A Diagrammatic Cartography of Discourses on Architectures of Life and/or Death

Gorny, R.A.

Important note
To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

A Cartography of Discourses on Architectures of Life and/or Death

Robert A. Gorny

This contribution started out as a literature survey on the wider topic of 'architectures of life and death', within the discursive space opened by Deleuze's and Guattari's and Foucault's thoroughgoing reframing of the agency of matter on processes constituting life. In this focus, this survey will directly skip spaces or buildings *for* life or death; as much as it departs from common notions of *living* in the sense of 'dwelling', in order to reach beyond the well-known explorations of 'everyday life' that following Lefebvre's or Du Certeau's view on spatial practices. In the aim of repositioning architecture instead as a *technics* uniquely engaged in the purposeful transformation of our material world, it rather draws together studies that have fostered a *genetic* understanding of spatial setups or architectural arrangements *as instruments of social production*, desiring-production, and subjectivation processes. Taken together, these constitute a *genealogy* of an incrementally-emerging notion of architecture as a posthuman/ecosystemic technics.

As complex assemblages cutting together/apart particular psycho-socio-environmental dynamisms, the ecologies or architecture not only have transformative effects on life; they effectively produce it. Having historically-conditioned our present forms of inhabiting the world, this twofold transformation-production is also a conditioning factor in the ongoing endangerment and extinction of many traditional, minor forms of living and non-living entities. In shaping life by means other than life, architecture engenders processes of easing and facilitating life, by managing dynamic processes that involve both living and non-living matters; organic and non-organic matter flows and systems. This conception was fostered by the progressive convergence of post-Foucauldian and post-Deleuzo-Guattarian conceptions of material arrangements. In architectural discourse these ideas have long remained quite disjointed in their respective topical/conceptual foci (dispositifs, heterotopias, spaces of enclosure, curing machines, biopolitics; or assemblages, folds, smooth space, war machines, nomadology). They then converged much via feminist and queer/trans theorizations on the body; and then genealogically on the question of power, and the various historical formations, becomings, or figurations, which challenged us to arrive at an ethological, ecosystemic, or assemblage-theoretic conception.

To help foster theses ongoing reconceptualisations, I have diagrammed related discourses[1] into a chart that distributes these studies into streams within a non-linear discursive space [Fig. 1]. Extending a line of likeminded diagrammatisations of architectural styles and styles of thinking[2], this chart does not aim at offering a simple historical overview (or archaeology) of these emerging discourses. Instead, it hopes to render visible the various

genealogical convergences and bifurcations in an 'epigenetic landscape'. The following presents thus a 'stratigraphy' or 'stratoanalysis' of this discursive formation, which we will be moving down in reconstituting their differently-sedimented contents (i.e. focal topics), foldings (i.e contributive understandings), and *glissements* (i.e. ongoing relevance and possible new convergences). Therein my aim was to draw together a 'cartography' for navigating a field of changing conception of architecture's effects on life that is presently being generated, and thus locate possibilities for yet-to-be-made convergent streams; – a meta-genealogy of genealogies of architectures of life and death.

< insert Figure 1 around here, full spread >

Part One: The Post-Foucauldian Strata

Heterotopias and Spaces of Enclosure [1]

In its declared aim to subsume the history of architecture generally to a history of *technē*[3], Foucault's work has completely reframed our understanding how spatial configurations and architectural arrangements impact life, or the management of the living. Especially his heterotopic conception of spaces – introduced in the paper 'Of Other Spaces' (1967)[4] – was quickly absorbed into architectural discourse via the work of Teyssot, Porphyrios, and Tafuri; and became uncritically-equated with the 'spaces of enclosure' (of hospitals, asylums, and prisons) that Foucault's *History of Madness* (1961), *Birth of the Clinic* (1963), and *Discipline and Punish* (1975) had described. Between the latter two studies, Foucault made a crucial methodological move away from an archaeological approach to discursive formations toward a genealogical one interested in how spatialisations (and architecture) gained a generative function in the form-taking dispositif of disciplinarity.

In the 80s, Foucault's work continued to inspire topically related investigations in postmodern architectural history. Starting from an earlier research trajectory embarked on by Evans and continued by authors including Rykwert, Braham, or Vidler these studies began to respectively reassess the foundations of modern planning within Enlightenment architecture, and the resulting normalised forms of producing social environments (Rabinow 1995). Some scholars started studying architecture also as a deliberate means of control, based on a more diagrammatic reading as to how architectural arrangements enact framing conditions (such as 'permanent visibility' in the Panopticon penitentiary). These studies (including Markus 1994; Hetherington 1997; Dovey 1998; and Hanson 1998) have often employed the #SPACE SYNTAX method developed by Hillier and Hanson.[5] Their aim was to carefully reclaim a certain degree of spatial determinism within the creation of life, by acknowledging the #SOCIAL ORDERING that

architectural arrangements entail. While all these studies followed in the footsteps of Foucault's architecture-related topics and discourse-analytical method, they have not always taken up the methodological shift from archaeology to genealogy, that allowed him to move from describing transformations taking place (i.e. 'what was going on'), to explaining how these transformations emerged ('what was going on in what happened'). Wallenstein's *Biopolitics and the Emergence of Modern Architecture* (2009) respectively critiqued the extent to which architectural analyses have all-too-often stopped where architecture represents certain power formations, instead of explaining – *from a point of view of their genesis* – how those arise alongside emerging aerchitectures.[6]

