconstruction following the event of 9/11 on architecture? The only thing that can be proffered is what Lyotard terms as

"durcharbeitung" or 're-working' as articulated in his essay "Rewriting Modernity",[19] which is not a remembering (as in the structuralist cases for redevelopment put forth by the Meier/Eisenman/Seigal/Holl proposal or that of the Think group proposal and others), but rather a *working through* of thought in relation to architecture and in relation to the libidinal (desire) – the two together and in a reciprocal linked relation to one another: to raise architecture as a possibility of thought in the context of the event of 9/11 for the purposes of a critical architectural praxis resulting in redevelopment.

The term 'reworking' is taken by Lyotard from Freud's use of the term *"durcharbeitung"*, meaning "a working attached to a thought of what is constitutively hidden from us in the event and the meaning of the event, hidden not merely by past prejudice, but also by those dimensions of the future marked by the pro-ject, the pro-grammed, pro-spectives, and even by the pro-position and the pro-posal to psychoanalyse".[20] That is, architectural thinking should have placed itself on the couch and engaged that which it had learnt earlier from certain circles,[21] rekindling a pro[22]-active priority or stance in relation to thought. It is through such *"durcharbeitung"* that we clearly reveal the failings of the LMDC final 7, which constituted not so much a working through of the event of 9/11, but rather an exercise in the production of signs that may do justice perhaps to the response of the State and Power, but not to thought. Conversely, reworking or working through the event of 9/11 in relation to architecture, aims to return architecture to the analyst's couch once more and find the associative condition between sets of substrates, and link or thread them together in a way that they open up interpretation on an event, rather than close it down – it is the opposite of a structuralist grand narrative, and perhaps the opposite of what the State might desire to see and support from within its striated structure, but nonetheless necessary as an initial theoretical articulation and response to an event such as 9/11 and its implications on architecture and more importantly subjectivity –

[19] Lyotard: "Rewriting Modernity" in *Sub-stance* 16:3-9, 1987, No.54
[20] Lyotard, *The Inhuman*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991, p.26
[21] I refer here to the deconstructive project in architecture as worked through by Eisenman and others in the 1980s.
[22] for the etymological meaning of 'pro-' see Oxford Concise Dictionary of Etymology, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996; with 'pro-' representing the combined form of the Greek *pró* before (of time, position, priority)

the two of which are inseparable from one another and inalienable in their individual consideration.

In raising the question of a necessary *durcharbeitung*, that is a working through of an approach to redevelopment, and in raising it for the purposes of offering a different and other way to architecture in light of the libidinal (desire-based) valorisation and understanding of 9/11 and in the context of construing architecture as an immanent condition that operates from the inside-out, it is necessary to ask just what it actually is that needs to be examined and addressed in order for this reworking to occur. In other words, how might any necessary working through of architecture for the site of Ground Zero commence, and what might it need to examine?

In raising this question and the concomitant question of creating a critical subjective construal of architecture for the purposes of addressing the site of Ground Zero in consequence to the libidinal event of 9/11, it is necessary to first examine the micro-flows latent within the genesis of redevelopment as put forth by the LMDC final 7 schemes, as well as the micro-flows of both professional and public discourse surrounding redevelopment. What this is to say, that it is the genesis of redevelopment that needs to be examined in order for any critique of it to be valid, and in order for any reworking and working through of architecture to occur for that site.

In addressing the genesis of redevelopment, a theoretical trace is sought to be laid-out that might position a response as to how one might re-approach and work through architecture-production for the site of Ground Zero in relation to that genesis. This is to say, that if the redevelopment can be and is indeed to be critiqued, it is necessary to locate exactly what it was within this redevelopment approach that might be thought of differently, and other subjective construal of it raised for the purposes of architecture. Without such an initial trace on the LMDC final 7 schemes and their genesis, an analysis of how one might begin to work through the subjective construal

40

of architecture as it might address that site can not be made. This is argued in the context that it is within the genesis of any production, including architecture-production that the architectural content or approach of what might follow from it lies within. It is this theoretical trace as a conditional precursor to offering a reworking of architecture for the site of Ground Zero that I aim to make in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

A Theoretical Trace of the LMDC final 7

Genesis

The Desire of Redevelopment

An attack on the libidinal-construct of the State

Twin Towers

The Semiology of the Redevelopment proposals

Genesis

"So if there is fetishism (of a visual, intelligible, abstract space), and if there is
fascination (with a natural space that has been lost and/or rediscovered, with absolute
political and religious spaces, or with spaces given over to voluptuousness or death), then
theory is well able to trace their genesis, which is to say their production."

- Lefebvre, Production of Space, p140[1]

In turning from an examination of the nature and structure of the event of 9/11 as a
libidinal event residing in the intermingling of the surface-thought construct of the Twin
Towers and the desire of a particular segment of the global socius, and in turn beginning

---

[1] Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 2001, p140.

an examination of how and through what questions redevelopment might proceed, theory must be called upon to trace the genesis of such a thinking and any related consequent production, not only for Ground Zero, but for architecture as a whole and in general post the event of 9/11. It is only by way of calling on theory and holding out an address of it to architecture, that a trace and genesis of architectural conception, and consequently production can be propositioned, and a critical examination of the rebirth of the Twin Towers and Ground Zero be made, and made as such with view to the context and event of 9/11.[2] In this chapter I aim to provide a theoretical critique or trace of the LMDC final 7 redevelopment proposals, and do so for the purpose of being able to offer an alternative route toward redevelopment in light of a critique of them. This alternative route or reworking of architecture for the site of Ground Zero will be discussed in Chapter 4.

With the destruction of the Twin Towers and consequent proposals for rebuilding Ground Zero, the need arises to critically examine and think through these two poles of action, both of destruction and of rebuilding. In thinking through both the destruction and the rebuilding of Ground Zero a subjectivity is hoped to be construed that might be termed as critical, or a critical stance, by which a taking possession of space, or placing, and the manner in which that action of placing – namely the architecture of rebuilding - may be able to be framed and critically examined in light of the attacks on the Twin Towers. Such a construal may be termed as the formulation of subjectivity that directly informs the task of architecture by which making and rebuilding can be conceived in that place and in this time subsequent to the attacks, and given its libidinal nature. This thinking through, construal and framing might be termed a subjectivity of placing – an architecture by which that placing is construed and informed - that is a series of libidinal lines and velocities, multiplicities and assemblages that may inform the act of architectural production and raise architecture to the possibility of thought. In short, by a critically informed architecture of placing, that is a critically informed construal of subjectivity vis-

---

[2] The context and event of 9/11 as used here is construed in light of having argued 9/11 as a libidinal event, one whose substance and architecture might arguably be defined to exist within a subjective latency of force and desire on the part of those who perpetrated it; the consideration or reconsideration, critical examination and construal of the rebirth of the Twin Towers and redevelopment of Ground Zero is being propositioned to be read and theorized in light of this construal of 9/11 as a libidinal event, that is through the latent subjectivity present in the desire that may inform a replacement for the Twin Towers and which imprints itself upon this replacement's architecture.

à-vis the architectural act, a theoretical tracing is meant of the conceptual construal, thinking and reverberations of desire involved with subsequent action which informs the production and creation (*poiēsis*)[3] of built architecture as governed and influenced by factors such as the apparatuses of power and knowledge, be they economic and/or of the State.[4] In a critical approach to practice, all placing and taking possession of space as such is arguably governed by subjective construal – it is this that makes it critical – it is an approach to this criticality which I aim to trace.

Following on from the quote from Lefebvre above, and in approaching a critical examination of the rebirth of the Twin Towers through the use of the term 'genesis', the term itself must be placed into scrutiny and ascertained by which meaning it is proposed to be used. Derrida discusses the term 'genesis' in at least four different guises in his *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy*. Amongst these guises, Derrida uses the compound term 'natural genesis' meaning "(that) which constitutes the real unity of the object by relations perceived as primary"[5] or objective; 'phenomenological genesis': "the genesis of the sense of the object...that intentionally constitutes an objective sense";[6] 'empirical genesis': as that which is "approximate"[7] or reliant on empirical observation and hence approximate; and 'psychological genesis': that is "a series of subjective acts constructing *a posteriori* the sense of the object".[8] Furthermore, an etymological analysis of the English term 'genesis', reveals that it's meaning is associated with generation or

---

[3] Meaning "Poetics" as derived from Gr. *Poiēsis*, meaning creation (or production) specifically in relation to poetry, but attributable through extrapolation to other arts, including architecture – see the *Oxford Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.

[4] Guattari discusses the nature of contemporary subjectivity, (of which I here posit contemporary architectural thinking and conceptual construal of design as it takes place in the inter-connected context of the marketplace and government as but a narrower facet) thus: "Subjectivity today remains under the massive control of apparatuses of power and knowledge, thus consigning technical, scientific and artistic innovations to the service of the most reactionary and retrograde figures of sociality." (*The Guattari Reader*, ed.: Gary Genosko, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, p.107) To the list of technical, scientific and artistic innovations and thinking, we might also add architectural thinking and construal of design, that is, what I term as 'a subjectivity of architectural construal', particularly the way in which architectural thinking is governed and influenced, as Guattari asserts, by power and knowledge, that is by economic and government (State) factors and influence.

[5] Jacques Derrida, *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2003, p.23

[6] ibid. p.23

[7] ibid. p.40

[8] ibid. p.30

44

creation, derivative from the root of *gen*, meaning to be born or produced.[9] What is aimed to be examined therefore is a genesis of *poiēsis* that is a production of creation in relation to the Twin Towers and subsequently the rebuilding proposals.

In approaching to theorise the rebirth of the Twin Towers and in attempting to provide a theoretical trace of the LMDC final 7, including the desire invested in Ground Zero to be born again by means of redevelopment – its (re)*gen*eration, creation and production as a rebirth as such –, it is the genesis and *poiēsis* of this rebirth that needs to be examined critically. Indeed in examining the rebirth and redevelopment of the Twin Towers, that is its redevelopment's generation, creation and production, one is by etymological necessity concerned with the subjective roots of that redevelopment, for it is within the subjective root of the redevelopment that the redevelopment's creation and production is concealed, and hence its meaning unravelled.

For the purposes of departing on an examination and theoretical trace of the rebirth of the Twin Towers, and being able to trace the genesis of such rebirth, 'which is to say its production' – borrowing from Lefebvre and from the etymological trace of the term 'genesis'–, Derrida's later meaning of genesis as 'psychological genesis' will be appropriated, namely that the rebirth of the Twin Towers lies within – as it will be argued – an *a posteriori* construal of the object, subject to subjective acts, utterance and meaning relating to the individual and collective self of the socius as it suffered and then made meaning of the event of 9/11 for the purposes of conceiving a rebirth of that which was lost, namely the Twin Towers.

The psychological genesis as reliant on subjective acts constructing an *a posteriori* sense of the object, and therefore any generation and production of architecture, architectural action, including a subjective construal of approaching redevelopment in the name of resurrection and rebirth – that is reverberations of individual and collective desire and subjectivity that have come to construct *a posteriori* the sense and sensibility of rebirth at

---

[9] See '*genesis*' in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.

Ground Zero and the substance of form in which it should be made – need to proceed through Derrida's understanding of genesis as 'psychological genesis' in which the sense of the object to be constructed to replace and give rebirth to the Twin Towers (and the subjectivity associated with this construal) is constructed *a posteriori*. Such a subjective construal of redevelopment is made from a series of subjective acts and utterances, feelings and thoughts of reverberated individual and collective desire that have come to fore in the context of the passing, and manner of passing, of that which was destroyed – they imprint themselves on that which is being conceived as replacement or redevelopment, including the desire of redevelopment and with it the subjectivity that imprints itself on the redevelopment through such desire – that is a trace. It is these *a posteriori* subjective constructions of the Twin Towers, and their reflection on the construal of anything that might come to replace them, that have come to direct the discourse and conceptual construal around the redevelopment and rebirth of the Twin Towers, and it is in this sense that we can identify them as the reconstruction's genesis. In the same way the previous chapter aimed to provide a plane for understanding architecture-production (and destruction) in relation to the libidinal, the gaze of theory must be turned to attempt to unearth the psychological genesis, generation and production of the redevelopment proposals, and ask how the reverberations of the libidinal intensities of the event of 9/11 have shaped a response to it in and by way of architecture.

Such an address to architecture by way of theory must always proceed through an oblique action, an oblique action of deconstruction, or in a Freudian term as articulated by Lyotard, a *durcharbeitung*,[10] a reworking or working through, a thinking through of the propositions of rebuilding made thus far in the name of architecture, and made for a site in which a certain fetishism and fascination of a space lost and rediscovered as a political or religious space, as a space given over to voluptuousness and death – and all the consequences imprinted on our collective subjectivity for the purposes of creating and producing architecture on that site and after the event of 9/11, as influenced by economic and government factors, that is power and knowledge, and thinking which arise from this – has already been asserted.

---

[10] See Lyotard, *The Inhuman*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991, p.26

The question of unearthing or uncovering the origin of a given production is one of "taking the moment of genesis as the first and primary key to [its] meaning".[11] In contextualising a genesis that lies within subjective construal that gives sense to an object *a posteriori*, the threads and lines of a production may be unravelled that provide a standing on and bearing forth of any resultant architecture for the replacement of the Twin Towers, in addition to founding a meaning on which they are proposed to stand. The architectural redevelopment of Ground Zero and the rebirth of the Twin Towers requires just such lines to be uncovered and for just such a genesis to be unearthed, if for no other reason than to examine the way in which architecture is being produced on that site (and in general elsewhere), and how that bears on and draws from the consequences of the event of 9/11 in light of its dual libidinal-architectural nature. For this reason, and in order to unravel and unearth the event-horizon around which the genesis of any production at Ground Zero rests within, it is necessary to turn to an examination of the architectural and societal sentiments and desires that arose in consequence to, and after the event of 9/11 itself.

The Desire of Redevelopment

The first and most immediate sentiments toward redevelopment of Ground Zero following the event of 9/11 was articulated most forthrightly by a number of architects and artists interviewed in the weeks immediately after the attack. In a 30 September 2001 *New York Times* article, Deborah Solomon surveyed a number of distinguished architects and artists as to what sort of response to redevelopment they might like to see on the site. Amongst the varied voices that emerged from her interviews, a need for memorialisation versus rebuilding was articulated, as one of two poles in which any redevelopment might take its course.[12] Amongst the rebuilding proponents (as opposed to memorialisation) were a number of architects, such as Richard Meier, who voiced amongst other things,

---

[11] Terry Smith, "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002, p23.
[12] See Deborah Solomon, "Art/Architecture; "From the Rubble, Ideas for Rebirth", *New York Times*, 30 September, 2001

that "we need office space, we need new buildings that are an even greater symbol of New York than what was there before",[13] whilst others echoed this sentiment, such as Robert A.M Stern, Dean of the School of Architecture Yale, who stated that "we are still a brash, new, swaggering country, and we must still explore the imaginative possibilities of height. To bury our heads in the sand and create imaginary voids seems not appropriate."[14] From the vantage point of architects surveyed for this *New York Times* article, there was a desire therefore to see new buildings rise in the place of the Twin Towers from almost the moment they collapsed, and that any redevelopment proposal should be one of rebuilding. The die of redevelopment was finally cast in favour of rebuilding on 9 April 2002, with the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) unveiling a preliminary blueprint for Lower Manhattan.[15]

The nature of rebuilding and the sentiments and desires surrounding it, which might be taken as a quasi-libidinal reverberation of the event of 9/11 in the American socius – if one takes the intensity and articulation of desire in and through thought and action to be the context of a libidinal construction –, is captured by Reinhold Martin in a highly insightful piece on the currency of the Twin Towers and the substance against which the event of 9/11 unfolded, titled "One or More".[16] In this article, Martin articulates a connection between the architecture of the Pentagon and that of the Twin Towers, situating the Twin Towers as an architectural extension of the sentiments (and we could also say desire, although not articulated by him through the specific use of this term) embodied by the Pentagon, and thus viewing the attack of 9/11 as an event that boils down to one of attempting to destroy the networks of trade and global capital of which both the Pentagon and Twin Towers starkly embodied in their aspiration and architectural conception. It is not necessary to reiterate the thrust of Martin's argument here, however illuminating it may be on the meaning of the Twin Towers architecture and the architecture of that which was attacked, but it is perhaps necessary to offer his voice as a preliminary route to analysing and evaluating the desire and sentiments of

---

[13] ibid.
[14] ibid.
[15] See http://www.lowermanhattan.info/rebuild/timeline/rebuild_timeline_html_2002.asp#apr

[16] Reinhold Martin, "One or More", *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002, p116

redevelopment, the psychological genesis from which a redevelopment was to take form. Martin writes: "the political rhetoric and actions that have followed [the destruction of the Twin Towers] formulated around 'good' versus 'evil', 'us' versus 'them', and so on, have been largely directed toward restoring the security of this bubble, which is to say, to rebuilding it in both literal and a figurative sense".[17] The bubble that Martin eludes to is the networks of post-World War II trade and circulation, and we might suggest the libidinal currency invested in them, in which he identifies the architecture of both the Pentagon and that of the Twin Towers to take shape,[18] and against which the architecture of the attack was arguably directed.