An exception proving the point is Teyssot's 'Disease of the Domicile' (1988), which – in extending Foucault heterotopological reading – took much more inspiration from the lesser-known collaborative work by Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari, at the Centre d'études, de recherches et de formation institutionellles (CERFI) toward a *Genealogy of Capital* (1973).[7] Inspired by *Anti-Oedipus*'s take on social production, the CERFI researchers took a strong stance against the idea that '(social) space is a (social) product' (Lefebvre 1974). They argued that it is inversely the organization of space – the way built environments are configured so as to channel material, economic, or affective flows in specific ways – that presents the *instrument of social production;* 'Collective Equipments of Power' that require a radical reconceptualisation:

> The city is not outside of production processes … but presents an engine of transformation …[that] brings together and metabolises all sorts of heterogeneous productive chains. …[The city] is not simply a thermodynamic machine, it is first of all an informational machine, coding and decoding energy fluxes, decoupling productive powers … by operations of cutting, mixing, and intersecting. … In its essential function to produce information, cut and cut across heterogeneous productive series, the city has thus as its principle condition circulation.[8]

This idea was a crucial junction in the mutual development of Foucault's notion of apparatus [*dispositifs*] from Deleuze and Guattari's earlier notion of assemblages [*agencements*] in *Anti-Oedipus*, while Deleuze and Guattari were going to reconceptualise historical formations from a more geological (not genealogical) and rhizomatic (not arborescent) philosophy.

Feminist Intersections/Queer Convergences [2]
Neither Foucault's genealogical method nor Deleuze and Guattari's geophilosophy of assemblages has found much appreciation by socially-inclined architectural historians. The latter have insufficiently questioned the false opposition of agency (as enabling practices) and

structure (as material constraints) that Giddens (1979) critiqued as a core problem in social theory. Characterized by a problematic container conception of space, these studies approach spaces merely as changing 'settings' for changing practices, rather than 'setups' configuring them. This resistance to inquiring architecture's structuring operations within social transformation processes, contributed to a tangible disciplinary divide of architectural history from the field of architectural theory that, alongside the increasing digitalisation of architectural practice during the 1990–2000s, was beginning to explore that material causality thanks to which dispositifs, diagrams, or assemblages perform in form-finding processes.

At the same time, feminist and queer authors including Ahmed, Butler, Grosz, Halberstam, Heyes, hooks, or Sedgwick, who intercalated post-Foucauldian critiques of otherness with Deleuze's philosophy of difference, did a better job in developing the genealogical conjecture between bodies and power in broader performative terms. These studies have often expanded on Deleuze's reading of Spinoza's *Ethics* (1677) and its 'ethological' conception of the #BODY – the configuring architecture of life – as a composition of differential forces of speeds and slownesses, and its resulting powers to affect (*potestas*/'power over') and be affected (*potentia*/'power to'). Deleuze and Foucault's work has here been productively conjoined by way of Irigaray's emphasis of #SEXUAL DIFFERENCE, so as to stress to what degree 'difference from' implies 'being less than' (Braidotti 1994). Therein she joined forces with contemporaneous efforts at reassessing the workings of Western ontologies[9] that traditionally hierarchise beings by drawing multiple differences through gender, race, ethnicity, class, belief, sexual orientation, age, ableness/neurotypicality, economic status, or geopolitical locations, and which – as *intersecting* structural inequalities – coalesce into a complex matrix of oppression (Crenshaw 1989, 2017; Anzaldúa/Moraga 1981; Hill Collins 1990; also Nash 2018).

In the 1990s, also architectural discourse generated more nuanced readings and ground-breaking feminist/queer(-of-color) critiques of spaces of otherness (McLeod 1996; Urbach 1998; Reddy 1998), and re-investigated the wider relation of space and architecture to sex and gender (hooks 1990; Colomina/Bloomer 1992; Betsky 1995, 1997; Agrest/Conway/Weisman, 1996; Massey 1994; Achebe 2000; Rendell/Penner/Borden, 2002; Parrenas 2008). Architecture as both object/structure and practice/agency becomes here critically interrogated from feminist and queer angles, often specifically centring on the production of domestic space. After Hayden's *Grand Domestic Revolution* (1980), some architectural analyses on domestic space offered a critical assessment of spatial modernisation practices of the early 20th century (Floyd/Bryden 1999; Heynen/Baydar 2005); helping stress that this transformation actually consisted in forms of socio-economic segregation (more than just functional differentiation).