In his analysis, Martin alludes to a political rhetoric shaped around "us versus them", around "good versus evil", which took hold of both public, populist and political discourse following the event of 9/11, and found its way into the sentiments and desires for redevelopment, culminating in rebuilding. This is to say, that the generation, creation and production of rebuilding, its genesis in other terms, lies within a subjectivity formulated by the sentiment of "good versus evil", and "us versus them". It is necessary to emphasise this fact, namely that the sentiments voiced by the US administration and the public at large alike, situated the attacks of 9/11 in a rubric of contestation between forces and flows of what they have termed simplistically as "darkness", and the "liberal" light of freedom that the US State and public alike believes to possess by virtue of their birthright. It is here argued, that this contestation of sentiment and desire sets the plane for the genesis (generation, creation, production) and subsequent proposals of rebuilding articulated for the site of Ground Zero following the attacks.

Through the lens of the *New York Times* article and Martin's analysis of redevelopment sentiments, we may rightly ask: what was the psychological genesis in which the redevelopment of Ground Zero became construed – and the libidinal construct for replacing the Twin Towers - reveals itself? Taking into consideration the statements of the two architects quoted above which might be taken as representative of the sentiments

---

[17] Reinhold Martin: "One or More", *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002, p116
[18] ibid.

favouring rebuilding, it was one of triumphalism over defeat, one of rebuilding and reconstruction over destruction, one of "good" triumphing "evil". The event-horizon on which we find the rebuilding of Ground Zero taking place is one articulated by "brashness" and "swagger", the desire to see something that is an "even greater symbol of New York than what was there before", a symbol and sign triumphing over the desire of the terrorists.

In the months that followed the clearing of Ground Zero from the rubble left behind by the destruction of the Twin Towers, and in the context of debate surrounding redevelopment versus memorialisation, a citizens group of New York expressed this same sentiment and desire by hiring a billboard in SOHO, which read: "Rebuild the Towers, Bigger and Better than Before",[19] voicing a radical vision for the site in which the mistakes of the Twin Towers were destined to be blindly repeated again. This is stated as a means to point out that it was the Twin Tower's genesis themselves that was being attempted to be transplanted and carried over into the creation, generation and production of any rebuilding, and thus the signification against which the attack on the Twin Towers was made was being desired to be resurrected, with the potential that gave currency to the acts of that fateful day to be blindly repeated again. This is stated not for wanting to evacuate the need for "big" or "better", but rather for wanting to highlight the substance of that "big" and "better" that is desired to be resurrected, namely a subjectivity and desire finding its way to architectural creation, generation and production that is beholden to power as vested in capitalist circulation of which the Twin Towers was a sign, following Martin's previously referred to insightful analysis.

The clamour to rebuild an edifice even bigger and better than before, and as a way to demonstrate the victory of "good" over "evil" demonstrates a populist thrust that lacked any analysis or comprehension of how the architectural accomplishment and architecture of the Twin Towers led to it being enveloped in a moebius band of libidinal force that contributed to and culminated in its ultimate destruction. Conversely, the libidinal

---

[19] Edward Wyatt, "Longing for a Sept. 10 Skyline; Some Vocal Groups Call for Restoring the Twin Towers", *New York Times*, 2 November, 2002

50

response of desire to see something "bigger and better" replace the Twin Towers, and voiced by architects and society at large, failed to enter into any sober analysis of the forces of desire at play. The play of forces in American society resultant to and let loose by the destruction of the Twin Towers seemed only to grasp a need for a re-expression of monumentalism and symbols of triumphalism over that or those who destroyed them. In this way, the libidinal currency of architects, government[20] and society at large voicing a triumphalist resurrection of the Twin Towers in a new development, construed a subjectivity whose genesis might only do justice to resurrecting the "iconomy"[21] of that which was destroyed as a reverberation of the Twin Tower's genesis in the redevelopment, an *a posteriori* articulation and construal of a sign-object as replacement, and the structure and architecture of that sign-object, of that which was destroyed. This point is given further emphasis in the sequence of events surrounding redevelopment, whereby the initial Beyer Blinder Belle's presentation[22] of redevelopment schemes (be they master-plans only) at the Javits Center on 20 July 2002, were hounded down by the press and public alike as not being imaginative or symbolic enough as architectural proposals: the public and press wanted to see something triumphalist and monumental replace the Twin Towers as opposed to banal, something in which the Twin Tower's "iconomy" is reflected, regardless of the substance of that "iconomy". It was this sentiment that was captured by the comments of *New York Times* architecture critic Herbert Muschamp when he critiqued these initial LMDC proposals exhibited first at

---

[20] here I refer to the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) as a *de facto* arm of government, in as much as it was this body that the State gave *de jure* responsibility to, to conduct the redevelopment (both political and economic) of the lower Manhattan area devastated by the attacks.

[21] See Terry Smith's use of the term "iconomy" in "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002.

[22] In the 20 July 2002 Javits Center presentation of the initial master-plan proposals, it was not in fact Beyer Blinder Belle's schemes that were the only ones on view. Accompanying Beyer Blinder Belle's proposals were two proposals by Peterson/Littenberg Architecture and Urban Design, one proposal by Cooper Robertson & Partners, and one further proposal for the site by David Childs/SOM. The presentation of the initial schemes at the Javits Center on 20 July 2002 however is widely associated with the Beyer Blinder Belle proposals, against which the published and popular criticism arising from the presentations is also associated with.

Federal Hall and then presented to the public at the Javits Center as an exercise in "breathtaking determination to think small".[23]

The lack (*manque*) that the destruction of the Twin Towers created in the subjective horizon of the socius of New York and broader American populace translated itself into a desire, whose genesis was expressed in varying ways for the redevelopment of the LMDC final 7 designs at Ground Zero. The history and pattern of subjective construal and expression of desire that can be traced through the responses mustered by architects responding to interviews in the immediate aftermath of the attack, the public citizens' group expressing to recapture the substance of the Twin Towers, through to the popular and professional rejection of the initial LMDC proposals presented at the Javits Center, all share a common genesis in the lack (*manque*) of "iconomy" that the destruction of the Twin Towers created, and an expression of a need to recapture it. Such a repeated subjective construal and expression of desire in relation to what might be seen as desirable to replace the Twin Towers might be suggested to lie in the absence of libidinal flow which might subvert the resurrection of a symbol of power, and it is desire for such "iconomy" which returns to recreate power and make it possible, in which power finds its genesis, for as Lyotard writes: "we must therefore say that power comes from desire insofar as it is folded back, and nothing more".[24]

In referring to the term "iconomy" it is, as Terry Smith points out[25], the "symbolic exchange" invested in and flowing from the architecture of that which was sought to replace the Twin Towers that is being defined. Such a "symbolic exchange" is reliant on an economy of representation and signification, a semiology by which the redeveloped scheme is imbued with and can be read. As can be gleaned from the above analysis, the representation and signification of redevelopment was desired to reflect and refract back, indeed recreate the regime of symbolic exchange that the destroyed Twin Towers

---

[23] For the full response of Herbert Muschamp to the initial LMDC proposals presented to the public at the Javits Center see "Visions of Ground Zero: An Appraisal; An Agency's ideology is unsuited to its task", *New York Times*, 17 July 2002.

[24] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, p.219

[25] Terry Smith, "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002, p1.

embodied. In doing so, the iconomic regime of the destroyed buildings is being sought by the socius in redevelopment - its "iconomy" by another term – was being regenerated, reproduced and recreated through a lack of libidinal flow which might have sought to create something other for the site in redevelopment.

In contrasting Lyotard's concept of "libidinal economy" and the Terry Smith's term "iconomy", or regime of "symbolic exchange"[26] which was being sought in redevelopment, one needs to return to an understanding of what is actually meant by Lyotard's concept of "libidinal economy". As was analysed in Chapter One, a libidinal economy is characterised by 'systems', 'energy' and 'intensity', one that seeks a creation of meaning as residing in desiring-affects, which reside and affect the individual and collective formation of subjectivity. Such an affect is always unleashed by an event, which unleashing causes new possibilities or creative movement to take place, and in doing so subvert the assignation of the sign[27]. The substance of such movement and unleashing of new creative possibilities is lacking if a mere replication of the representation, signification and semiology of the Twin Towers is being sought; it is in this vein that Terry Smith asks: "...just want kind of regime of symbolic exchange, what kind of "iconomy", is coming into being?".[28] Instead of dissimulation as a force for new possibilities, creative movement and the subversion of the sign as it existed in the destroyed Twin Towers, what we see emerge is a desire for simulation (the exact opposite) in any redevelopment. It is in this way that we can assert that the complex inter-relationship between senses (subjectivity) and matter creating affect that is associated with libidinal eruption and the seeking of otherness, was short-circuited in the professional, public and populist discourse and practice surrounding redevelopment. If the "iconomy", or the regime of symbolic exchange being sought for redevelopment had attempted to create a subversion of the symbolic economy of power, we might be able to say that a libidinal flow would have affected itself, and an entirely different approach to redevelopment would have been sought – an entirely different "iconomy" would have

---

[26] For further reading on "symbolic exchange" and its relation to the sign, see Jean Baudrillard, *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, Sage Publications, London, 2004.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Terry Smith, "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002, p1.

been pursued – and realised. Instead, the genesis, creation and production of "iconomy" being sought for redevelopment remained in a desire for erecting a sign that might regain and resurrect a symbol of power as dictated by the sentiment of lack originating from the destruction of the original buildings.

This analysis is made in a manner to not forsake or forget about the very practical need to provide a replacement for the lost leaseable floor-space that was in the interest of Larry Silverstein – owner of the Twin Towers – in championing redevelopment. The question however becomes the way in which the LMDC final 7 proposals were conceived in their genesis, that is what generated, created and produced (*gen*) them to proceed in their substance of subjective imprint or subjectification of architectural possibilities (desire), in their very ideological foundations and genesis leading to a production and outcome. In as far as the ideological foundations and genesis of the design of redevelopment is concerned, it might be reiterated that its outcome and subjective source was to regain and resurrect a symbol of capitalist circulation and hence power as of the Twin Towers original, and thus could be said to be in collusion with the sentiments and subjective architecture of capitalism inherent in the design of the Twin Towers as theorised by Reinhold Martin.

An attack on the libidinal-construct of the State

In furthering the analysis of a desire for power to be resurrected in the design of the LMDC final 7, and in making a theoretical trace of the genesis of redevelopment for the purposes of working through and bringing to fore a different subjective construal of architecture for the site of Ground Zero, it is necessary to take a detour and ask the question in what or whom, in what substrate does this power lie, and what does it represent in its "iconomic" function? In what follows, an answer to this question will be argued to be made, one that posits that the power of this desired "iconomic" function resides in the politics and representation of the State as vested in capitalism.

Lyotard writes in *Libidinal Economy*, that "What is mercantilism other than the politics of the *kapélikon* [retail trade] elevated to the level of the State?"[29] Lyotard theorises the term "mercantilism" here as a taking, a plundering a looting, an act of jealousy.[30] Conversely to mercantilism, Lyotard distinguishes capitalism from mercantilism as *reproduction*, that is a producing, an adding of surplus value, or a gift of credit.[31] Lyotard uses these two terms as a means to understand force-power residing in libidinal intensity: "there are two uses of wealth, that is to say of force-power [*puissance-pouvoir*] : a reproductive and a pillaging use".[32] It is the attributed and analytical attributes of these two terms, mercantilism on the one hand and reproduction on the other, that contribute to Lyotard's analysis of the libidinal construct of modern commerce and capitalism in *Libidinal Economy*.[33]

In a parallel extrapolation of Lyotard's statement on mercantilism, we might rightly attempt to substitute the term 'mercantilism' in the above statement to 'capitalism', and that of *kapélikon* to the term of *reproduction*: what is capitalism other than the politics of reproduction elevated to the level of the State? This play of extrapolation can be made as a result of Lyotard defining two sides of the use of wealth or uses of money,[34] mercantilism on the one hand, and reproduction in the other, with the difference between them being that one is "circular, global, organic; the second is partial, deadly, jealous",[35] both however existing within and as a force-power of commerce-capitalism.[36] It is through this extrapolation of Lyotard's statement on mercantilism that we might come closer to theorising Lyotard's understanding of the State – or the politics of the State – that is a condition in which it comes to reflect itself, even reproduce itself in its own image in the form of capitalism, and begin to answer the question in what or who's "iconomy" was the desire to resurrect power made?

---

[29] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, p.227
[30] ibid., pp.227-228
[31] ibid., pp.223-226
[32] ibid., p.212
[33] ibid., see Chapter 5: Capital, pp.202-239
[34] ibid., p.212
[35] ibid., p.212
[36] For a further extrapolation of the relation between mercantilism and reproduction, see *Libidinal Economy* p.228, where Lyotard discusses that mercantilism and reproduction are a continuum of one another, through the requirement of one (mercantilism) in order to create the possibility of the other (reproduction).

In light of Lyotard's construal of capitalism vis-à-vis a libidinal economy and his drawing of this relation in correspondence with the State,[37] a theoretical trace can be made that articulates the genesis of the redevelopment of Ground Zero not only in a desire to recapture the "iconomy" of capitalist circulation as expressed in the original architecture of the Twin Towers and put to work in the proposals made by the LMDC final 7, but also a relational trace of this desire to the substance of the State. This postulation is made through an assertion that it was not only the space, libidinal-material construct and representation of capitalist circulation of trade – as outlined by Reinhold Martin through an analysis of the architecture of the Twin Towers – that was attacked in the event of 9/11, but through a reading and an extrapolation of Lyotard it can be asserted that the attacks were also aimed at the space and libidinal-material construct of the politics of the State *by way of* their attack on an "iconomy" of capitalist circulation of trade. It is from the understanding of this extrapolation that we can appreciate a lineage of thought that the capitalist circulation of trade as captured by the Twin Towers "iconomy" and found in the genesis of its redevelopment proposals as put forth by the LMDC final 7 were made in the light of capitalism and its flows (as discussed by Martin in "One or More"), and assert that such an "iconomy", subjective construal and ideological and psychological genesis of redevelopment is also of the politics of the State, refracts and represents it in as far as we accept the extrapolation of Lyotard's understanding of the relation between mercantilism and capitalism to the State. Such an assertion is non-other than saying that the attacks on the Twin Towers in as much as they were an attack on the "iconomy" of Western global capitalism as captured by architecture (and hence an architectural event), also and at the same time intertwined with it and inseparable from it were an attack on the Western (in this case US) liberal State (and hence a political event); this double assertion of a dual-event can be made in light of a Lyotardian understanding of the politics of the State and capitalism being intertwined and refracting off one

---

[37] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, p.227; see also Bill Readings: *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, Routledge, London, 1991, p.90

another, containing each other's substance and genesis in the form of one's respective politics in relation to the other.[38]

Such a comprehension of the structure and workings of capitalism residing within the politics and space of the State – and hence its "iconomy" - can further be extrapolated from Deleuze and Guattari in their theoretical analysis of Striated space and Smooth space.[39] Here Deleuze and Guattari contrast the space of the city with that of the Greek *nomos*, with the former being governed by striation, work and money, and the later by intensities, haecceities and events. The space of capitalism is of the striated, of the city, of the polis, of work and money, and hence an extension and envelopment of the politics of the State. The politics of the State creates striated space in which capitalism can function, and hence lends and imprints its "iconomy" to it and on it. The capitalist subject is constituted through the affects of the striated, through the affect of the politics of the State, existing in a single libidinal moebius band in concordance with and as an extension of the space and creation of the State.[40] It is in this manner that it can be said that as much as the Twin Towers were of a capitalist "iconomy", they were also by virtue of that an extension and part of the "iconomy" of the politics of the State, and hence what was attacked on 9/11 was as much the State as it was its symbol and sign existing in and through capitalism, that being the architecture of the Twin Towers.

To argue this point from a different angle, one might be able to highlight the fact that the multiple event of 9/11 targeted not only the destruction of the Twin Towers as a capitalist "iconomy", but also targeted the "iconomy" of the State in the form of the attack and failed attack on institutions of the State, on the one hand in the case of the attack on the Pentagon, and on the other in the failed attempt at the destruction of the White House or

---

[38] Such an understanding of the State is what may be termed as a metaphysical construct of the State, that is a construct that goes beyond itself to reveal itself in something other, or in my terms being intertwined and refracted off something else, in this case, capitalism off the structure of the State. L. T. Hobhouse argues against such a metaphysical understanding of the State in his book *The Metaphysical Theory of the State: a criticism* (Allen & Unwin, London, 1951), however a Lyotardian reading of the relation between the State and capitalism as outlined above, relies on such a relation between the two to be construed.

[39] See Deleuze & Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, chapter 14: The Smooth and Striated,

[40] for a relation between capitalism and the State, see also ibid. p492.

Capitol building through the failed efforts of the hijackers of United Airlines flight 93. What one draws into the analysis of the nature of the event of 9/11 through a reading of Lyotard's understanding of the State in relation to mercantilism and capitalism, is that the Twin Towers at the same time as being an "iconomy" of capitalist circulation of trade, was also by virtue of that fact and in relation to it, an "iconomy" of the politics of the State, thus further reinforcing the target of the attacks as being on both the State and capitalism (by way of architecture).