Biosocial Techniques and Immunizing Habit(at)s [3]

In parallel (around the centre-line of my diagram), we find a stream of studies that critically engaged with Foucault's lectures at the Collège de France (1971–84). These followed his post-1975 attention to the emergence of those novel technologies of power through which the modern state apparatus emerged alongside its increasing attempts at governing the biological aspects of human life. He here revealed the longer lineage through which *bios* (meaning a form of life governed by the 'kind of life' it implies, and what modes of existence and subjectivation it involves) progressively became the object of *technē*. By dating this process back to earlier incarnations of a *technē tou biou* – an art concerning how to live consisting in a set of practices and managerial techniques (including architecture) for *leading* a life, so as to fashion and modifying life, and transform ourselves; meaning: techniques *by which we become human subjects* – he argued that the more advanced biopolitical technologies evolved through the incremental instrumentalisation of not just specific architectural apparatus, but wider, more general, forms of planning that strategically regulate (and stabilise) material conditions of coexistence. And it is in this sense that the more advanced forms are still deeply connected to the production of subjects.

While the renown readings of Agamben (1995, 1998, 2003) have further looked into this biopolitical aspect, in stressing the dark side of these techniques and their deadly workings within modern spaces of enclosure like concentration or extermination camps, these may have done a disservice for understanding this productive connection. This disservice lies not in his more explicit distinction between *bios* (as forms of cultured life) and *zoe* (as forms of #BARE LIFE); but in reframing such apparatus in purely-negative, oppressive terms. Preventing any affirmative notion of biopower as a relentlessly generative life force [10]; this negative vision also precludes many genetic aspects in how those apparatus came about. In recuperating Agamben's analytic erasure of the colonial prehistory of apparatus such as the camp, Weheliye (2014) powerfully identified a much broader dispositif in the dehumanizing *socio-political* assemblages of racialisation, sexualisation, and gendering that *operate in the differential production of more-or-less human life forms*. Agemben's initial occlusion of these differentiations, and resulting universality, however, has slipped into many studies employing Agamben's notion of apparatus for reinvestigating (state) power, and territorial strategies of managing life (Rose 2000). While this has informed a wider reassessment of spatial planning as warfare by other means (Tesfahuney and Ek 2014; Rolnik 2019); especially in related interrogations, what precisely an (architectural) apparatus is or does (Raffnsøe 1999; Pasquinelli 2015), we note an increasing *politicisation* of apparatus as means for (political) subjectification (Lahiji 2014). This contributed to a purely-polemic *biopoliticisation* of architectural form that once more stopped short at the level of representation.

As Weheliye's work suggests, the socio-political spatializations underlying camps (or also the prison–industrial complex, or public housing), are reconceptualised more accurately as *setup for producing* specific (bio)political substances and subjectivities, formed as social categories through particular techniques of differentiation and hierarchisation. Such understandings of the socio-political mechanism in the differential concretization of ways of living, could inform studies exploring how *alternative architectures* might give rise to alternative, emancipatory forms of subjectivation (Brott 2000; Preciado 2004). Deutscher, for instance, has powerfully reconsidered the twofold (re)productive potential of biopolitics as a *power to transform life* in the aim of collective interests and futurities.[11] From an anthropological angle, Rabinow (1992) had similarly begun reframe 'biopower' in terms of 'bio-social techniques' that operates directly on life processes, and real material conditions that *enable* the stable (co-)existence and emergence of new forms inhabiting the world.[12] Theorists like Esposito (2002, 2004) have since identified a larger paradigm in 'immunity', as a mediating element by which 'bios' and 'politics' are being juxtaposed in heterogeneous multiplicities.

Reconnecting to an older architectural discourse on techno-mediated environments, some studies have here approached the characteristic cellularity of modern space in relation to an increasing technological #ENCAPSULATION. This stream is represented most notably by Sloterdijk's *Spheres* trilogy (1998–2004). Grounded but implicitly on Foucault's heterotopological approach, it repositions the subjectivating function of architectural cells in explicitly *anthropotechnic* terms of 'co-isolating' self-containers. Together with techno-utopian critiques of our atomic form of cohabitation (De Cauter's 2004; Schuldenfrei 2012; Šenk 2017), and initial analyses of the specific economy of capturing and capitalizing on forms of co-living in our 'Societies of Control' (Deleuze 1991; Lazzarato 2006), this stream clearly anticipates the compartmentalizing strategies of home-containment in the name of collective risk-mitigation experienced by many urbanites during the COVID-19 epidemic. Perhaps it is this continued line of thinking, that – with several doses of Nietzsche – draw the genealogy of that *herd*immunopolitical (govern)mentality that characterises *The New Normal* (Bratton 2019). This might contribute to a more genetic understanding of how architectural arrangements and their heterotopic cellularity enable us to co-exist *as* heterogeneous multiplicities, and account for the particular *geneses* (the 'machinic heterogeneses') effectuated by them.