In order to further analyse a Lyotardian understanding of the contextual relation between mercantilism and capitalism on the one hand, and the State on the other, and their intertwined relation, one might turn to the analysis that Bill Readings offers in his *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, based on his reading of Lyotard's *Dérive à Partir de Marx et Freud*.[41] Readings writes that "Lyotard turns to the state as the site of the political in order to issue a corrective to economistic Marxism."[42] Thus in following Reading's analysis, Lyotard articulates a relation between the State as the site of the political and the capitalistic as the site of the economy. Readings goes on to construe Lyotard's conception of the State thus: "the state places capitalism as not merely a matter of relations of production but of the *re-production* of those relations, as representational apparatus. Nor is that apparatus secondary or ideological; the State is not so much the instrument or expression of the ruling class as the extension of capitalism."[43] Hence, according to Readings reading of Lyotard's *Dérive à Partir de Marx et Freud*, the expression of capitalism (its "iconomy" as captured in architecture or not) is but an extension of the State and the politics of the State, and it could be said according to this reading that the mechanism and content of capitalism and the State are mirror images extruded into one another – two surfaces of the one (libidinal) economy continually refracting off and into one another. From this perspective, it might be argued that the expression of redevelopment for the Twin Towers as an "iconomy" that might be bigger and better than what stood there originally, be it from the desire to resurrect a symbol of power as defiance in the face of those who destroyed them or whether it is of a practical

---

[41] Lyotard, *Dérive à Partir de Marx et Freud*, Paris: Union Générale d'Editions 10/18.
[42] Bill Readings: *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, Routledge, London, 1991, p90
[43] ibid.

consideration to replace floor-space lost in the attacks, the economic motivations of redevelopment are as much representative of the semiology of economic power as they are representative of the politics of the State which organises and extends itself *as* economic power.

To underline the nature of a Lyotardian relation between the economic factors of capitalism and their relation to the politics of the State, Readings goes on to say that "... a major shift is taking place within Lyotard's Marxism. There is a drift away from an understanding of the political as ideological reflection of capitalist relations, to an account of capitalism as primarily a space of representation. In Marxist terms, we might say that this is a description of capitalism as political rather than economic."[44] If Reading's construal of Lyotard's understanding of capitalism as primarily political is correct, than any redevelopment proposal that rests on purely economic considerations of redeveloping lost floor-space as an economic and capitalist exercise is also of politics, and as such resides in the substance and refraction of the politics of the State as an entity that creates Striated space. As Lyotard himself writes in *Dérive à Partir de Marx et Freud*, the socio-political space of the State is "the empirical space of intuitions and representation. It is not the space of the system which supports it and hides itself there, it's the space where social relations are lived, where the class struggle takes place"[45] – namely in the practice of economics and capitalism that led to the redevelopment decision of Ground Zero and the manner in which it found its genesis of creation, generation and production, and proceeded. The redevelopment of the Twin Towers could be said therefore to find its genesis from within and of the stumped fundamentalism of the politics of the State, in as far as the relation between the State and power is economic in addition to being political, and in as far as the politics of the State resides in and refracts the power of the economic.

Given that the space of redevelopment according to a Lyotardian reading of politics and the socio-political is found within the workings of capitalism, how might the architectural

---

[44] ibid.
[45] Lyotard, *Dérive à Partir de Marx et Freud*, Paris: Union Générale d'Editions 10/18, p.278)

elite called upon for a redesign and rebirth of the Twin Towers proceed? Namely what is at stake in the subjective construal of the architects involved in redevelopment, given that the economics of redevelopment is so closely construed with and compromised by the substance of the politics of the State as capitalism? In his examination of Lyotard's stance toward the State, Readings offers a reading to answer this question. Readings states that "even within Marxism, *Dérive* picks up the figural as the site of a resistance to political representation: the way to carry forward the class struggle is not the counter-exploitation of political space for socialist ends, but its disruption"[46] Such disruption that Readings attributes to Lyotardian thought is akin to a deconstruction of the space of the State, which by default must be assumed through the disruption of capitalism and capitalist semiology (something that has been iterated in this thesis before)[47] as the manner in which architects approaching the design and redevelopment of Ground Zero should have taken, given an attempt to deconstruct its subjective reverberations. Readings goes on to say that "the work of the avant-garde is thus not to produce left-wing art but to produce an 'anti-art' that will deconstruct representational space."[48] The representational space Readings refers to is the socio-political space of capitalism, namely, in a Lyotardian reading, the space of the politics of the State. In deconstructing this representational space, a space opens up to circumvent the libidinal thrust of the State as embodied in the power and will of capitalism. Having chosen to disregard such analysis in the working-through of their design proposals, it is not too far fetched to claim that the architects' involved in the LMDC final 7 proposals, more precisely their subjective construal of the architecture to replace the Twin Towers, and the ideological foundation and genesis for redevelopment, remained within the fundamentalist space of the politics of the State as it resides within capitalism, and hence can be said to refract the libidinal construct of the politics of the State and represent it.

What can be traced from the analysis of Lyotard's conception of the libidinal construct of the State in relation to capitalism, is that the event of 9/11 was as much an attack on the US or Western State (in as far as the State can be conceived as invested in and be a

---

[46] Bill Readings: *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, Routledge, London, 1991, p91
[47] See Chapter 2 – Redevelopment and the Libidinal Event of 9/11
[48] Bill Readings: *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, Routledge, London, 1991, p91

precursor to capitalism, that is that it was the State *as* Capitalism, or Capitalism *as* the State that was attacked). The desire and power of iconomic function that was sought to be resurrected in the genesis of the redevelopment therefore was also of the politics of the striated State as much as it was of capitalism. In order to respond to such an event in a deconstructive and critical manner through the means of architecture (redevelopment), a strategy that critiques and displaces the context of capitalism and the State is the only one that can be logically pursued. In pursuing architecture for Ground Zero in this way, not only a redevelopment would be able to be accomplished, but also a memorialisation in the one instance. What is required therefore in order deconstruct and displace any resultant architecture at Ground Zero consequentially and following the attacks of 9/11 is an anti-capitalist art, which in the same instance becomes an anti-State architecture or art – as far as this is possible. It is this that will be aimed to be examined in the concluding chapter. However in order to first examine the fundamentalism that resides in the genesis and sentiments of redevelopment, it is necessary to analyse the Twin Towers' libidinal structure in some detail, as a way to uncover the production (*gen*) that was desired to be resurrected by the socius and architects alike, resulting in the genesis of the LMDC final 7 schemes.

Twin Towers

In construing the libidinal currency of the Twin Towers, and that which was not only desired to be resurrected by the American populace, architects and government agencies following their destruction on 9/11, but also that which was put forth as an appropriate rebirth for the Twin Towers by architects involved in the design of their redevelopment, it is necessary to first understand the genesis of sentiment captured in the Twin Tower's original design as a mark and statement of the libidinal economy of capitalism and the politics of the State, in as far as one might follow and accept the reading of Lyotard in articulating the nature of the politics of the State as an extension of capitalism.

The original desire and sentiment in construing the Twin Towers, was one of attempting to frame global peace through the supremacy of global trade and liberal capitalism as

dictated and represented by America to the rest of the world.[49] In this desire, the Twin Towers conception lies within a sign and symbol of American and State hegemony, a symbolic statement that is given emphasis by a metaphoric exclamation mark (not unlike the Twin Towers itself), as opposed to an open structure begetting or inviting a response, dialogue or any sentiment of heterogeneity.[50]

In the very design conception of the Twin Towers and their *raison d'etre* as architecture and architectural conception, a hegemonic force of currency was desired to be erected (whether consciously or not is aside from this point, as libidinal flow resides with the wholly pre-verbal, subconscious strata of the libido), in which the force and libidinal flow of liberal capitalism might reveal itself, and not only reveal itself as a singular statement, but achieve that through the re-iteration and re-emphasis of such hegemonic force through the erection of not one, but two identical towers, two exclamation marks bringing to end any confusion or disagreement as to where, in what and in whom power within the post-World War II global order resides.

As Martin argues, the subconscious and subjective force of the Twin Towers' conception acted as a symbol and sign for the space of networked global trade and a monument to that power in enforcing the ideology of such regime.[51] Further to Martin's analysis, and as Terry Smith states, "it is evident that the intended targets [on 9/11] were buildings that actually housed functions of profound centrality to the United States as a State, and that had, in the language and the imagination of the world, come to symbolise the exercise of these functions (this logic extends from the Pentagon to encompass the White House and Capitol Building)."[52] The Twin Towers thus served as a symbol to the supremacy and space of networked global trade and all that that represented as power to the world.

[49] see David L Solomon, "Divided Responsibilities: Minoru Yamasaki, Architectural Authorship, and the World Trade Center", *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002, p.87-88 and Anthony Robbins, *The World Trade Center*, Englewood, Fla. : Pineapple Press ; Fort Lauderdale, Fla. : Omnigraphics, Inc., c1987.
[50] See Lyotardian discussions on heterogeneity in Rojek and Turner (eds.): *The Politics of Jean-Francois Lyotard: justice and political theory*, Routledge, London, 1998
[51] Reinhold Martin: One or More, in *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002
[52] Terry Smith, "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002, p24

Furthering this analysis, Terry Smith writes that "the real targets were America's icons of military and economic power",[53] and therefore it could be stated in the context of an analysis of the substance of such icons as the Twin Towers, that their "iconomy"[54] was fully integrated with and a sign of the libidinal economy of the politics of the capitalist State and much of its socius.

When the Twin Towers are analysed in relation to the term "iconomy", it is the economy of their iconomorphic semiology that is being apprehended, namely the libidinal economy of their architecture as metaphoric and iconic signs that give expression to such semiology in material and form. What is being rearticulated in rebuilding Ground Zero and in the genesis of such desire for rebuilding, is a resurrection of this "iconomy", an "iconomy" of military and economic power that the Twin Towers embodied.

That the Twin Towers were undeniably a symbolic and metaphoric statement of capitalist power and of capitalism as such, is also discussed in an essay by David L Salomon, where he construes the authorship of the Twin Towers as symbols designed and erected with a symbolic function,[55] a symbolic function that arguably envelopes the meaning and mechanism of the symbol as an expression of power. Other authors, such as afore quoted Reinhold Martin also emphasise this subjective construal by saying that the Twin Towers "...was the ultimate vertical monument to authoritarian state and corporate power."[56] In considering the Twin Towers as a monument to authoritarian State and corporate power, Reinhold Martin continues his comparative analysis of the two destroyed targets of 9/11, namely the Pentagon and the Twin Towers, by stating that "though the two couldn't seem more different, the embryonic spatial ambiguity of the Pentagon and many of the large suburban office buildings that followed it, in which State and/or corporate authority was networked into consumerist individuality, was in-fact exacerbated in the 'twin towers' of the World Trade Center...which is to say the very literal space of the capitalist

[53] ibid., p25
[54] See Terry Smith's use of the term "iconomy" in "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002.
[55] see David L Salomon: "Divided Responsibilities – Minoru Yamasaki, Architectural Authorship, and the World Trade Center", *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002
[56] Reinhold Martin, "One or More", in *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002, p117

marketplace. A flexibly modulated, horizontally networked space that we now recognise as the space of word trade."[57] Although Martin doesn't theoretically trace his use of the terminology of the "State" to Lyotard, it can be offered to be construed and understood in light of Lyotardian analysis of the relation between the politics of the State and capitalism as entered into above.

What we find therefore in the sentiments and desire for rebuilding, not only redevelopment, but rebuilding the Twin Towers "bigger and better" and as a monument that is "an even greater symbol of New York than what was there before", is a desire to recapture the semiology and "iconomy" of the original buildings that were destroyed, a resurrection that includes the resurrection of their entire iconomoprhic latency and force, whose symbolic exchange is one of a regime of power. It is in this desire and in this substance of iconomorphic latency and force that we find the seed of sentiment for redevelopment and the genesis for what is to follow in the conception of the LMDC final 7 schemes. This seed of iconomorphic power as embodied in the Twin Towers is the genesis of the subjective construal of those who would like to see rebuilding occur, and the genesis of the libidinal currency in which we eventually see the LMDC final 7 proponent's schemes take form.

What, one might ask, is problematic with such desire and thinking for resurrecting something "bigger and better" than what originally stood in its place, especially if the wounds inflicted by the collapse and destruction of the Twin Towers so dramatically affected the latent libidinal currency of not only the politics of the capitalist State, but also its socius in which the attacks took place? To such question and sentiments, Terry Smith argues "... for those in other cultures, particularly those with an anti-modernising thrust and thus every reason to reject these frameworks [in which the conceptualisation and execution of the architecture of the Twin Towers is conceived], symbolic architecture such as the WTC and the Pentagon are actualities, the exact equivalent of the

---

[57] ibid. , p.120)

64

headquarters of a rival warlord."[58] In desiring and willing to resurrect the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers and the currency of its iconomorphic substance, the politics of the State and its mediatedly captured socius demonstrates a failure to comprehend the libidinal context to which such iconomorphic signs lend themselves to in the context of a war of subjectivity. Not only can it then be argued that the genesis of the rebuilding proposal's sentiments, intensity and desire remain within the libidinal realm of the politics of the capitalist State and that which was targeted to be attacked, but also any rebuilding conception, including architecture, if it fails to deal with, address and evacuate the "iconomy" and libidinal currency of the original structures which were destroyed. This secret, Terry Smith argues, is "the public secret that the bombers set out to reveal [and which] is now out in the open: it is the fragility of capitalism, both as a system and as the occasion and design spirit of this [WTC] particular building";[59] it was this spirit and libidinal currency that was the object of attack, and any reversal to resurrect such "iconomy" fails to take into consideration within its architecture and architectural conception, or even genesis, the subjectivity and micro-flows of desire and belief invested in it. With almost 3000 resultant dead from the attack on the Twin Towers, it is this subjectivity, micro-flow, desire and belief that is necessary to be rethought, displaced and deconstructed, or in other terms, an operation of 'reflective judgement'[60] pursued - to borrow a term which Lyotard takes from Kant in his essay "Rewriting Modernity".

The Semiology of the Redevelopment Proposals

In having set-out an analysis and theoretical trace of the genesis of the sentiments of redevelopment and rebuilding of Ground Zero, and having highlighted the libidinal flow and currency of such genesis, it is necessary to turn to the LMDC final 7 proposals themselves, and analyse the semiologic substance and structure of their architecture, and by this it is meant not their form per say, but rather their libidinal investment by which

---

[58] Terry Smith, "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002, p27)
[59] ibid., p35
[60] See Lyotard: "Rewriting Modernity" in *Sub-stance* 16:3-9, 1987, No.54

they take possession of place and articulate an architecture – their structure and architecture of conception and subjectivity.

In analysing the standing forth of the LMDC final 7, it is precisely subjectivity that is at stake, the formulation and articulation of subjectivity following the libidinal event of 9/11, and which in turn gathers into and finds its way to expression, creation and architectural production (*gen*). What is the currency and latent micro-flow of symbolic exchange expressed in the rebuilding proposals of the LMDC final 7? What is the "iconomy" of their architecture's structure on which they stand and come into being, or in other words, as Terry Smith states: "...just want kind of regime of symbolic exchange, what kind of "iconomy", is coming into being?"[61] It is this set of questions that concern any rebuilding's relation with the libidinal reverberation of the event of 9/11, that is what sort of micro-flows of subjectivity are set off by the attack and in what manner do these micro-flows find their way into a rearticulation of politics through architecture. The assertion being made is that they could develop along either one of two ways, either as a rearticulation and resurrection of the desire of capitalism and its socius in relation to that which was destroyed, or conversely a deconstruction, subversion and re-evaluation of such sentiments in turn leading toward an art of architecture whose stance is critical to the politics of the State as capitalism. To such set of questions, all one can assert following the analysis of the genesis of the redevelopment-rebuilding process, is that the rebirth of the Twin Towers as captured by the LMDC final 7 and the public, political and popular discourse surrounding it in all their libidinal investment and flow, arguably takes the former route, and articulates a semiology of "iconomy" as a reflection of the Twin Towers' "iconomy", "as an image of its own destruction".[62] As Koolhaas has opined: "In spite of Bloomberg's pragmatic sobriety, the trans-national metropolis is enlisted in a national crusade. New York becomes a city (re)captured by Washington. Through the alchemy of 9/11, the authoritarian morphs imperceptibly into the totalitarian. A competition for rebuilding Ground Zero is held, not to restore the city's vitality or shift its

---

[61] Terry Smith, "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru,, The Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center", *Architectural Theory Review*, Vol. 7 / No. 2, 2002, p1.
[62] ibid.

66

centre of gravity, but to create a monument at a scale that monuments have never existed (except under Stalin)."[63]

The genesis, semiologic structure and substance of the LMDC final 7 – their libidinal currency – therefore finds expression in the vein of a monument to triumphalist totalitarianism as co-opted by capitalism and represented in a sign. The monumentalism of the conception, immanence and desire captured by the LMDC final 7 (and here it is not their size or volume, but their semiologic substance, conception, structure and psychological genesis which is being termed monumental – their currency of conception and semiology) is a sign of power, libidinal reverberations that failed to transcend the politics of the State as it finds itself invested in capitalism and a stumped fundamentalist totalitarianism residing within its libidinal economy to bring about signification – whether in material or not. Indeed the very semiology present in the LMDC final 7 is a reverberation or echo of the State's politics as invested in capitalism, a voice and utterance in a relation and response to the event of 9/11 that could only be deemed as misguided and uncritical, if not downright perverse. How else could an architect arrive at an architectural semiology such as that articulated in the "Freedom Tower", if not through the echo of such fundamentalist totalitarianism reverberating through the design conception, genesis, desire and comprehension for rebuilding.

The conception of a tower rising to 1,776 feet with its association to represent the semiologic substance of the American War of Independence (1776) (and undoubtedly everything that America has since come to stand for and arguably against which the attacks took place) is nothing but a blind, uncritical and unreflective semiologic reaffirmation by way of architectural redevelopment of the very substance of that which was wanted to be destroyed in the attack. It is in this vein that one can assert a failure on behalf of the architect to assess, comprehend and reflect on the libidinal valorisation that came to destroy the Twin Towers in the first place, and from which any consequential (architectural) action of redevelopment might take its cue. Again, it is a matter of psychological genesis, one of subjective construal of generation, production, creation, of

---

[63] Rem Koolhaas, "Delirious no more", in *Wired* issue 11.06, June 2003

understanding the substance behind the attack and its relation to a particular "iconomy". Libeskind's semiologic conception of the "Freedom Tower" fails to assess the need for a rearticulation of semiology in any redevelopment of Ground Zero resultant from the attacks – in short, it fails to comprehend the libidinal structure of the attack and to draw architectural consequences from it. It is Libeskind scheme's psychological conception, generation, production and creation that is being critiqued, regardless of the "style", the angles, or any other feature by which this tower and adjoining towers is designed. What is being critiqued is the "Freedom Tower's" signification and semiology and its co-option of the subjectification of the politics of the State in the context of the attack on the Twin Towers - that which threads its way into perception, subjective construal and ultimately action as outlined in Chapter One. Instead of rearticulating and the State's semiologic function, one should have attempted to critique, displace, subvert and deconstruct it in any architectural proposal for redevelopment in order to evacuate the regime of power that is latent in such signs. That having been said, there were some more admirable components to Libeskind's scheme, particularly in the lower-rise sections.

Alternatively if one surveys the semiology of the Think Group proposal, whereby an almost exact replica of the Twin Towers is conceived, yet one that is hollowed out in skeletal form and given over to memorial and cultural functions, one sees the mourning of the loss of power articulated: an absence rearticulated through functions and a semiology that hopes to rise above the "evil" of that which caused the destruction of the original. There is no pretence in this scheme - despite the functional transformation of the building - to articulate the form of something other than the resurrection of that which was lost in the attack. At least if Libeskind can be credited for attempting to find a new form for any redevelopment, regardless of how one might critically evaluate his proposal on semiological grounds, the Think Group's proposal does not even try to attempt this. Instead the sign of the original Twin Towers is resurrected, reconnecting the new buildings to the same signification of power as that which the original occupied, if through no other way than by transference. No comprehension has been made into the relationship between power and the sign, as might be understood from Lyotard's

statement: "there is no sign or thought of a sign that is not about power and of power".[64] Hence the Think Group's proposal might rightly be critiqued to remain in the bosom of power that was the target of the attack, and to articulate a resurrection of power by way of the resurrection of its sign. Be it conscious in its genesis of creation and production or not, one can nonetheless philosophically critique it in such way. It is fully comprehendible why any psychological genesis for architectural redevelopment might connect itself to desire created by lack (*manque*), and aim to resurrect the substance of loss, namely power, but it is in the understanding of the exact root of the libidinal substance of why the attack took place that one can critique the scheme as being misconstrued.

Similarly to the Think Group proposal, the Foster & Partner's euphemistically dubbed "Kissing Towers" attempts to recapture the monumentalism of the Twin Towers as it stands for and heralds the space of global capital and trade, revoicing the triumphalism of the victory of "good" over "evil", albeit that its environmental and structural credentials may be more up to date than that which was originally destroyed, but nonetheless still remaining within the space and logic of the stumped fundamentalism of the politics of the State as vested in capitalism. The critique of the Twin Tower's replication of the network of global capital, trade and circulation as made by Reinhold Martin in his article "One or More"[65] is both literally and figuratively recreated in Foster's scheme, without any attempt to hide or masquerade it. In effect, Foster's "Kissing Towers" proposal is a reaffirmation of the capitalist semiology that was embodied in the original Twin Towers and destroyed. In Foster's scheme we see neither mediation, reconfiguration, nor any attempt at rethinking the source of libidinal reverberation that created the attack on the Twin Towers; what we conversely see is a wholesale repetition of the original's functional and semiologic structure. It must be reiterated as critique of Foster's scheme, that without disrupting the micro-flow of symbolic exchange that the Twin Tower's engendered, and without disrupting the semiology of capitalist circulation – and most importantly its sign - any redevelopment proposal is bound-up within a potential

---

[64] Lyotard, *The Lyotard Reader*, Andrew Benjamin (ed.), Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, 1989, p3.
[65] Reinhold Martin: "One or More", *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002, p116

repetition of the libidinal event which destroyed the original towers. It is this that is at the heart of the critique of the redevelopment proposals.

Other examples could also be pursued from the nine proposals submitted by the LMDC final 7, such as the Meier/ Eisenman/ Siegal/ Holl proposal, in which the building is designed and takes its form in such a way as to provide multiple and varied "escape routes" to any impending attack, thus not re-subjectifying or rethinking form, structure, perception and function-use in a way of taking place on such a site following the event of 9/11, but rather repeating the striated semiology of capitalism and its networked space of global trade, whilst hoping that if this new building is attacked, at least there will be more of a chance to evacuate before any impending collapse. The same critique made about Foster's proposal could be made about this consortium's scheme, namely that the semiology of power vested in the original Twin Towers remains intact and that the sign and signification of the Twin Towers is repeated.

Similarly in the Peterson/Littenberg scheme, what we see is a design based on axial symmetry; both within each individual buildings' design, as well as repeated across the site. The use of symmetry echoing a recreation of order and hierarchy seems to not take into account that something significantly disruptive to the libidinal economy of the United States took place on this site – it tries neither to remember, nor reflect or invoke this in its scheme. By proposing to recreate order through symmetry and hierarchy on the site of Ground Zero, the event of 9/11 and its potential for libidinal reverberations is blindly swept aside as though nothing of any significance ever happened, and in turn fortifies the subjectivity that after 9/11 capitalism and its libidinal tide of trade and reproduction concomitant with power will resume business as usual.

The semiology of the United Architects proposal and its complicity with the military-State complex has already been analysed in the previous chapter and does not require any further emphasis here. A critique of the final of the LMDC 7 schemes by SOM will be left aside, as it was withdrawn from the final line-up of schemes due to conflict of interest between their engagement on the design of WTC 7 on the north of the site with developer

Larry Silverstein and that of the LMDC commission, however it too can be critiqued in the same light as the above.

In the various examples above, an attempt to rearticulate the striated power and fundamentalism of the politics of the State as immanent in the practice and pursuit of capitalism is at play, and therefore they are all still beholden to the State as striated signifiers for and of it. It is subjectivity and the subjective conception of the LMDC final 7 proposals that is in critique here, and one could mention others, not their form or style, but rather their substance and co-option of thought which their semiology attempts to capture or by which it is captured in turn. A folding back and semiologic rearticulation thus occurs in the architectural conceptions of the LMDC final 7, a folding back and semiologic rearticulation of that which was destroyed in the attacks, albeit brought forth through new form, but retaining nonetheless the substance of a monumental sign and signification of power, a reiteration and resurrection of the very semiologic substance of the architecture that was attacked.

Such a folding back and rearticulation could not but be otherwise as long as the conception and genesis of the rebuilding remains in deferment to the libidinal currency (desire) that arose in the socius of New York and America following the attack; through such deferment the genesis of rebuilding remains immanent to the politics of the State and its sign and semiology of power as vested in capitalism. As Deleuze writes, the nature of the sign as such is to double up on itself: "In the end, it's the same thing to say that each sign is doubly articulated, i.e. that a sign always refers to another sign, indefinitely, and that the supposedly infinite ensemble of signs refers to a greater signifier. Such is the paranoid regime of signs, but one could just as well call it despotic or imperial."[66] Thus while the conception of rebuilding remains within the need to resurrect a sign, and a replacement to the semiologic function of the sign that has been destroyed, the despotic and imperialist circle of the regime of signs that Deleuze refers to (and therefore the semiology of anything that might come to replace the Twin Towers) remains forever to be repeated and intact. Only by evacuating through critique the

---

[66] Deleuze, *Two Regimes of Madness*, Semiotext(e), New York, 2006, p.14

semiology and desire of the politics of the State as vested in capitalism can anything other, or any otherness, find its way to form – it is the semiology of capitalism that needs to be rethought and displaced in any rebuilding proposal in order to deconstruct the place and possible taking possession of space at Ground Zero.

To site a few examples of some positive rearticulation to redevelopment, one could highlight the lower reaches of Peter Eisenman's scheme prepared for the *New York Magazine* independent of the above mentioned official proposal in which he took part with Meier, Seigal and Holl, which does attempt to subvert the semiology articulated in the Twin Towers, however only in the low-rise sections. The most promising of all proposals as might be critiqued in light of the theoretical trace above, both official and unofficial, was Kas Oosterhuis and Ilona Lénárd's (Oosterhuis.nl) morphing hyposurface skin structure, regardless of the fact that it was only a concept sketch for the Max Protetch Invitational Exhibition - it is precisely in the conception of possible architecture that we can locate the genesis and subsequent creation and production of it, and in this scheme, perhaps alone amongst all the various schemes, can we recognise a libidinal flow of creative movement seeking-out otherness for the site come into play.

To return to the critique and further examination of the substance of misconstrued conception in rebuilding vis-à-vis the recapturing of a semiologic meaning that was lost, it is necessary to quote Lyotard in relation to the sign, an echo of the previous sentiment regarding the sign voiced by Deleuze: "The first consequence [of the sign] is that the relationship is therefore based on an infinite postponement, and so recurrence is installed as a fundamental trait of the system... we never get presence itself...".[67] Instead of articulating presence or a possible presence, that is a taking possession of space resulting in a making of place through a deconstructive process that aims to articulate the presence of the absence of a sign, that is a rethinking of the way in which architecture might proceed on Ground Zero following the substance and nature of the event of 9/11 and what it means to architecturally conceive of a development on that site and in this time, what we get instead is a reiteration of the sign and semiology of the Twin Towers

[67] Lyotard, *The Lyotard Reader*, Andrew Benjamin (ed.), Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, 1989, p3.

continually deferring to another sign, that is to the sign of capitalist circulation as made immanent by the Twin Towers, as opposed to a libidinal presence that might do justice to the event. This argument can be made in light of the analysis of the genesis of the redevelopment lying in the desire and will to replace the "iconomy" of that which was destroyed, and unconsciously therefore also its semiology; until this circuit of the referential sign is displaced and deconstructed through a new genesis and formulation of subjective construal for the purposes of creating an architecture, and the need for signification and the creation of a sign in itself displaced, such state of affairs will always return, for "there is no sign or thought of a sign that is not about power and of power".[68] Hence to suggest a way forward, it is the sign and the thought of the sign that needs to be displaced – such a question of thought is of subjectivity, and it is in this manner that we can justify an analysis of the redevelopment proposals on the basis of the genesis of their subjective construal.

The manifestation of the genesis of the architecture construed for the redevelopment of Ground Zero in the schemes of the LMDC final 7 was plugged into a body that failed to connect to a libidinal intensity and creative flow of escape, instead carrying with it and recreating the traits and desire of the politics of the State as vested in capitalism. In essence, and in the context of a thoroughly media-saturated society as that of the United States, in the wake of such an event as 9/11 and in the context of late-capitalism, this was the only natural libidinal outcome that it could take. The architecture of the LMDC final 7 could not escape the libidinal tide of power, and a will to demonstrate and voice the power that emanated from the politics of the event of 9/11 and which reverberated through the libidinal plane of the socius of America and the broader West. The architecture of the LMDC final 7 therefore remained within a libidinal construction whose substance was an echo of capitalism and the politics of the State as vested in capitalism, as opposed to demonstrating a creative challenge to such politics and subjectivity, thus failing to come to terms with and articulate the political and historical dimensions of the event of 9/11 and articulate any re-subjectification.

---

[68] ibid., p3.

That the LMDC final 7 remained within the realm of symbolic exchange tied to the politics of the State and its striated libidinal economy is no surprise, for how could it do otherwise when the genesis of redevelopment was already cast in such a light. What needs to be highlighted is the fact that only by imbuing the economy of icons, that is an "iconomy" with a libidinal framework that is of an other than the power and libidinal currency of capitalism, can a semiology emerge that circumvents and displaces the politics and consequential subjectivity that emerged in response to the attack; for this to take place, a subjectivity of heterogeneity is required as opposed to it being captured by striation. Without the politics of redevelopment taking another course – and it was this that should have been the call of architects and the subjective conception of their architecture –, the restoration and resurrection of striated signifiers in place of the Twin Towers is the only substance that is left to emerge. In Reinhold Martin's words: "And so each defiant act of "rebuilding" the bubble is also a violent restoration of the forced subjective unity that networks on all sides will continue to tear apart. To the degree that such rebuilding continues, the catastrophic event goes on."[69]

---

[69] Reinhold Martin, "One or More", *Grey Room* 07, Spring 2002, p 122.

Chapter 4

Toward a Critique of the Spatiality of the State

Smooth and Striated Space

Molecular Revolution

The Situationist legacy

Puissance > < Pouvoir

Smooth and Striated Space

If the problematic with the response to the redevelopment of Ground Zero by way of architecture – as well as the "iconomy" of the original structures that stood in their place – can be argued to manifest a collusion with the politics of the State by way of a subjective construal (desire) that echoes the space of capitalism, then what alternative might be sought out for architecture, what alternative route to architecture might exist for that site and in general elsewhere, or in other words, how might the subjective construal (desire) of architectural production attempt to escape, or at least displace, disrupt and critique the politics and space of the State in the process of a conception for rebuilding? What alternative desires might be construed, and how might these alternative desires surface within architecture, or what latent subjectivity and libidinal escape might be suggested to be activated for a response by way of architecture that evacuates the politics

of the State in and through architecture for the site of Ground Zero (and in general elsewhere) as a critical response to the event of 9/11? How might a *durcharbeitung*, that is a reworking or working through, of the subjective construal of architecture proceed? These questions are asked in a manner as to attempt a theoretical construal of taking possession of space and taking place on that site post the event of 9/11.

What requires to be addressed and understood is the way in which a subjective construal of architecture that displaces the libidinal reverberations of the American socius post the event of 9/11 can be forwarded, or at least theorised, an approach, production, construction and subjective construal of architecture that critiques and deconstructs the space and politics of the State that so forcefully came to fore in the public, professional and populist discourse in America surrounding the event of 9/11, and came to representation in the LMDC final 7 schemes. What requires to be addressed is the genesis, that is to say generation, production and creation of subjectivity by which architectural construal and production might address the space and politics of the State post the event of 9/11, that is produce the possibility in its subjective construal of a creative movement toward a critique, disruption and displacement of the space of the politics of the State as residing within capitalist (striated) representation.

As has been quoted from Bill Reading vis-à-vis Lyotard's *Dérive à Partir de Marx et Freud*, "even within Marxism, *Dérive* picks up the figural as the site of a resistance to political representation: the way to carry forward the class struggle is not the counter-exploitation of political space for socialist ends, but its disruption".[1] A way forward therefore by way of architecture for the site of Ground Zero might be suggested to reside within a figural space that disrupts political representation, a disruption of the space and representation of capitalism as a political space, a disruption of the striated and its space that Deleuze and Guattari talk about in *A Thousand Plateaus* as the nature of the space of the State.[2] And again quoting Reading, "the work of the avant-garde is thus not to produce left-wing art but to produce an 'anti-art' that will deconstruct representational

---

[1] Bill Readings: *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, Routledge, London, 1991, p91
[2] see Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, Chapter 14, "1440: The Smooth and the Striated", The Athlone Press, London, 1996

space."[3] Hence a response to the libidinal event of 9/11 and its reverberations captured in the LMDC final 7 schemes might be to approach architecture for the site of Ground Zero in a manner that deconstructs representational space to produce an anti-architecture, or in other words a subjective construal that attempts to deterritorialise striated space toward figural characteristics of smooth space as discussed by Deleuze and Guattari.[4]

Deleuze and Guattari write of the characteristics of such smooth space that it is non-delimited and unpartitioned,[5] that is that it has yet to been subjugated by conquest, and that power has not yet marked itself on it, and as a consequence it is occupied without counting,[6] belonging to the likeness of habitation, occupation of space and taking place of the nomad,[7] or the virginal condition of the sea before human exploration and charting of it.[8] Striated space on the contrary, as Deleuze and Guattari write, is constructive of sedentary occupation,[9] governed by money and work,[10] that is by affects of power, subjugation, control, the state and capital, displaying a figural hierarchy. As a consequence, movement in and through and the experience of such types of space are also markedly different, that is to say the subjective construal that arises from moving and being in them is of an altogether different nature. In opposition to representational hierarchy, Deleuze and Guattari point out "that smooth space is occupied by intensities, wind and noise, forces, and sonorous and tactile qualities…",[11] characteristics which echo the formulation of *haecceities* which they discuss earlier in *A Thousand Plateaus*[12], and by which term of "intensity" we can understand the eruption of the libidinal as discussed by Lyotard.

---

[3] Bill Readings: *Introducing Lyotard – Art and Politics*, Routledge, London, 1991, p91
[4] For a reading on the philosophical concepts of Smooth and Striated space, see Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, Chapter 14.
[5] ibid., p481
[6] ibid., p477
[7] ibid., p474
[8] ibid., p478-482
[9] ibid., p474
[10] ibid., p481
[11] ibid., p479
[12] ibid., p260-265

As a result of architecture existing within the sedentary category of space ("the city is the striated space par excellence")[13], it can never fully escape striated space, it is always connected to the State apparatus and its means of representation by consequence of its sedentary function as an archetype, however it can give way to smooth characteristics, and therefore characteristics of an "anti-architecture" in its individual structurisation of organisation, and most importantly in the subjective construal brought to it. It is this subjective construal brought to the generation, production and creation of architecture that displaces striated space toward the smooth that is in question to be activated for the purposes of displacing, disrupting and critiquing the politics and space of the State, and for the purposes of forwarding an anti-architecture, and ultimately for working through an approach to architecture for the site of Ground Zero that might result in a *durcharbeitung*. It is in the deterritorialisation of a representation of power (the striated), all forms and articulations of power belonging to hierarchy and the space of the State – including that of capital – that an anti-architecture might be able to emerge.