Critical Spatial Practices [4]
In their materialist reading of internalization processes, these analyses can complement studies of emerging #INTERIORS (Penner/Rice 2004; Rice 2006); especially approaches through the notion of atmospheres, as an interface of the production of (interior)spaces and the production of affect, have furnished reconsiderations as to *How the Built Environment Shapes our Lives*

(Goldhagen 2017). In helping recover a more nuanced notion of the ways in which architecture influences us psychologically (an influence that had long been categorically discarded), these studies are still limiting themselves to *spaces in which life* – shaped by emotions – *takes place*. This timid structuralism has obstructed an urgently needed theorization of the relation between *Cognition and the Built Environment* (Möysted 2018), wherein life – shaped through an affective modulation of material flows – takes various forms. Backed by the increasing recognition of cognitive sciences and the rising field of neuroecology or #ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY of the environmental influence on psychology, architecture has attempted to design spaces and care facilities with positive effect on mental and physical health for our *Burnout Society* (Han 2010). In this regard, it parallels and otherwise separate stream of studies in which Foucault's *Machines à guerir* [Curing Machines] (1977) are fundamentally rethought in more affirmative terms of #CARE: 'Architectural Ecologies of Care' (Rawes 2014) engineering many more-than-human actors (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017) and factors.

Could one re-envision architecture as a means conducive to countering and curing neo-liberal 'Technopatriarchy' (Preciado 2012; 2018)? This idea parallels approaches that have since the mid-2000s engaged with the problematic 'precarianisation' of architectural practice in the mutation of capitalism towards #COGNITIVE CAPITALISM (Moullier-Boutang 2008). Fostered by the increasing cognitarianisation of the architect/thinker alongside the wider immaterialisation of previously material form of (social) production, one stream attended closer to the *noo*political dimension of *Cognitive Architecture* (ed. Hauptmann, 2010) and those spaces symptomatizing the *Psychopathologies of Cognitive Capitalism* (ed. Neidich 2013). Smith's *Bare Architecture* (2017) is one of the few studies to embrace a deliberately-*schizoanalytic* approach in the production of desire in its material effects. Another strand, prolonging the Lefrebrian attention to emancipatory practices (and its abovementioned presupposition of spaces being the *product* of practices), reproblematised the architects's agency in cultivating 'Critical Spatial Practices' (Rendell 2003; Dodd 2020) and *Other Ways of Doing Architecture* (Awan/Scheider/Till 2011) by finally attending more to the dimension of *Social (Re)Production* implied within spatial/architectural practices (ed. Petrescu/Trogal 2017).

But here, precisely, one must pause to raise the question 'Who builds your architecture?'[13], and open up this discussion through #POST- AND DECOLONIAL discourses. From the angle, the 'architecture' of life and death becomes, of course, a much greater systemic issue of institutionalised Western practices. It is on this vast interstratum where post-Foucauldian discourse glitches towards the tremendous task of *Decolonizing Architecture* (Pezzani 2010; Hillal/Petti/Weizman 2014) in its foundation – by decolonizing theory and practising solidarity first[14] – call for a complete transvaluation how majoritarian architectural arrangements necessarily render visible political structures. It allows a critical deconstruction of the history

that is represented by institutional spaces or national monuments, and (re-)construct 'other monumentalities' as Wilson suggests.[15] In return, this involves reconstructing a wider awareness of *architecture's complicitness in the spatial (re)production of intersecting social divisions*. To do so, we must uncover the hidden co-constitution of subjectivity through the particular 'Order of Appearances' , as Matsipa reminds us, within dominant regimes and practices of representation, to reveal the different modes in how spatial technologies come to be used as social, cultural, political, and/or economic technologies.[16] Based on this, the prime task lies in unmasking and unmaking *The Art of Inequality* (ed. Martin/Moore/Schindler, 2015) working within institutionalized planning practices, policies, and policing practices and universalizing representational practices through which white supremacy keeps its hold as a totalizing structure that disproportional affects the lives and deaths of the non-white majority of people. Amoo-Adare (2013) respectively suggests to develop a 'renegade stance' towards architecture to redefine ones' positionality within the pedagogies and politics of place-making.[17] For understanding these entanglements, we ought to be #MAKING SPACE for intersectional feminisms within architectural education to help make it radically inclusive.[18]