So given the distinction between smooth and striated space, and their mutually reliant relationship to one another, with the smooth space belonging to the space of the nomad, the non-city dweller, and striated space to the space of the sedentary State, and in the context of the need to displace the libidinal reverberations of the American socius post the event of 9/11, that is to displace, disrupt and critique the space and representation of the State by way of offering architecture to the redevelopment of Ground Zero in a manner that addresses a different libidinal reverberation than what came forth as a result of the attacks of 9/11, and subsequently has the ability to displace the space of the politics of the State in the process, how might architecture deterritorialise from the space of the striated toward the space of the smooth, or in other words, how might a subjective construal and movement toward a critique of the space of the State proceed in and by way of architecture?

In order to address this question, one needs to go back to the genesis of any architectural construal, that is to say to the generation, creation and production of desire that might set

---

[13] ibid., p481

in motion any movement toward an architectural response, that is to the genesis of subjective construal of architecture for the site of Ground Zero. How might such a genesis be reformulated given the lack of libidinal reverberations evident in the professional, public and populace discourse surrounding the redevelopment of Ground Zero (as discussed in the previous chapter), and its presence in directing the subjective construal of architecture for that site, how might the thinking of *durcharbeitung* proceed for the site of Ground Zero given the analysis of 9/11 as a libidinal event?

Molecular Revolution

In response to this question, one might return to the thought of Guattari articulated post the events of May '68 in France, to the articulation of how a given socius might set-out on a movement of deterritorialisation resulting in an encounter, critique, disruption and displacement of the space and politics of the State. In this regard, Guattari formulated and forwards a concept known as 'molecular revolution', a movement and deterritorialisation of the socius that involves its subjective latency and formulation of subjectivity. Guattari writes that a 'molecular revolution' exists within the economy of desire, or we could say the libidinal economy of a socius, through the privileging of a way of thinking about life and society that he calls 'schizo-analysis'.[14] Letting-loose and activating 'molecular revolution' involves harnessing the economy of desire of the socius, its economy, or at least tapping into such economy of desire by the architect for the purposes in question, even arresting and altering it. The question of allowing free-flow of a molecular revolution in the subjective construal and conception of architectural form enters into the argument from the perspective of desiring a way in which to displace, disrupt and critique the politics and space of the State, to deterritorialise striated space toward that of characteristics of smooth space, to critique striated space – and with it all forms of power (*pouvoir*) – by way of desiring an otherness and heterogeneity to our sedentary occupation of space in a way that opposes a taking place through counting, in favour of taking place through *haecceities*. To activate the sedentary with affects, intensities and events, to allow *haecceities* to infiltrate the subjective construal and conception of

---

[14] Guattari, *Molecular Revolution*, Penguin, London, 1984, p260

making space, occupying space and taking place. To make architecture a real taking of place, that is an orchestration that sets off events, new thoughts and new feelings that affects and displaces subjectivity of the user in short.

Molecular revolution in the subjective construal of architecture, that is its genesis of orchestration, is to set a libidinal economy in motion that desires to break-down and break-away from the representation and politics of the State, to break through its qualities and subjugation of striation toward possibilities of otherness, of other ways of conceiving a taking possession of space and the generation, creation and production of place, an anti-architecture, one that creates unforseen consequences in the thoughts and feelings and actions of the user – to be affected by intensities, and informed by *haecceities* – even in work, or most importantly in work, if that is the redevelopment of Ground Zero is predominantly aimed at recouping lost floor-space for office use. What is at stake here is a different kind of work, social and urban environment, one that is liberating in all its potential, one that imbues a sense of heterogeneity and possibility for otherness: to think new thoughts, to experience new feelings, to assist a molecular revolution that suspends and counters the context of labour as a commodity.

Guattari writes that "the first task of a theory of desire must be to try to pick out ways of breaking through into the social field..."[15] with the social field in question for our purposes being architecture, movement in and through space, perception, relation to the incorporeal, to sign and signification. Only in consequence of a theory of desire and thinking 'breaking through into the social field' can a molecular revolution be activated in the users of the space of the social field. Given that the space of that social field in our question is architecture and its contextual urban and social environment, the architect who chooses to approach architectural production by means of deterritorialising striated space toward that of smooth space, is charged with the responsibility of setting in motion a molecular revolution of subjectivity in and by way of their architecture, that is to create an architecture that will allow different perceptions to emerge through the use and occupation of their architecture, different perceptions and otherness about function,

---

[15] Guattari, *Molecular Revolution*, Penguin, London, 1984, p254

80

circulation, movement, being still, community, work, etc. Just as Guattari has stated that "the point is to try and make the text work"[16] – the point in our case is to try and create a molecular revolution in the user of any architecture situated on Ground Zero that opens up an other space to that of the striated, that offers an experience of space, accompanied by thoughts and feelings, that deterritorialises toward a smooth occupation of it: to create in representation and actuality an anti-State architecture – as much as this is possible by way of architecture. The approach and promise of activating a molecular revolution in the user of the space in question is the first step toward realising a reworking and working through of architecture for the site of Ground Zero, and the initial movement toward raising architecture as a possibility of thought in consequence to the libidinal event of 9/11 and any subsequent redevelopment.

Having laid this desire out in a brief outline above, it is necessary to take a look at various movements in art and politics that aimed at destabilising the space and representation of the State, and learn from those movements for the purposes of architecture. The movement of art and politics in question that needs to be looked at more closely is that of the Situationist International (SI), stretching from its formation in 1957 through to its demise in 1972, and the reverberations influenced by it, in particular two key concepts it developed, namely *dérive* and *detournement*.

The Situationist legacy

The Situationist International was formed in 1957 through the merger of the International movement for an Imaginist Bauhaus and the Lettrist International (which Guy Debord had previously founded), and existed until its dissolution in 1972. The *raison d'etre* of the Situationist International was the production and forwarding of theoretical formulations for a revolutionary society under which guise all its various activities were formulated, which included the publishing of books, production of art, films and concepts for the renewal and critique of urbanism. The theoretical background for the movement was founded upon a mixture and extension of Surrealism, Marxism, and importantly, the

---

[16] ibid., p254

writings of French sociologist and philosopher Henri Lefebvre, in particular his book *Critique of Everyday Life*,[17] this latter title influencing the Situationists to address the concept of 'alienation' present in everyday life discussed in it. Peter Wollen writes of the Situationist International, that "in many ways its project was that of relaunching Surrealism on a new foundation, stripped of some of its elements (emphasis on the unconscious, quasi-mystical and occultist thinking, cult of irrationalism) and enhanced by others, within the framework of cultural revolution"[18] It is this last aspect of the Situationist International for which it is important in revisiting its legacy, namely cultural revolution, that is a way in which the striated order of taking possession of space and taking place may be able to be dislodged, critiqued and disrupted.

As the name of the movement suggests, the Situationist International was concerned with the production and creation of 'situations', events which aimed to critique and disrupt the habit of everyday consumerist life, capitalist space and bourgeois representation. In turn, these disruptions to the fabric of capitalist space and representation might be considered to be called attempts at molecular revolution. As Wollen writes, situations are "...constructed encounters and creatively lived moments in specific urban settings, instances of a critically transformed everyday life."[19] These constructed encounters and creatively lived moments were formulated as an intervention, critique and response to the "sterility and oppression of the actual environment and ruling economic and political system".[20] The Situationist International was therefore concerned with the critique of capitalist representation and the politics inherent within it, with its legacy offering ample aspects for the discussion and theorisation of a critique of the politics and representation of the State. As part of the theorisation and critique of the politics and representation of

---

[17] for a detailed account of the theoretical background to the Situationist International, see Peter Wollen, "Bitter Victory: The Art and Politics of the Situationist International" in Elisabeth Sussman (ed), *On the passage of a few people through a rather brief moment in time :The Situationist International 1957-1972*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1989

[18] Peter Wollen, "Bitter Victory: The Art and Politics of the Situationist International" in Elisabeth Sussman (ed), *On the passage of a few people through a rather brief moment in time :The Situationist International 1957-1972*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1989, p22

[19] ibid., p22

[20] Peter Wollen, "Bitter Victory: The Art and Politics of the Situationist International" in Elisabeth Sussman (ed), *On the passage of a few people through a rather brief moment in time :The Situationist International 1957-1972*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1989, p22

the State, its approach and writings offer ample scope to critique the architectural production offered to rebuild the site of Ground Zero in the context of the critique of the LMDC final 7 schemes. Much can be learned from the legacy of the Situationist International in conceiving a heterogenous architecture in genesis, one that destabilises and critiques striated space and deterritorialises it toward characteristics of the smooth, and in turn sets off molecular revolutions in the user of the space.

In discussing the aspects of the Situationist International's production that offer a critique of capitalist space and taking place, and which aspects might contribute to a formulation for destabilising and disruption of striated space, it is in what they had to say about architecture and urbanism that this critique is most forthrightly pronounced. In an article by Ivan Chtcheglov titled "Formulary for a New Urbanism" Chtcheglov paints the picture of a Situationist urban environment and architecture that might serve as a means to dislodge capitalist space and its subjective representation on the individual occupying it. It is the dislodgement and critique of the (urban) environment as a setting giving rise to forms of subjectivity, which comes to formulate the heart of the Situationist's approach to the critique of urban space and the force by which it can be harnessed for an alternative genesis to redevelopment at Ground Zero.

In conceptualising this new city, new urbanism and new architecture, Chtcheglov writes of the Situationist architecture to come, that "... architecture will, at least initially, be a means of experimenting with a thousand ways of modifying life, with a view to a mythic synthesis."[21] He goes on to conjure up an image of this new urbanism and architecture, writing that "we have already pointed out the need of constructing situations as being one of the fundamental desires on which the next civilisation will be founded. This need for *absolute* creation has always been intimately associated with the need to *play* with architecture, time and space..."[22] Chtcheglov continues, that "this new vision of time and space, which will be the theoretical basis of future constructions, is still imprecise and will remain so until experimentations with patterns of behaviour has taken place in cities

---

[21] Ivan Chtcheglov, "Formulary for a New Urbanism", in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p2
[22] ibid., p3

specifically established for this purpose, cities assembling – in addition to the facilities necessary for a minimum of comfort and security – buildings charged with evocative power, symbolic edifices representing desires, forces, events past, present and to come."[23]

The urbanism and architecture that Chtcheglov depicts, is one that is fuelled and given over to "representing desires" and "forces", qualities of a libidinal economy that set in motion a heterogeneity of occupation: the arresting, suspension and disruption of subjectivity. The Situationist's approach to the critique of architecture and urban space rests within a libidinal valorisation of space as it comes to affect and construct subjectivity in the user. Such libidinal valorisation of urbanism and architecture is aimed at the construction and formulation of subjectivity toward a particular type of place and space, forces that herald a contestation with, and an anti-representation to homogenic State power and force through which capitalist representation structures space. By doing so, it could be surmised that a deconstruction, reworking, or *durcharbeitung* of the striated formulation of urbanism and architecture as formulated by the politics of the State as vested in capitalism is hoped to proceed, one that liberates the libidinal economy of the user to be able to grasp an alternative way to taking place and being in space: it is a question of the subjectivity that is formed in the user as a result of being in such space. It is such alternative constructions of subjectivity and desire created by architectural productions of space (and the relation that it necessarily imbues in the user to the everyday), in which the critique of the LMDC final 7's schemes can be made and in which a reworking, rethinking and *durcharbeitung* of redevelopment for Ground Zero may be able to be articulated.

The built environment that is envisioned by Chtcheglov is one in which the qualities and representations of the State are laid bare through a figural reformulation of space and occupation, one that harbours a liberating potential in the face of striation, labour, capital, the everyday and its attributes. Chtcheglov proclaims at the end of this essay, that in this new architecture and urbanism, "the principle activity of the inhabitants will be the

---

[23] Ivan Chtcheglov, "Formulary for a New Urbanism", in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p3

CONTINOUS DÉRIVE."[24] It is the call for the possibility and activation of a continuos *dérive* by Chtcheglov that is at the heart of the anti-architecture and disrupted representation of the politics and space of capitalism that the Situationists hope to forward.

A./ *Dérive*

So what then is this activity called the *dérive* that this new architecture and urban environment will make so spontaneously accessible and desirable to its inhabitants, and through which capitalist representation might be disrupted and critiqued toward an anti-architecture of representation, even forwarding the possibility for molecular revolution?

The *dérive* was a concept and practice invented by the Situationists as a means to occupy and move through space and the urban environment in a way that deconstructs and displaces the subjective content and bourgeois nature of capitalist urban environments, namely a concept and practice that has as its aim to liberate the user from the affects of the politics, representation and subjectivity imbued by the striated. A definition of *dérive* (meaning 'drift' in French) is given at the end of an article published in the *Internationale situationniste* journal titled "Preliminary Problems in Constructing a Situation", whereby it is defined as "a mode of experimental behaviour linked to the conditions of urban society: a technique of transient passage through varied ambiances",[25] that is what might be termed, following Deleuze and Guattari, as an attempt at creating a smooth experience and deterritorialisation of striated (urban) space. The *dérive* therefore is a concept and practice that aims to deconstruct the inhabitation of capitalist space and the space of the politics of the State by means of affecting an altered, liberated or other consciousness and subjectivity of urban space in the person active in and experiencing the space through a *dérive*. By participating in the *dérive*, the aim is that the subject might experience a

---

[24] ibid., p4
[25] "Preliminary Problems in Constructing a Situation" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p45

different or heterogenous occupation of space and the urban environment, one in which the affect of capitalist striated space is disrupted.

In his article titled "Theory of the Dérive",[26] Guy Debord talks about the practice and concept of the *dérive* as a "state of mind",[27] and again as a "transient passage",[28] an "awareness of psychogeographical effects",[29] with psychogeography being given the propositional definition of "the study of the precise laws and specific effects of the geographical environment, consciously organised or not, on the emotions and behaviour of individuals".[30] What Debord's description of the *dérive* attests to, is that the *dérive* is a concept-activity in which subjective production in the use-context and occupation of the urban environment shifts away from affects and linearity of striated space and its representations, toward the creation of an alternative way of occupying space that breaks down the affect of capitalism, an alternative subjective production that engenders a liberation from the space of the politics of the State. The concept and practice of the *dérive* then might be argued to suggest a movement, subjective construal and occupation of space that is characterised by what Deleuze and Guattari define as smooth space, a subjective occupation of space and taking place that is not delineated or strictured by points, or by counting, but rather heralds and activates the creation of a new and heterogenous psychogeography, a psychogeographical smooth space that arrests subjectivity and causes new thoughts and new feelings to emerge in contra-distinction to those created by the space of the State. The key of course to the concept, nature, practice and any possible architectural production and affect of the *dérive* in the built environment is one of liberating and disrupting subjectivity from the burdens of the striated.

In relating the *dérive* to Lyotard's conception of libidinal economy, what we might surmise is that *dérive* is resultant from the setting in motion of desire on both an

---

[26] see in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989.
[27] Guy Debord, "Theory of the Dérive" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p52
[28] ibid., p50
[29] ibid., p50
[30] Guy Debord, "Introduction to a Critique of Urban Geography" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p5

individual and collective plane. When, as Lyotard might suggest, desire turns perception and action and toward a creative transformation of possibilities and reality, when it takes flight and dislodges, disrupts and subverts the everyday in such a manner as to create mutation in behaviour and lived relations, both between individuals and with their urban context, an alternative lived experience emerges whereby 'systems', 'energy' and 'intensity' as residing in desiring-affects create and affect a formation of morphed individual and collective subjectivity. Such an affect is always unleashed by an event, which unleashing causes new possibilities or creative movement to take place, and in doing so subvert the assignation of the sign[31]. In the end, we might surmise, that the efficacy of *dérive* is precisely to subvert the assignation of the sign and its affect on individual and collective subjectivity, perception and consciousness, and most importantly on the plane that the built environment and architecture inhabit.

What therefore can be derived from the concept and practice of the *dérive*, is that in order to displace and critique capitalist space and the representation of the politics of the State, new thoughts and new feelings are required to be able to be constructed in the face of regular, mundane, repetitive behaviour, behaviour of the everyday that are governed by striation, such as work tasks and the daily routine of work. The creation of a subjective construal and construction that arrests striated patterns of subjectivity is required to be sought and desired,[32] creating an affect of difference in the feelings and thoughts of the user or worker in turn. It is this real desire and libidinal experience, one that seeks to break down the representation of the politics of the State and the networked space of capitalism, that ought to have formed the genesis of any redevelopment and production of architecture at Ground Zero, and which should have been the analytical task of the architects in putting forth their schemes. The reason the term "worker" is emphasised here, is because it is the reconstruction of lost office-space that provided the impetus for the redevelopment of Ground Zero, and therefore the manner and context in which labour

---

[31] Ibid.

[32] When the term 'desire' is used here, it is meant not in any abstract way, but in a real experiential and felt way that penetrates to the core of one's being in exactly the same way as how most of us have experienced lust for another person's body and sex.