This project joins forces with an 'anthropology of the otherwise' that counters the particular 'Geontology' (Povinelli 2016, 2017) of late liberal governance that subtends the (bio/geo)politics of western modes of planning and its 'radical substitution of complex existing networks' through 'ecological simplifications' (Tsing 2016): those impoverished life-worlds disengaged into heterogeneous patches devoted to a machinic replication of the same, that characterise the 'Architecture of Man'.[19] Therein, Tsing argues, it is clearly connected to the wider landscape management techniques and disciplinary models that emerge with European colonialism and colonialization practices – in particular, plantations; as much as it is connected to the consolidating imperial forms of power founded on a governmentality through the production of exploitative infrastructures. Mbembe's concept of #NECROPOLITICS (esp. 2003; 2019) highlighted how biopower is always lined by historically-changing forms of power over things left to die, and which particular ways of (fostering) life cannot be disentangled from. This lining has gained renewed urgency for revealing the multiple (intersecting) inequalities in *what lifeforms matter,* or are being 'simplified' within the ongoing transformation of the planet in the name of white man. From this angle, the anthropocene appears as a Man-made landscape of reduced liveabilities, extinctions, and genocidal practices that produced the (geo-)ontic conditions for *Anthropos* to arise; – what Yusoff has called 'Anthropogenesis' (2015).

From Object Dispositions to Affect Dispositioning [5]

This vision is supported by more materialistic, systems-theoretical views how systems generally create 'order' by maintaining dissymmetries. In line with this vision, some scholars

have initially reconsidered architecture as a practice that matters in matter material ways (Lloyd-Thomas 2007). They also increasingly employ the methodological apparatus of material culture studies developed in anthropology and archaeology, in tracing the resources, crafts, fabrication of objects, their circulation, cultural practices, use, etc., that the biography of material artefacts retains traces of. But thinking with *poiesis* rather than *technē*, these studies stay closer to Marxist notion of *material conditions for (social) production*. Therein, these studies find themselves generally closer to Latour's *Actor-Network-Theory* (1995), which highlights the epistemological importance of non-human actors and networked heterogeneities that materialise around the generation of larger and complex phenomena, like climate change. These have since been reconsidered in terms of *Hyperobjects* (Morton 2013) that were granted a separate 'object-oriented' ontological status. Cities being the main driver in the production of such phenomena, urban (economic) theorists have since reconsidered the production of *Urban Assemblages* (Farias/Bender 2010) and the *conditioning* role infrastructures (and network practices) play in controlling urban metabolisms and fluxes (Heynen/Kaika/Swyngedouw 2006; Swyngedouw 2006; Gandy 2009). Thus connected to a *Liquid Modernity* (Bauman 1999) and the resulting need to reconsider the function of *Architecture in the Space of Flows* (Ballantyne/Smith 2012), some authors have re-invested in a wider infrastructural critique of modes of planning and the integrative reciprocity between social and technical infrastructures, to reconsider the production of new modes of existence that this systemic reciprocity entails (Easterling 2014).

Interestingly enough, quite close to the CERFI research's notion how infrastructures engender desiring-machines, also several social scientist have finally begun to consider how spatial technologies matters in organizing and regulating desires and behaviours. Seyfert (2012) could here identify specific 'affectifs'; relational constellations of affects and (not-only-human) bodies involved in the emergence of affects through forms of distributed agency; as particular 'affect disposition[ing] regimes' with characteristic 'affective economies' (Ahmed 2004, Angerer 2017; Bösel 2018).[20] Some sociologists of space have opened up new analytic territories in revisiting the built environment's constitutive function in rendering existing life, rather than framing it passively, by spatializing its social segmentation and stratifications (Löw 2001; Delitz 2010). Transgressing the structure/agency problematic, these studied — akin to the co-constitutive understanding of 'other spaces' and 'spatialised otherness' outlined in critical race theory — promote a generalized notion of socio-spatial structurings as not determinatively constraining behaviours, but first of all *enabling* them.

Part Two: The Post-Deleuzian Strata

Assemblages, Territorialization [6]

This then raises the question *what systemic behaviours* architectural systems enable. Hence, this second part will be expanding on the more materialist philosophy of #ASSEMBLAGES developed in Deleuze and Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980) as concatenations of #ENABLING CONSTRAINTS. And with this notion, we also transgress the purely projective border at the bottom of our discursive map, and land back in its upper area.

Here we should start over with the 1990s, when architectural designers became first fascinated by the concept of 'folding', which lead to a fruitful encounter of architectural, feminist, and Deleuzian thought.[21] At that time, DeLanda was starting to expand on the more materialist interpretation of the #MORPHOGENETIC dimension of bodies and assemblages, the role of diagrams in the genesis of form, and the agency of matter in this process. From these initial studies, taking inspiration from thermodynamic systems theory and Braudel's history of capitalism, he distilled deliberately non-linear cartographies (DeLanda 1997, 2002). During the mid-noughties, he then began singling out from Deleuze and Guattari's work a neo-materialist philosophy of society in the form of a wider *Assemblage Theory* (2006, 2016) of how socio-spatial assemblages take form through the nesting of components at various territorial scales and levels of complexity. This paralleled Donati and Archer's efforts to install a #RELATIONAL SOCIOLOGY as a new *realist* research paradigm for the social sciences (Donati 2011, 2015; Archer 1995)

Around 2000, especially Deleuzian theorizations of territorialisation processes (Cache 1995; Grosz 2008) repeatedly called for reconsidering architecture more diagrammatically through its #FRAMING function: If 'the wall is the basis of our coexistence,' Cache argued, its separating function cannot be disentangled from its capacity 'to select and bring in.'[22] One could thus reconsider architecture through Meillasoux's conception of bodies as 'local rarefaction[s] of fluxes'.[23] In one of his comments, Massumi defended that architecture 'functions topologically, [by] folding relational continua into and out of each other to selective, productive effect' residing in the assemblage it binds together.[24] In this radically relational view, architecture no longer presents an apparatus of enclosure, serving to separate, but a machine for establishing #SELECTIVE relations by 'determining what is related to what.'[25] That is; similar to the CERFI researchers's precursory notion of built environments, we can reconsider *architectural arrangements as a spatial technique for establishing environments for selective interaction*.

This requires reconsidering architectural arrangements like grids or filters in terms of *Cultural Techniques*, like Siegert (2005) has done; while further deconstructing the nature/culture divides towards a more ecosystemically-generalized reading wherein built environments are no longer understood as some artificial cultural construct, but as spec ifically-augmented, adapted, constructed anthropogenic habitats. I will return to this again, after

quickly dealing with the fact that this vision turns out to require a much more flattened ontological stance, the #FLAT ONTOLOGY that DeLanda advocated to avoid not only the more apparent pitfalls of 'macro- and micro-reductionist' visions, but also the less apparent intricacies of 'meso-reductionism' (or 'central conflationism' in Archer 1995), by which we mean a false reification of praxis as the core of social reality, which ignores how practices are being effectuated on many intermediary flevels of living and thinking. The question, brilliantly posed in Massumi and Manning's many works, is rather how this 'middling' works in affecting us on many levels.

(Con)Figurations and Reconfigurings [7]

Helpful ideas on this point can be drawn from Barad's approach of *Meeting the Universe Halfway* (Barad 1996, 2007) and account for the 'posthumanist' and 'queer performativity of nature' (2003, 2012) that characterises how phenomena come to matter, by intersecting realism and social constructivism. By extending through the field of techno-scientific practices, Foucault's notion of apparatus, bodies, and forces, Barad's work stresses that physical experimental setups are ill-conceived as devices to 'detect' physical phenomena, for actually they present material arrangements that *produce* a range of related phenomena that only emerges *together with* them. This agential realist position thus never detaches phenomena from the particular reconfigurings of material environments that brought them about in co-constitutive ways. In this view, inspired by Haraway, objects never pre-exist as such; all *relata* (as phenomenal entities) 'emerge through and as part of their entangled intra-relatings', in which their boundaries are constantly (re)drawn within a field always already populated by productive forces and material bodies. These 'boundary-drawing processes' consist in *material-discursive practices* by which Barad understands those ongoing intra-actions through which phenomena come to matter in producing new physical materialities and meanings, and for which an 'ethico-onto-epistemology' is needed to draw differences in understanding *what differences* come to matter.[26]

To help foster such approaches to the built environment, we might follow Braidotti's neo-materialist manner of investigating all sorts of historical formations, subject formations, or social, technical, or environmental formations on the same 'ontological footing'; and promoting an 'ontologically pacifist' worldview.[27] By the same token her work thoroughly re-conceptualises them in an otherwise non-reductive fashion as 'embodied, embedded, relational and affective figurations'.[28] In this situated approach, (different) figurations are not figurative ways of thinking, but existential conditions that translate into a (differential) style of thinking; one that offers theoretically-grounded navigational tools for charting ongoing material and discursive manifestations of transformation processes, with all the different speeds engendered.[29] Similar to Barad's intra-active view, a purely positive vision of these

(recon)figurations as intensive formations calls then for a thoroughgoing critique of all sorts of (in fact, highly political) metaphysical container-conceptions through which subjects and objects only exist, rest, and move against some spatial, temporal background, or on different levels of reality.

Arrangements as Stratified Systems [8]