87

is performed seems to be the key point of contestation for any new and liberating environment that might be created on that site.

In discussing the *dérive* in "Theory of the Dérive", Guy Debord quotes Marx, writing that "men can see nothing around them that is not their own image; everything speaks to them of themselves. Their very landscape is alive."[33] In order to create psychogeographically charged space, one in which people see a reflection that might be able to break down the subjective affects of striation, it is the desires of the users that need to be awakened through the respective production of architecture, for if these desires are awakened through the way in which the space is produced, then encounters with oneself are able to emerge and be recognised, which recognition in turn causes an active displacement of the striated routine of the everyday, and in emerging, has the potential to suspend and arrest the everyday subjectivity of the worker or user. Such an approach is one of a particular subjective construal taken toward architecture by the architect, one that charges the space with force (*puissance*).

In the course of an active generation, production and creation for the possibility of *dérive* in architectural production, "the adjective 'psychogeographical'....can thus be applied to the findings arrived at by this type of investigation, to their influence on human feelings, and even more generally to any situation or conduct that seems to reflect the same spirit of discovery".[34] The only way therefore that the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers and that which was proposed to replace them in the LMDC final 7 schemes can critique and escape the space, representation and politics of the State as capitalism, and readdress the libidinal cause of the event of 9/11 – including the envelopment of architecture (the Twin Towers) in the libidinal moebius band of the excretion of 9/11 – is by allowing the conscious generation of a psychogeographical unfolding in the user of the space. This entails a different kind of taking possession of space, a different kind of taking place, and most importantly genesis, an architecture that is open to suspending striated

---

[33] see Guy Debord, "Theory of the Dérive" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p52
[34] Guy Debord, "Introduction to a Critique of Urban Geography" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p5

subjectification in the user and affording an influence on human feelings and behaviour that results in heterogeneity, and in turn a self-discovery in the process of use and habitation – of allowing people to recognise and see themselves in their true perverted reality as created by the power of striation. Debord goes on to write, that "we might be justified in thinking that a future urbanism [and architecture] will also apply itself to no less utilitarian projects that will give the greatest consideration to psychogeographical possibilities."[35]

What we can therefore learn and take from the Situationist practice of *dérive*, is a method of occupying, experiencing and existing in space, of a taking place that as a method aims to construct an alternative experience to that of striated sedentary space. What such a method would suggest, is a way of encountering and occupying space that relies less on counting and more on bringing to fore qualities of *haecceities* and forces (*puissance*), in place of power (*pouvoir*). The pursuit of the subjective qualities of the *dérive* in the built environment of Ground Zero is the first task that any *durcharbeitung* might set-out to accomplish, and is reliant on desire taking flight through the realisation of a libidinal flow.

Although Debord sets the stage for a *dérive* in "industrially transformed cities" and their great urban mass, it is not exclusive to such a large area, and can be sought out and created in a place within a smaller space, a block or several blocks (such as the site of Ground Zero), or even within buildings themselves (Debord gives the example of the Saint Lazare train station).[36]

B./ *Detournement*

Guy Debord and Gil J Wolman wrote another tract, published in the *Internationale situationniste* on critiquing bourgeois society and the representation of capitalist figural

---

[35] ibid., p5
[36] see Guy Debord, "Theory of the Dérive" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p52

production titled "Methods of Detournement". *Detournement* roughly translates from the French verb *detourner*, which means to divert, making the meaning of *detournement* to be translatable as "diversion". Debord and Wolman set-out four laws of *detournement*, by which they propose the practice might be outlined.[37] Of these four laws, it is the second law of *detournement* that has the most architectural sensibility, namely that "the distortions introduced in the *detourned* elements must be as simplified as possible, since the main force of *detournement* is directly related to the conscious or vague recollection of the original contexts of the elements"[38] *Detourned* elements thus have a "dependence on memory"[39] as the authors suggest, one in which the original element is recollectable, but in a way that the *detournement* of it distorts it from its original signification. The diversions achievable through the practice of *detournement* of architectural elements, amounts to diverting meaning, diverting representation and signification, in short acts as a critique and displacement of representation in a way that the figural is harnessed for a site of resistance to political representation, one that deconstructs representation, and in the process critiques the representation of the politics of the State as vested in capitalism.

An article titled "Detournement as Negation and Prelude", also published in the *Internationale situationniste* goes on to say that "the two fundamental laws of *detournement* are the loss of importance of each *detourned* autonomous element – which may go so far as to lose its original sense completely – and at the same time the organisation of another meaningful ensemble that confers on each element its new scope and effect."[40] So in approaching architectural production through the purpose of creating *detournements*, architectural signification must not only succeed in breaking-down the original signification and figural meaning behind what stood there in the first place, but at the same time create a new meaningful ensemble and effect. *Detournement* is an artistic tactic with architectural implications that in dislodging striated figural representation in

[37] for the four laws of Detournement, see Guy Debord and Gil J Wolman, "Methods of Detournement", in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p10-11
[38] Guy Debord and Gil J Wolman, "Methods of Detournement", in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p10.
[39] ibid., p10
[40] "Detournement as Negation and Prelude" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p55

signification, creates a new signification at the same time, a double-movement of sorts, one that is a dislodgement of what has been *detourned* coupled with an assembly of something other that relies on the lingering effect of the *detourned* element; it is in short a deterritorialisation of the striated figural representation toward that of smooth representation, but doing so by retaining the vestiges of the striated – it is in this retainment where its affect lies.

It is precisely this outcome that Lyotard refers to in *Libidinal Economy* when he states that "Such an affect ... causes new possibilities or creative movement to take place, and in doing so subvert the assignation of the sign[41]. It is through *detournement* that the subjective affects of *dérive* are realised, and it is through *detournement* that desire can be unleashed in a creative movement causing intensities which create new relations to lived everyday experience, most importantly architecture and the built urban environment. It is through *detournement* and the resultant creation of *dérive* that the eruption and potential of the libidinal economy finds its way to expression and realisation.

In the same article as quoted above, it is stated of this tactic that "*detournement* has a peculiar power which obviously stems from the double meaning, from the enrichment of most of the terms by the coexistence within them of their old senses and their new, immediate senses."[42] *Detournement* as an artistic tactic with architectural implications therefore always works together with what has been displaced or dislodged in order to bring about the new figural representation. It is reliant on vestiges of the detourned element in order reconfigure and restructure meaning and communication, that is to perform a *detournement* per se.

Debord and Wolman directly address architecture and urbanism in the course of setting forth their discussion on the methods of *detournement*. The authors write, "to the extent that new architecture seems to have to begin with an experimental baroque stage, the architectural complex – which we conceive as the construction of a dynamic environment

---

[41] Ibid.
[42] ibid., p55

91

related to styles of behaviour – will probably *detourn* existing architectural forms, and in any case will make plastic and emotional use of all sorts of *detourned* objects...."[43] The tactic of *detournement* in architecture is therefore one of constructing 'dynamic environments related to styles of behaviour', that is creating affect that will displace the everyday modes of ingrained behaviour to do with a striated environment, space and perception toward an ensemble that offers the opportunity to the user of the space to recognise and engage figural representation that disrupts and critiques it. And in relation to urbanism the authors write that "if *detournement* were extended to urbanistic realizations, not many people would remain unaffected by an exact reconstruction in one city of an entire neighbourhood of another. Life can never be too disorientating: *detournements* on this level would really make it beautiful."[44]

The act of *detournement* in the end is one of suspending the predictable and diverting the expected, and it is through this operation that we can begin to critique the space of capitalism in situ. In following this line of argument pertaining to *detournement*, Iain Borden writes: "either implicit or explicit here are challenges to existing logics. Whenever a map is cut up or a building stood on its end then logics of cartography, symbolism, function, rationality, structure or whatever, are similarly disrupted and challenged. The question of 'is this a building?' becomes 'is this architecture?', 'what do you mean?' becomes 'what is knowledge?', 'how does this work?' becomes 'what is the point of functionality?'". Such actions are particularly necessary given the ever-increasing tendency of capitalism to naturalise its operations; that is, to present them as if they were in some way inevitable, homogenous and always acceptable. These questions [and actions] allow us to undermine not just the products of capitalism but its very operational logics and assumptions"[45] – that is not only the representational production of architecture, but as Iain Borden writes, 'its very logics and assumptions'.

---

[43] ibid., p13
[44] ibid., p13
[45] Iain Borden, "New Babylonians: from the avant-garde to the everyday", in *The Journal of Architecture*, Volume 6, Summer 2001, p131

The questions and actions of *detournement* allow us to critique and disrupt the representational space of capitalism and the politics of the State. The outcome of harnessing *detournements* in architecture is one of setting up new and unexpected patterns of perception and consequential behaviour in relation to elements of space; it is a new way of taking possession of space and representing it back to the viewer or user, or in Debord and Wolman's words, "the cheapness of its product is the heavy artillery that breaks through the Chinese walls of understanding", unleashing a new opportunity for subjectivisation.

Detournement above all is about negation: "detournement is thus first of all a negation of the value of the previous organisation of expression."[46] The practice of *detournement*, be it in architecture or any other art, is therefore as such a critical stance, and it is in the value of this critical stance that it can affect the decomposition, critique and disruption of the representation of the politics of the State and capitalism, and the decomposition, critique and displacement of striated representation leading to molecular revolution. In approaching the redevelopment of Ground Zero through a tactic of *detournement*, a space may have been able to be opened-up and created that might have broken-down and disrupted the libidinal architecture of what both stood there prior to the event of 9/11 and was desired to be resurrected through the LMDC final 7 redevelopment schemes, and might have created in turn a taking possession of place that contests, disrupts and deconstructs the libidinal structure of the Twin Towers and in consequence, deterritorialises the redevelopment of Ground Zero toward a resolution of the libidinal cause of the attacks and architecture's role in it as discussed in Chapter 2. The pursuit of the subjective qualities created by the conception and practice of *detournement* in the built environment of Ground Zero is the second task that any *durcharbeitung* might set-out to accomplish.

---

[46] "Detournement as Negation and Prelude" in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p55.

In addition to the two concepts of *dérive* and *detournement* as surveyed above, the Situationists hoped to re-imagine the built fabric of cities as a liquid: "if architecture and urban design embodied all the stifling forces of the modern city, if their stasis functioned as the crystalline image of an immobile society, then the SI would propose a practice based on a vocabulary of liquidity. An image of life, of movement and flux – of presence, in a word – water and its associated metaphors provided the foundation for an anti-architectural practice whose mobility was the very converse of the frozen world of late-capitalist culture".[47]

The image of water and that of liquidity is pertinent to seize on. As discussed in the outline of Deleuze and Guattari's theorisation of smooth and striated space, they name the sea as being the smooth space par excellence in opposition with that of the city: "In contrast to the sea, the city is the striated space par excellence; the sea is smooth space fundamentally open to striation...",[48] that is the liquid-nature of architecture and urbanism that the Situationist's hoped to enable was, in nature, a desire to recapture the smooth space of the sea in opposition, contradiction and critique of the striated space of the city. And again: "for Debord, as for the surrealists of the 1920s, the modern city could be reimagined as an oneiric realm open to exploration and discovery, an ocean with its own depths and expanse."[49] This again reinforces the sea/ocean as a metaphor used by Deleuze and Guattari for the exemplification of smooth space.

This ocean however only remains smooth if the occupants of it remain nomadic. Once sedentary patterns of behaviour develop and occupation of it is taken over by counting, the smooth space of the ocean-like urban environment envisioned by the Situationists, will be captured by striated space and traversed and translated back into it. What this suggests, that as soon as a taking possession of space occurs, that is a taking place, any

[47] Thomas McDonough, "Fluid Spaces: Constant and the Situationist Critique of Architecture", in Catherine de Zegher and Mark Wigley (eds.), *The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001, p95
[48] Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p481
[49] Thomas McDonough, "Fluid Spaces: Constant and the Situationist Critique of Architecture", in Catherine de Zegher and Mark Wigley (eds.), *The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001, p95

smooth characteristic that might be locatable in that space translates back toward and is captured by that of the striated. Completely smooth space therefore, as envisioned by Debord for the ideal Situationist urban environment, can never be accomplished, only if the inhabitants of that space remain nomadic and never take possession of the space. This naturally excludes any architectural production from taking place on a site, for it is through architecture and the construction involved with architecture that taking possession of space and taking place is actualised. Any actualised architectural production as a course of taking place therefore, always recaptures space for the affect of the striated. The question is not whether not to build or not, not to conquer and take possession or not, but rather in taking possession of space, how might architecture proceed to minimise striated figuration and maximise the figuration of the smooth.

As has been discussed above, one approach to this might be the actualisation of aspects of the concepts *dérive* and *detournement* in the subjective construal of architectural production. In the end, the degree that striation captures smooth space, or in turn is deterritorialised by it is a question of the subjective construal brought to architecture by the architect, and the desire that she wants to activate in the user of her space: it is a question of libidinal economy and its application, of architecture taking place from the inside, and moving from the inside-out as opposed to a movement from outside-in. This of course is only the case, if our collective subjectivity (that of the socius) and libidinal economy (or in at least a minimum of that of the architect's) in approaching the redevelopment of Ground Zero has been sufficiently apprehended by the event of 9/11 – that is if the socius and the architect creating and producing (*gen*) for Ground Zero has appropriately deconstructed the event of 9/11, which is to say that any redevelopment begins from an alternative and rethought genesis to that in which it actually proceeded from; this can only take place if a proper understanding of 9/11 in all its libidinal structure and architecture of coming forth, including the role that the Twin Towers played in its libidinal structure and cause of architecture being enveloped in it, is fully comprehended.

The argument of smooth space capturing striated space, and striated space deterritorialising toward smooth space, and their respective possibilities of being brought forth or alternatively arrested, brings into question the requirement of a space at Ground Zero that will serve as a space taken possession of for the purposes of work and labour – this is beyond the problematic of the architecture itself proposed to be constructed there, which function of work in itself becomes a vehicle of striation before we even begin to consider a resolution for it. What this is to say is, that with the performing and housing of labour being the main characteristic and reason for the redevelopment of Ground Zero, an immediate striation is reimbued upon the space, however smooth it may originally be hoped to be constructed as. As Deleuze points out in a passage from *A Thousand Plateaus* "smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; [and] striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space".[50] The question with the problematics of taking possession of space through the means of architecture at Ground Zero, and its additional problematic of its function for the purpose of work, is a question of *how* that architecture might be able to be inscribed in its figural dimensions, in a way as to favour the deterritorialisation of the inherent striated nature of any architectural production on such a site (or any other for that matter) toward the space of the smooth: it is a question of valorising affect and haecceities for the purpose of disrupting the figural space of capitalism and networked trade. This peculiar nature of architecture being part of the cause of striation and its affects, and at the same time an argument for a possible disruption of it, is what Andrew Benjamin refers to as the logic of the *apart / a part*, that is architecture takes on the position of being *a part of* the striated and at the same time possessing qualities that might lead it *apart from* it.[51]

Faced with such a dilemma, what architecture can do following Situationist thought is "… counter the bounded, privatised building or urban square of mono-functional intentions with variable spaces and atmosphere, spaces with no particular boundaries (whether physical or mental), with spaces of change and indeterminacy. Above all, these are spaces of the unexpected, unexpected forms, unexpected events, unexpected

[50] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p474.
[51] For the logic of *apart / a part*, see Andrew Benjamin, *Architectural Philosophy*, The Athlone Press, London, 2000, p57-60.

96

collisions and sounds, unexpected anythings."[52] It is in the opening onto the unexpected, onto *detourned* space that the Situationist legacy affects a critique of capitalism and a critique of the striated, and that a reworking of it can proceed. The striated will never be able to be evacuated – this is not even the aim – merely deterritorialised, or deconstructed and disrupted toward the smooth in various and numerous aspects. Even in the urban environment, however small an ensemble of coagulation – such as that of Ground Zero – the legacy of Situationist thought would be to create spaces that are "unconfined by the rationalism [striation] and function of the urban, and which are instead formed along lines of emotion, irrationality, and accident",[53] that is, just as Iain Borden writes and attributes to Steve Pile,[54] the creation of urban space (and internal office space) that is beholden to Affect.

Another architectural figuration that might be taken from the Situationist's oeuvre is Constant's pre-occupation with movement as a way to break down the striated affects of capitalist urban space. McDonough writes in his article "Fluid Spaces: Constant and the Situationist Critique of Architecture", that "Constant proceeded to contrast [the] sedentary image of urban life with what he saw as its antithesis: the promise of a new, nomadic lifestyle embodied in buildings having to do 'with departures and arrivals', buildings such as train stations, harbours, and, above all else, airports. Such structures in their emphasis on movement, stood at odds with immobility inscribed in the city's fabric, and signified a 'break in the pattern of everyday life'."[55] The figural and functional capturing of movement as 'the site of a resistance to political representation' therefore has the potential to disrupt, dislodge and critique the capitalist striated representation of space, creating an antithesis to the striated, or what could be termed as an opening for the anti-architectural and the beginnings of a reworking or working through of it. Such gestures in the thinking through of architectural production calls for a reinvention and

---

[52] Iain Borden, "New Babylonians: from the avant-garde to the everyday", in *The Journal of Architecture*, Volume 6, Summer 2001, p131

[53] ibid., p131
[54] ibid., p132
[55] Thomas McDonough, "Fluid Spaces: Constant and the Situationist Critique of Architecture", in Catherine de Zegher and Mark Wigley (eds.), *The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001, p96

complete rethinking of the nature and characteristics of office space and the work environment, a genesis to the thinking of the space of work that might completely change the nature of what could be perceived and architecturally produced for the site of Ground Zero as a redevelopment of the striated function of recouping lost office-space.

In the genesis of rethinking architectural production for the site of Ground Zero, and following the analysis of what might be able to be learned from the Situationist legacy in critiquing the spatiality and representation of the capitalist State in architecture, form must do away with function; the function that follows from the tasks of the office worker, and the form that it begets will only suffice to reproduce striated representation in architecture, the very critique hurled at the LMDC final 7 schemes in this thesis. Instead, in order to actualize a critique of the genesis of the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers and the libidinal envelopment of them in the event of 9/11, form must liberate itself from function, indeed must recreate function entirely anew, in order to escape the "iconomy" of the politics and representation of the State, and in doing so escape the possibility of the event re-occurring and enveloping architecture in its libidinal moebius band.

The suspension of form following function through the figural representation of movement, attunes with what Constant termed as the central feature of his New Babylon project, that is mobility: "the liberatory quality of these structures was, then, to be registered in their refusal of static architectural form; instead New Babylon would be "in constant modulation and in accord with the continually changing aspects of our existence such as we will produce it."[56] The figural representation and functional actualization of mobility is what is proposed by Constant as the aspect around which the sedentary nature of striated space and representation might be broken down, of "allowing the fourth-dimension of time to dissolve built form"[57] in order for "the creative imagination [to be] given full play".[58] Such focus on modulation for the purposes of mobility breaking-down

---

[56] ibid., p97
[57] ibid., p98
[58] Werner Blaser's description of Mies's 'Project for a Concert Hall' (1942), which McDonough quotes in comparing the Constant's drawings for New Babylon with the drawings of the former. See Thomas McDonough, ""Fluid Spaces: Constant and the Situationist Critique of Architecture", in Catherine de

the sedentary functional aspects of an environment such as office-space, and in turn

creating the possibility for a different and heterogeneous ensemble of space to emerge, is

one that echoes and continually re-presents the 'changing aspects of our existence as we

will produce it' in the context of a revolutionary relationship to work and occupying

space for the purpose and function of work. Indeed, what this modulation and mobility

begets, is what Constant describes as: "nobody can return to what was there before,

rediscover the place as he left it, the image he had retained in his memory".[59] Such an

approach is suggestive of, and echoes aspects of the *dérive*. What is at stake in this line of

argument, is that architecture be harnessed for the breaking down of the function of the

striated, and in turn that the resultant changed nature of work register itself on the

environment and its architecture through the possibility for modulated form. Such

modulation begetting mobility '... transforms into 'architecture' what is, after all, meant

to be anti-architectural in its flexibility: architecture should in fact have nothing to say

about the various activities taking place in this autodesigned city".[60]

In Constant's *Labyratorium* (1962) drawing for New Babylon, a cue and glimpse can be

seen of what smooth space, or perhaps more precisely certain characteristics of Deleuzian

smooth space might be proposed to look like in the context of sedentary architecture:

"here any attempt at rendering a perspectival, isotropic space – in other words, what since

the Renaissance has been considered 'buildable' space – is abandoned. Instead, forms lie

on the white surface of the paper, a workspace that suggests a mutable, alterable interval

of kinesthetic, or perhaps I should say psychogeographic, experience: visual space is

transformed through 'sliding mirrors' and a 'screen of radiance', temperature through

'transmission of air currents', sound through 'atmospheric obstacles'."[61] In short, a space

that is more haptic in its qualities than it is functional, a space that gives way to

---

Zegher and Mark Wigley (eds.), *The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001, p99

[59] Constant quoted by McDonough in Thomas McDonough, ""Fluid Spaces: Constant and the Situationist Critique of Architecture", in Catherine de Zegher and Mark Wigley (eds.), *The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001, p100

[60] ibid., p97

[61] ibid., p98

haecceities as opposed to striation, a space that opens onto smooth characteristics that is, as McDonough writes, a fusion of surrealist characteristics with the mechanical.[62]

In having taken a cue from Constant's New Babylon project in relation to modulation-mobility and the affects that it might imbue architectural space with, a voice of critique of his approach is also necessary to be given: "[Constant's] plans were based on a fundamental misrecognition at the heart of the Situationist aesthetic project: mobility is not simply a revolutionary force, disrupting bourgeois stability. In fact, just the opposite is true, for capitalism is nothing if not dynamic, dependent on mobility, on the elimination of distance, on breaking down all the Chinese walls standing in the way of the commodity. Solidity and stasis could never define a society in which, as Marx and Engels so aptly wrote over one hundred and fifty years ago, 'all that is solid melts into air'."[63] This critique might be evident to us today in the context of late-capitalism, but it is questionable how evident it might have been to someone working in the contexts and critique of a nineteenth century urban environment that is Paris.

In learning from the concepts *dérive, detournement*, liquidity, mobility and modulation that the Situationist's critique of architecture and the urban environment laid out, the legacy of Situationist thought and tactics could be said to "…shadow-box capitalism's global-yet-local multi-dimensionality, by becoming similarly ever-possibly-present in cities around the world, ever capable of not just reclaiming the streets, protesting the roads and blocking the summit but also, inserting themselves into everyday practices and operations. It is this potential which allows us to counter the controlling and dominating aspects of capitalism, providing a dispersed yet powerful presence in the everyday city."[64] The key idea to Situationist thought and tactics is precisely the disruption of the everyday, in particular of the space and time of work, of the subjectivity and subjective construal created by the striated in creating a space for work and which work in turn imparts to it. For the purposes of learning from them for the redevelopment of Ground

---

[62] see ibid., p98
[63] ibid., p100
[64] Iain Borden, "New Babylonians: from the avant-garde to the everyday", in *The Journal of Architecture*, Volume 6, Summer 2001, p132

Zero, in particular the breaking-down of the networked architectural space of global capitalism present in the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers and the schemes that proposed to replace it, it is the valorisation of Situationist aspects of the critique of architecture and the urban environment that is called for: a subjective construal of architectural production that emanates from a different libidinal genesis (desire) to that from where the LMDC final 7 schemes were produced from. It is in recognising and articulating this stance that a *durcharbeitung*, reworking and working through of architecture for the site of Ground Zero can proceed.

Such tactics and approach to architecture could be never more important, especially given the financial imperatives of replacing lost office-space on the site of Ground Zero. Instead of recreating the "iconomy" of the Twin Towers and by doing so risking the catastrophic event to go on, do so in its stead by valorising a revolutionary libidinal structure for architecture and space – and the possibility for molecular revolution through it – that might in turn just resolve and readdress the libidinal event of 9/11 and its consequences on architecture that became so apparent in the destruction of the Twin Towers – that is assume a deconstructive response to it.

Puissance > < Pouvoir

What then about the libidinal force that surfaced on the body of the socius and led to the event of 9/11 and the destruction of the Twin Towers, and in particular, what then about the libidinal outcome of that force in the American socius, its reverberation, that saw schemes for redevelopment proceed in an attempt to resurrect the "iconomy" of that which was destroyed, and thus begetting the tragic event to go on?[65]

The only address one can make to this question, which is a question of the subjective construal of any rebuilding effort, is one that learns from the libidinal cause of the event of 9/11 and the destruction of the Twin Towers, and alternatively learns from the libidinal

---

[65] "And so each defiant act of "rebuilding" the bubble is also a violent restoration of the forced subjective unity that networks on all sides will continue to tear apart. To the degree that such rebuilding continues, the catastrophic event goes on.", see Reinhold Martin, "One or More", Grey Room 07, Spring 2002, p 122.

reverberations that surfaced in response to it in the American socius, that is one that seeks to disrupt striated figuration from any architecture that might proceed on the site of Ground Zero; such a learning and comprehension is the genesis by which any *durcharbeitung* might proceed on that site. Such disruption is sought as a displacement of power and its affect in the representation of the politics of the State and capitalism, and is meant as a readdress to the libidinal cause and architecture of the event of 9/11 in the face of the destruction of the Twin Towers. It is in this desire that a disruption and dislodgement of power with force might be actualised - that is to say a disruption of *puovoir* (power) in favour of *puissance* (force). The desire for *puissance* (force) over *pouvoir* (power) is as a means to create affects and figuration of heterogeneity and otherness by way of, in and through architecture, as opposed to striated affects. The only address to architecture in the face of the event of 9/11 is to seek and desire an otherness from power through architecture, and an otherness for the subject inhabiting that architecture, an otherness that seeks to disrupt the affects of this power on the person's subjectivity in inhabiting and using that space in particular. This otherness and heterogeneity must be sought from the very genesis of redevelopment, its subjective construal of generation, production and creation; such a struggle, is what Foucault has termed as a "struggle for a new subjectivity".[66] It is through struggling for a new subjectivity in architecture, specifically for any architecture that might be created on the site of Ground Zero, that a *durcharbeitung* of architecture might be realised, and it is in the accomplishment of this struggle and the thought that goes into constructing it, that architecture can answer its call to be raised as a possibility for thought.

In addressing the phenomena and representation of power (*pouvoir*) in architecture, it is the space and function of the sign that is being apprehended, for as Lyotard writes in *Libidinal Economy*, "there is no sign or thought of the sign which is not about power and for power."[67] One can therefore not talk about power and the thought of power in architecture without talking about the space, function, figuration and representation of the sign. It is only in disrupting the space and function of the sign, that a heterogeneity can

---

[66] Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power", in *Art after Modernism: rethinking representation*, The New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York, 1984, p421
[67] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, Continuum, London, 1993, p44

come about in architecture. This is a question of "iconomy", of just what sort of "iconomy" is intended to be represented in that which is redeveloped. The antagonism of signs and their relation to architecture is the precise problematic that is found in both the destruction of the Twin Towers and the problems with the proposals for redevelopment. This antagonism is one that is caught up with the State's reproduction of itself and its libidinal economy in and through architecture, and specifically in the official proposals of the LMDC final 7 schemes. The challenge therefore to this libidinal eruption is a challenge that must be had with power, and as such with the sign. It is only in challenging and then disrupting the relationship between the sign and power that architecture will be able to begin to enter into any meaningful redevelopment of Ground Zero following the event of 9/11. Furthermore, if power (*pouvoir*) and force (*puissance*) are oppositional concepts to one another, as indeed Lyotard uses them in *Libidinal Economy*, then the affects and figural representation of force are the oppositional representation to the figural act of the sign.

Following this quote concerning the sign and power, Lyotard goes on to discuss and critique the nature of the sign and semiotics, finishing by saying "don't even hope to catch the libidinal in these nets",[68] that is to say, that the representation of libidinal desire that might be befitting to any architectural production at Ground Zero, an architectural production that disrupts the representation of the politics of the State as capitalism, cannot be brought forth by an "iconomy" that depends on a construal of the sign. The only way a libidinal construal of any efficacy can be brought about at Ground Zero, and by doing so avert the event of 9/11 from repeating itself, is by architecture producing a creation and production that is devoid of the sign, that is to say devoid of a representation of power, in stead valorising the figuration of libidinal intensities of a nature that are in opposition to those of the figural representation of striated power. In its stead, it is an architectural production of force that is required, akin to some of the strategies developed by the Situationists, or developed at least in the same spirit of critique of representation as what they forwarded. One cannot catch an efficacious libidinal outcome for Ground Zero

---

[68] ibid., p48

in the nets of power, nor, it must be said, can one awaken a required readdress of the libidinal through power and its representations of striation to which the sign lends itself.

"Thus the sign is enmeshed in nihilism, nihilism proceeds by signs; to continue to remain in semiotic thought is to languish in religious melancholy and to subordinate every intense emotion to a lack and every force to finitude."[69] This passage from Lyotard, read together with the previous passages quoted above, suggests that the figural representations of power, which the sign by nature always refers to and creates, is always enmeshed in nihilism, that it subordinates every intense emotion to lack, and every force to finitude, that it counters and extinguishes the production of force, that is creates the opposite affects to that of the representations of force. Conversely this is to say, that the only way intense emotion, desire and force are able to be presented in and through the figural is through a representation that dissimulates and disrupts power and the striated.

What is required in light of the State's co-option of architecture into its libidinal band following the event of 9/11 and present in the proposals for redevelopment, is not a search for and erection of striated signs in the vein of networked spaces of trade, but rather a challenge to the logic of production of signs in architecture all together, or a way in which they might be rearticulated. The only way that the "iconomy" of anything that is built on Ground Zero can escape, or at least disrupt the space and representation of the politics and space of the State as capitalism and its libidinal structure, the only strategy which holds-out libidinal efficacy for redevelopment, is the entering into an architectural production of dissimulation. Lyotard defines dissimulation as "difference within identity, the chance event within the foresight of composition, passion within reason – between each, so absolutely foreign to each other, the strictest unity...",[70] that is a disruption of striated characteristics of architecture toward the smooth – dissimulation happens in the act, realisation and representation of the process of this disruption.

---

[69] ibid., p48
[70] Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, Continuum, London, 1993, p51

Lyotard talks about dance to illustrate dissimulation, saying that such a dance would then be "... not composed and notated, but on the contrary, one in which the body's gesture would be, with the music, its timbre, its pitch, intensity and duration, and with the words (dancers are also singers), at each point in a unique relation, becoming at every moment an emotional event..."[71] A dance therefore that disrupts striated representation and the semiotic hierarchy between music and body, and conversely fuses the two into a new ensemble, one that sets each other in motion, one in which the distinction of power of one upon the other is suspended: pure force. The analogy of such dance in relation to an architectural dissimulation, would mean as Deleuze has written about characteristics of smooth space, "continuous variation, continuous development of form;...[and] the pure act of the drawing of a diagonal across the vertical and horizontal."[72] – that is characteristics that are not dissimilar to some of the figural representation harnessed in some instances by the contemporary digital architecture avant-garde, and noted about Kas Oosterhuis and Ilona Lénárd's (Oosterhuis.nl) proposal for redevelopment in Chapter Three. Any body of architecture intended for Ground Zero must harness and enter the realm and figural representation of such pure force.[73]

If architecture at Ground Zero could begin on this route toward a production through a different genesis to that which was entered upon, then the power of the sign might have the potential to be disrupted, and an architecture of dissimulation be forwarded. The resultant "iconomy" of any such creation would dissipate into and be, as Lyotard writes of the libidinal, "productive of movement",[74] beget subjective construal, a "construction of other things, texts, images, sounds, politics, caresses..."[75] etc, creating a "different reaction, a different reception",[76] in other words a heterogeneity and otherness, an opening onto smooth characteristics of occupation, an architecture which is liberated

---

[71] ibid., p50
[72] ibid., p478
[73] here it is noteworthy to mention Peter Eisenman's *New York* magazine scheme for Ground Zero in which force-lines are used for the generation of the low-rise elements of the scheme interconnecting his replacement towers. See *Imagining Ground Zero*, Suzanne Stephens (ed.), Thames & Hudson, London, 2004, p105.
[74] ibid., p49
[75] ibid., p49
[76] ibid., p49

from power and the affects of power and striation, in order to arrive at a truly deconstructed response to the event of 9/11, a deconstructive response entered into and addressed in, by and through architecture.

The aim of having theorised and begun to think through the potential of first "raising architecture the possibility of thought", followed by addressing the role of architecture in relation to the workings of the libidinal economy, working through a trace of redevelopment as put-forth by the LMDC final 7, and then examining the legacy of the Situationist International and learning from it for commenting on the redevelopment of Ground Zero, is to lay-out a horizon of subjectivity through which a taking place and taking possession of space can proceed, that is to construct an understanding of a framework of subjectivity through which architecture might be able to proceed for the site of Ground Zero, and in turn raise it as a possible desire from which to operate and create action. When using the term 'desire' and the concurrent term 'libidinal economy' throughout this thesis, it's semantics are denoted by the splayed-out sexual body and its ephemeral skin with which Lyotard commences *Libidinal Economy*[77] - a very-much real and living experiential effect and all consuming feeling, one that is exactly the same as that which we have all experienced in our lust toward another person's body and sex. Desire is real, it is penetrating, wanting to be penetrated, and all consuming, it controls ones thoughts and emotions begetting a need for gratification and resolution; it is in this same sense that the term 'desire' needs to be understood as used and denoted by the term 'libidinal economy' in this thesis: it is a real experiential state of body and mind creating flow and dissimulated movement.