Suggesting a new reasoning about architectural formations, such a reciprocal conception of material arrangements challenges us then to rethink 'intensive' figurations irreducibly through this co-constitutive history of material transformation. From this immanent angle, the Deleuzo-Guattarian notion of 'arrangement' remains a relatively unmined field in the ethological study of the built environment. It would foster something akin to an 'assemblage theory' (such as heralded by DeLanda and also Protevi in their efforts at synthesising a non-reductionist paradigm for the study of socio/bio/noo/solar/hydro/geo/techno/material formations), while reconceptualising built arrangements in their non-representational function as #ENABLING CONSTRAINTS that effectuate particular assemblages and their economies, ecologies, and politics. Deacon (2012; and Sherman 2017) for instance illustrated that these always arise as a systemic effect of synergistically-coupled constraints, wherein higher-order emergent constraints help sustain the manifoldly-nested and thus dynamically-interlocked regularization processes. These coupled constraints regularizing morphodynamic processes *are the very architecture of 'life'*. Long misunderstood and falsely discarded in their effect – for instance concerning the supposedly determinist dimension in Foucault's reading of disciplinary environments of enclosure – constraints are not material boundaries. Instead, they arise from boundary-drawing practices that form *sufficiently-closed and reciprocally-metastabilised* systems made up of material-discursive (i.e. thermodynamic as well as informational) processes that are 'teleodynamically'-coupled and path-dependent. More than following Sara Ahmed's mantra 'The more a path is used, the more a path is used', such processes actually operate by way of *dysselective elimination*, as paths come to be constrained so that fewer alternative pathways become likely; meaning that '*prevented dynamics account for presented dynamics*'.[30]

Recently several scholars aligning with the wider analytical framework of #NEW MATERIALISM – which in the 2010s gained increasing momentum as a set of transversal methodologies (incl. Coole/Frost 2010, Van der Tuin/Dolphijn 2010, 2012; Fox/Alldred 2017; Ellenzweig/Zammito 2017) – have started contesting how Barad as well as DeLanda's works often seem to move seamlessly from smaller to larger scales, and analytically foregrounded instead those specific *scale-dependent phenomena* that are constitutive for certain assemblages to form.[31] Here a concerted effort must be made to re-conceptualise the multiple strata of reality, without separating them onto ontologically different planes, while at once not losing the

ontological distinction between the actual and the virtual. Scalar invariance is much more important for actual spacetime than it is for those virtual problems generating structurations, as Saldanha argues in distinguishing that '*abstract machines* [may be] flat', but '[*concrete*] *assemblages* are necessarily stratified, hence scalar'.[32] This 'provides an ontology adequate to this scalar nature of reality', whose adequacy lies in Deleuze's strategically *stratoanalytic* conception of assemblages as an architecture of concatenated levels of organisational complexity.[33]

Ecosystemic Becoming-With's on Machinic Phyla [9]

Architecture thus requires to be reconceptualised teleodynamically, as *coupling* specific strata or layers of complexity through its material-discursive boundaries drawn at critical levels of organizational complexity. In contrast to borders, boundaries, limits, and margins have a doubly-*binding* function through which they become a prime site of production of socio-environmental organizations.[34] Thus proving an urgent investigative lens, Moe's work (2014) warns that reductive concepts like 'enclosure', 'co-isolation', or 'separation', and related part-to-whole conceptions prevent us from ever approaching architecture as a dynamic open system. Approaching it by contrast as a system forming through 'inclusive disjunctions', challenges facile explanations and illegitimate 'exclusive disjunctions' supposedly underlying spaces of enclosure, border walls, refugee camps, gated communities, and the various xenomisic mind-sets or notions like 'tolerance/diversity' characterising today's highly-divisive socio-environmental climate. Instead, what is at stake here, I have argued[35], is nothing short of an ethological vision that consists in a radically relational, (eco-)systemic, and machinic notion of how architectural arrangements 'are cutting us together/apart' as Barad would say.

Inspired by Guattari's *Three Ecologies* (1989), the work of Rawes or Radman variously illustrates the three distinct yet interconnected biosocial, techno-environmental, and noo-political teleodynamisms 'through which modern subjectivity and our habits, habitats, and modes of inhabitation are co-constituted' through the relational ecologies of architecture.[36] This idea – connected to the nesting of scales stressed in DeLanda's assemblage-theoretic approach – is naturally explored in a stream of studies that take an ecosystemic view. Any production of habitats and lifeforms implies *Niche Tactics* (O'Donnell 2013): i.e. processes by which developmental niches for evolution are co-adaptively constructed by establishing *dysselective interactions* within existing material milieus, wherein individuation or ontogenesis takes place in a two-fold process involving both an 'adapting to' as well as an 'adapting of' that milieu. Habits and Habitats are always co-constituted, as the respective re-readings of Ravaisson's notion *Of Habit* (1838) by Malabou (preface to Ravaisson 2008) and Grosz (2017) demonstrates. Biology-trained theorists like Margulis, Oyama, or Haraway have here diffracted

Varela's idea of 'autopoiesis' towards a 'sympoietic' notion of ecosystems in which 'nothing makes itself' but only evolve in processes of 'becoming-together-with'[37], wherein speciation occurs through convergence, and #EPIGENESIS presents the real *Form of Becoming* (Wellmann 2017).