All this having been said, the words of Deleuze and Guattari echo through our thought: "never believe that a smooth space will suffice to save us".[78] Smooth space in itself, as iterated above, can never exist outside of a certain move toward and envelopment by striation, just as when architecture is proposed for redevelopment, an immediate striation is entered upon in taking possession of place. However it must also be prudent to be

---

[77] Jean Francois Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, The Athlone Press, London, 2004, pp.1-40.
[78] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, The Athlone Press, London, 1996, p500

reminded of Chtcheglov's words, that: "Architecture is the simplest means of articulating time and space, of modulating reality, of engendering dreams. It is a matter not only of plastic articulation and modulation expressing an ephemeral beauty, but of a modulation producing influences in accordance with the eternal spectrum of human desires and the progress of realizing them."[79]

---

[79] Ivan Chtcheglov, "Formulary for a New Urbanism", in Ken Knabb (edited and translated) *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley CA, 1989, p2

Postscript

Just as Peter Eisenman has articulated in relation to his own PhD thesis, "a mere restatement of the argument put forward in the preceding chapters would be little more than a gesture of literary formality, which traditionally dictates a section entitled 'Conclusions'. Nevertheless, it might be useful to examine briefly the validity of conclusions to any theory of architecture, and in doing so to raise the whole question of the purpose and nature of theoretical arguments."[1] Eisenman then goes on to discuss the nature of "open-ended" and "closed-ended" theory which I quoted from and discussed in the Prologue to this thesis as a model for this writing, to which we could add, following Eisenman, that a conclusion to "open-ended" theorisation is not possible without some sort of artificial closure: the whole rationale of "open-ended" theorisation being one of "allow[ing] for expansion and continuous application".[2]

What then might suffice as a concluding word, or more appropriately a postscript to such open-ended theorisation as this thesis has attempted? First of all, it must be pointed out, as the case was made in the Prologue, that this thesis has been conceived in the vein of a critically articulate theorisation on society and architecture relating to, and emanating from that society. My attempt was to steal from disciplines other than architecture, namely philosophy and critical theory, and weave what was found into a certain understanding and extrapolation of the subject topic. As such, the project for this thesis resides firmly within the camp of "critical architecture theory", one that unashamedly seeks-out the establishment of theoretical paradigms on its topic, and then applies those theoretical paradigms to critique the status-quo of architectural production and thought in relation to its subject topic, namely in this thesis the redevelopment concerns surrounding Ground Zero.

Reinhold Martin points out in his "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism" essay published in *Harvard Design Magazine* in 2005 that it is precisely around the question of

---

[1] Peter Eisenman, The Formal Basis of Modern Architecture, Lars Müller Publishers, 2006, p.337.
[2] Ibid., p.343

redevelopment of Ground Zero that the contemporary debates surrounding criticality in architecture have surfaced most acutely in the near past. Martin says in this regard that "Perhaps the most obvious demonstration of contemporary, theoretically informed architecture's all-too-relevant political efficacy has been in the ongoing debate over the future of the former World Trade Centre site in lower Manhattan."[3] Although on setting-out to write this thesis I hadn't conceptualised a conscious attempt at aiming to contribute to this debate, as it has come to pass, it is this which might become the outcome of the present writing.

My initial aim in choosing the subject topic of 9/11 and redevelopment of Ground Zero was to attempt to critically think through architecture-production from its most basic of elements and questions, all the way through to beginning to frame a formal outcome for it based on that analyses, or at least hint at a formal outcome. My aim was to think through thinking in relation to architecture, which cannot be done without a certain speculative departure into philosophy and back from it to concerns architectural. The spirit in which this thesis has been conceived, is one of challenging and apprehending the subjective construal of architectural thinking and thinking pertaining to architectural production, namely the architects' and the socius' subjectivity, with the aim of entertaining the possibility to think something differently, and then act from that thinking. It was for this reason why the thesis commences with a chapter that almost entirely muses only on philosophical issues relating to society and subjectivity, and only at the end of it begins to touch on the relation of that thinking to questions concerning architecture. My primary aim was to address the question of subjectivity in architecture, of how one might begin to think through various problems in an approach to architectural action and praxis; and since architectural action and praxis, just as all praxis following Marx, is rooted within thinking through society, it was necessary to address first and foremost a conception and theoretical understanding of praxis in relation to society in order to be able to make my argument.

---

[3] Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism", *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring-Summer 2005, p107.

The project of this thesis, which is arguably couched very much within a post-structuralist application of thought, was to allow texts to reverberate through my thinking in relation to the subject-topic at hand. Such an approach might seem unorthodox in the world of philosophy, but then again it is not a higher degree in philosophy which I have attempted, but rather an attempt to build a theoretical extrapolation concerning architecture and an architectural event. In as far as 9/11 and the redevelopment of Ground Zero figures in this equation, it merely serves as a vehicle for this thinking, as a site and context to which I could apply my thinking.

Above all else, it is the critical project in architecture theory stemming from the lineage of Tafuri, Eisenman and Hays that I have attempted to mould my work and thinking by. Although assaults have been made in recent years on the efficacy of the "critical" in architecture discourse, it is the "critical", perhaps with a tinge of "utopia" as Reinhold Martin might argue,[4] that enables a deliverance from the all too present capitalist neo-realism that has misguidedly crept into architecture discourse in recent years. To reiterate something from my Prologue and to quote Jane Rendell again: "In a world that currently remains in the grips of an unjust corporate and imperialistic capitalism, critical architecture is urgently required."[5] It was to this address, unknowingly at the time, that my attempt to formulate an argument around a critical discourse was aimed.

It is precisely in relation to the discourse surrounding the redevelopment of Ground Zero that Reinhold Martin addresses the critical as a panacea for architectural thought, couching it in a rubric of "utopia": "So what is to be done? To begin with, rather than lapse into the post-utopian pragmatism of that grandfather of the 'post-critical', Colin Rowe, the question of utopia mist be put back on the architectural table. But it must not be misread as a call for a perfect world, a world apart, an impossible totality that inevitably fades into totalitarianism. Instead, utopia must be read literally, as the 'non-place' written into its etymological origins that is 'no-where' not because it is ideal and

---

[4] See Reinhold "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism", *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring-Summer 2005.
[5] Introduction, *Critical Architecture*, Jane Rendell et. al (ed.), Routledge, Abingdon, 2007, p7

inaccessible, but because, in perfect mirrored symmetry, it is also 'everywhere'."[6]
Although some of the findings which I make in the final chapter of this thesis might be
challenged as residing within a utopian framework of thought, it is first and foremost
offered not because it might be utopian, but because it is above all else critical. To
reiterate Rendell's sentiments above, in a world of architecture governed by capitalist
neo-realism, it is the critical, however utopian, that is urgently required.

"Utopia, then, is what Derrida called the 'spectre', a ghost that infuses everyday reality
with other possible worlds...",[7] it is these other possible worlds that have the ability to
begin to break down the imperialism of capitalist neo-realism in architecture. Just as
Daniel A Barber writes in his essay "Militant architecture", it is critical architecture that
proposes the possibility of an "... architecture of autonomous formalism [that might]
disrupt social norms by producing defamiliarising spatial conditions, thereby creating a
space for reflection upon consciousness."[8] Such a project is nothing but utopian in nature,
albeit critical in substance. It was to this call that the oeuvre of the Situationist's work is
addressed at in this thesis. Borrowing from their legacy enables one to think through the
possibility of architecture afresh, in a manner that attempts to escape the barbarism of
neo-realist capitalism in architecture thinking, toward the possibility of "creating a space
for reflection upon consciousness"; above all, and if nothing else, the legacy of the
Situationists' is one of imbuing the experience and use of the city and art with new
subjectivity, what we could call a "reflection upon consciousness".

If the outcome of the event of 9/11 called for anything from architects, then arguably it
was to set in motion the possibility of a reflection on architectural consciousness and way
to praxis, that is to think through the subjectivity by which architecture is approached and
imbued with, for the purposes of creating another world. The world that previously stood

---

[6] Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism", *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring-Summer 2005, p109.

[7] Ibid., p109
[8] Daniel A Barber, "Militant architecture", in Jane Rendell et. al. (ed.), *Critical Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon, 2007, p58

111

in the place of Ground Zero clearly showed forth its shortcomings through the attack on it on 11 September 2001; as architects and architectural theorists it is our responsibility to learn from this event and conjure up new ways or other ways of filling the void, ways that aim to liberate human consciousness from the all pervasive neo-liberal dictums of capitalism, toward other, more critical forms of habitation, even utopian if need be.

On the subject of "utopian realism", as opposed to what I label "capitalist neo-realism", Reinhold Martin writes that "Meanwhile utopian realism must be thought of as a movement that may or may not exist, all of whose practitioners are double agents. Naming them or their work would blow their cover. (They may or may not be all architects.) Those who could voted for Kerry. (So you too could be a utopian realist.) Utopian realism is critical. It is real. It is enchantingly secular. It thinks differently. It is a style with no form. It moves sideways instead of up and down the family tree."[9] The approach that Martin eludes to is of the lineage of the critical project in architecture, one that begins to truly think through the issues within architecture thinking and discourse that we have inherited from the 1960s, 70s and 80s, and attempts to move "sideways" with them, remaining within a critical framework to the subject topic, but trying at the same time to renew an image of thought in relation to architecture praxis. Such a renewal of architecture-thought is always one concerned with a way to thinking the architectural that is in a comprehension and then subsequent destabilisation of set-modes of subjectivity in relation to architecture-praxis. The aim of such project is to take the tools of critical theory and reformulate the possibility of architectural thinking in the present through them, to present problems and issues as opposed to subverting its heritage for the purposes of a historically misguided project in architecture that "capitalist neo-realism" might wish to deliver. It is an attempt to use the heritage of critical architecture theory in order to think differently on a problem in the present, to attempt to open-up new horizons by which architecture-praxis and architecture-thinking might be thought and conceived, to theorise and think through the problems in a way that recognises reality and embraces that reality for the purposes of proposing solutions, even utopian if need be.

---

[9] Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism", *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring-Summer 2005, p109.

To quote Daniel A Barber from his "Militant architecture" essay again, the critical architecture project's legacy is just such: "...to find available openings to destabilise current regimes of production – continuously. The vigilance of this position requires a militant approach, finding opportunities everywhere for realising social desire in the production of the built environment."[10] It is to this "social desire" to which the call of criticality must be directed at in the context of the event of 9/11 and its subsequent attempts at architectural redevelopment. It was social desire that I argue in this thesis which led to the attack on the WTC Twin Towers in the first place. Any architectural response therefore to redevelopment of the site must first acknowledge and think through an address to social desire in the built environment; and this for the purposes of attempting to truly learn from the event and then address the site in question from what has been learnt. As I argue in this thesis, this is a process which lies at the heart of deconstruction in architecture, not necessarily of formal properties of built work, but in the way to subjectivity of what is conceived as replacement for the site. I argue in this thesis, that as architects, this is all one has to work with: the formulation of subjectivity by which the architect approaches architectural-production. Such position is a call to a politics of subjectivity, to thinking through our own thinking in relation to praxis; without this there is no renewal and no difference.

In a world where homogenisation is ever-more overwhelming, the architect's skill is in her ability to question this homogenisation and the instincts that lead toward it, and instead seek-out a route toward heterogeneity as the Situationsists have shown before us. Utopian as such a call may be, but "It is utopian not because it dreams impossible dreams, but because it recognises 'reality' itself as - precisely – an all-too-real dream enforced by those who prefer to accept a destructive and oppressive status quo."[11] Such an approach requires a Lyotardian *durcharbeitung* to come to fore, a reworking of everything that is conceived fundamentally to be architectural, including thinking. Within

---

[10] Daniel A Barber, "Militant Architecture", in Jane Rendell et. al. *Critical Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon, p.61.
[11] Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism", *Harvard Design Magazine*, Spring-Summer 2005, p109.

this sphere of "everything that is conceived fundamentally to be architectural", we find society, psychiatry, psychology, as well as philosophy and critical theory. To think through and rework a problem at hand is to precisely traverse through these disparate disciplines and steal from each in turn for the purposes of beginning to understand and comprehend the question at hand, the question which for us, is ultimately an architectural one. One can not arrive at a deconstruction of the architectural question without having first traversed through everything that is conceived as fundamentally contributing to architecture for the purposes of thinking things anew, for the purposes of a "struggle for a new subjectivity". Some might say that such a struggle is ultimately doomed to utopian thinking, but without such struggle it is impossible to conjure-up new worlds and new approaches to problems. A new subjectivity for architecture in short - to theorise and then critique the status-quo as a result of that theorisation for the purposes of being able to realise new thinking and new feeling on a subject-topic. In as much as I might have succeeded, and for the aim of bringing about new subjectivity in architecture for a specific site and in general elsewhere, it is this struggle which I have attempted in this thesis. Pointing this out and reaffirming it is the only possible conclusion one can offer.

Bibliography

Agger, Ben. "Critical Theory, Post-Structuralism, Post-Modernism: Their Sociological Relevance." Annual Review of Sociology. Annual Reviews Inc., 1991.

Amis, Martin. "The Age of Horrorism." The Observer 10 September 2006, sec. Review.

Barber, Daniel A. "Militant Architecture." Critical Architecture. Ed. Jane; Hill Rendell, Jonathan; Fraser, Murray; Dorrian, Mark. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.

Baudrillard, Jean. Symbolic Exchange and Death. London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2004.

Benjamin, Andrew. Architectural Philosophy. London: The Athlone Press, 2000.

Benjamin, Andrew, ed. The Lyotard Reader. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1989.

Bergson, Henri. Creative Evolution. London: Macmillan & Co Ltd, 1960.

Borden, Iain. "New Babylonians: From the Avant-Garde to the Everyday." The Journal of Architecture 6.Summer (2001): 131.

Deleuze, Gilles. Two Regimes of Madness. New York: Semiotext(e), 2006.

Deleuze/Guattari. Anti-Oedipus. London: The Athlone Press, 1984.

Deleuze/Guattari. A Thousand Plateaus. London: The Athlone Press, 1996.

Deleuze/Guattari. What Is Philosophy? London: Verso, 1994.

Deleuze/Parnet. Dialogues. London: The Athlone Press, 1987.

Derrida, Jacques. "Architetture Ove Il Desiderio Puo Abitare." Domus.671 (1986): 17.

Derrida, Jacques. "A Letter to Peter Eisenman." Assemblage.12 (1990): 7-13.

Derrida, Jacques. "Point De Folie - Maintenant L'architecture." Architecture Theory since 1968. Ed. K. Michael Hays. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2000.

Derrida, Jacques. The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Descombe, Vincent. Modern French Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

de Zegher, Catherine and Wigley, Mark, ed. The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001.

Eisenman, Peter. Diagram Diaries. London: Thames & Hudson, 2001.

Eisenman, Peter. The Formal Basis of Modern Architecture. Lars Muller Publishers, 2006.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power", in Art after Modernism: Rethinking Representation. New York: The New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1984.

Freud. Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality. London: Vintage, 2001.

Genosko, Gary, ed. The Guattari Reader. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1996.

Goodchild, Philip. Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire. London: SAGE Publications, 1996.

Guattari, Felix. Chaosmosis, an Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm. Sydney: Power Publications, 1995.

Guattari, Felix. Chaosophy, Semiotext(e). New York, 1995.

Guattari, Felix. Molecular Revolution - Psychiatry and Politics. London: Penguin, 1984.

Hays, K Michael. Architecture Theory since 1968. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.

Heidegger, Martin. On the Way to Language. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Hobhouse, L.T. The Metaphysical Theory of the State: A Criticism. London: Allen & Unwin, 1951.

Horkheimer, Max. Critical Theory, Selected Essays. Seabury Press, 1990.

Knabb, Ken, ed. Situationist International Anthology. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets, 1989.

Koolhaas, Rem. "Delirious No More." Wired 11.06.June (2003).

Lefebvre, Henri. The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001.

LMDC, Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. 2006. Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. Available: http://www.lowermanhattan.info/rebuild/timeline/rebuild_timeline_html_2002.asp#apr2006

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. Dérive À Partir De Marx et Freud. Vol. 10/18. Paris: Union Générale d'Editions.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. The Inhuman. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1991.
Lyotard, Jean-Francois. Libidinal Economy. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. "Rewriting Modernity." Sub-stance 16.54 (1987): 3-9.

Martin, Reinhold. "Architecture at War - a Report from Ground Zero." Angelaki 9.2 (2004): 217-25.

Martin, Reinhold. "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism." Harvard Design Magazine.Spring-Summer (2005).

Martin, Reinhold. "One or More." Grey Room 07.Spring 2002 (2002).

Muschamp, Herbert. "Visions of Ground Zero: An Appraisal; an Agency's Ideology Is Unsuited to Its Task." New York Times 17 July 2002.

New York Leage of Architects. After September 11: An Open Meeting. Available: www.archleague.org/nyc/nyc.html2005

Oxford Concise Dictionary of English Etymology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Readings, Bill. Introducing Lyotard - Art and Politics. London: Routledge, 1991.

Rendell, Jane; Hill, Jonathan; Fraser, Murray; Dorrian, Mark, ed. Critical Architecture. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.

Robbins, Anthony. The World Trade Center. Englewood, Florida: Pineapple Press, 1987.

Smith, Terry. "The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination: Uluru, the Sydney Opera House and the World Trade Center." Architectural Theory Review 7.2 (2002).

Solomon, David L. "Divided Responsibilities: Minoru Yamasaki, Architectural Authorship and the World Trade Center." Grey Room 07.Spring 2002 (2002).

Solomon, Deborah. "Art/Architecture; from the Rubble, Ideas for Rebirth." New York Times 30 September 2001.

Stephens, Suzanne. Imagining Ground Zero. London: Thames & Hudson, 2004.

Sussman, Elizabeth, ed. On the Passage of a Few People through a Rather Brief Moment in Time :The Situationist International 1957-1972. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

Tschumi, Bernard. "Architecture and Transgression." Oppositions Reader. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.

Tschumi, Bernard. Event Cities 3. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2004.

Turner, Rojek /, ed. The Politics of Jean-Francois Lyotard: Justice and Political Theory. London: Routledge, 1998.

Wigley, Mark. The Architecture of Deconstruction - Derrida's Haunt. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1995.

Williams, James. Lyotard: Towards a Postmodern Philosophy. Cambridge, Mass: Polity Press, 1998.

Williams, James. Lyotard and the Political. London: Routledge, 2000.

Wyatt, Edward. "Longing for a Sept. 10 Skyline; Some Vocal Groups Call for Restoring the Twin Towers." New York Times 2 November 2002.