Maybe even queerer ways of thinking (Puar 2005, 2007) are needed to truly understand these *Queer Ecologies* (Mortimer-Sandilands/Erickson 2010) as made up of an 'ecology of practices' that must be thought plainly *par le milieu* (Stengers 2013). Reducible to neither *Gathering Ecologies* (Goodman 2018) nor *Ecologies of Separation* (Neyrat 2017, 2019), 'Architecture is always in the middle' (Gough 2017); — middling precisely through its integrating/differentiating *capacity to select*. Architectural arrangements thus constitute a central interface *At the Edge of Everything Else* (Choi/Trotter, 2010). Yet, as Choi stresses[38], conceiving architecture's privileged position without at once acknowledging the central norms around which this 'everything else' or difference is said to pivot (while *difference is actually primary*), erases the uneven distributions in past and current practice and education. This then risks perpetuating techno-scientific practices organizing life, instead of critically altering them toward more inclusive forms of middling with historical differentiations.

To do so, we have to advance an e(thi)co-aesthetic paradigm; such as Erich Hörl's *General Ecology* (2017) developped vis-à-vis the notion of a 'general *organology'* favoured by Bernard Stiegler. His earlier works on technics and techno-mediated evolutions has greatly explained how the technical evolution entails an 'externalization' of memory, wherein past experiences and differentiation processes (as an 'epigenetic' process) are retained and successively accumulated within the very organization of material environments. Such 'ex-organizations' forestructure what he calls *epi-phylo-genetic* processes, which 'designate the appearance of a new relation between the organism and its environment', wherein co-evolving *technics* – like architecture – drive, consolidate, constrain, and steer the evolution of the living 'by means other than life'.[39]

It is in that sense that architecture theorists as Kwinter and Radman urge us to fundamentally rethink the level on which environmental formations such as architecture technically operate within ontogenetic processes.[40] This way, the cellularity (or reticularity) of built *milieus* must be radically rethought from an epiphylogenetic angle; starting from how Stiegler conceptualise the intertwined formation of techno-socio-psychical individuals by 'mechnologising' Guattari 'three ecologies' through the work of Gilbert Simondon.[41] Having increasingly come to be known through his work on the genesis and functioning (or 'allagmatics') of technical individuals and ensembles, Simondon had conceptually distinguished technics themselves from technology (or 'mechanology') as the proper knowledge of their working. This mechanology thus calls for reconsidering the relation between *Architecture and*

the Machinic (Graafland/Perreira 2018) far beyond the prevailing notion of *Architecture/Machines* (Gleich/Stalder 2018). Similar to the problematic symbolic reading of 'apparatus' in post-Foucauldian architecture history, this notion rarely moves analysis down to the 'machinic phylum', or engineering stratum on which these socio-environmental dysselection processes come to be configured and ordered 'neganthropically' (Stiegler 2019) through architectural arangements and boundary-drawing practices.

A Conclusive Opening Through the Death of (Hu)Man

Following Ferreira da Silva, this necessarily entails reimagining differentiations beyond simple separations[42], but as a selective establishment of entangled worlds; or entangling worldings. To approach this world-production epiphylogenetically beyond any nature/culture, or eco/techno divide, we may want to take a deliberately #POST-HUMANIST position that a stream of scholarship has begun to promote as the starting point to co-construct, as Banerji and Paranjape do, *Critical Posthumanism and Planetary Futures* (2019) to address those larger socio-environmental changes that are affecting life on both planetary and multi-scalar levels.

   Braidotti has most clearly defined the posthuman predicament as a convergence phenomenon, effectuaded by the conjunction of the Sixth Extinction and the Fourth Industrial Revolution. It implies first a wider reconceptualization of the massive extinction of lifeforms in the name of *anthropos*; – this fundamentally-flawed conception of Man as a 'genre' that Wynter substantially critiqued in its underlying 'cosmogonically-chartered sociogenic coding' of beings along multiple 'symbolic *life/death'*-divides that, as a system of discrimination, auto-instituted the Western-bourgeois prototype of being human as a generic taxonomic type[43], and which has turned more into a 'brand' (Haraway) by now. Respectively, Braidotti points out, that most people (i.e. basically all *non*-male/white/christian/straight/cis) never fully counted as 'human' to begin with. And what about all non-human (non-)living forms of matter involved in all life-constituting processes on earth? So rather than deserving its own era, the #(MIS/)ANTHROPO(BS)CENE, the relation between *(Neg)Anthropogenesis*, and the man-made dystruction of habitats and complex ecosystems deserves to be critically deconstructed so as to be creatively transformed toward an affirmative conception of life's constitutive heterogeneities and sympoieses.

   Combining methodological post-anthropocentrism with analytic post-humanism, Braidotti suggests, avoids reintroducing the falsely-universalizing 'neo-Kantian stuff' in some *trans*humanist approaches.[44] Where her *Posthuman Knowledge* (2019) brilliantly maps out this problem, a new conceptual apparatus is drawn together in Braidotti and Hlavajova's *Posthuman Glossary* (2017). One of the post-anthropocentric methods for conceptually-reconstructing the

built environment as a *Posthuman Territory* (Harrison 2013), would here consist in first cultivating a 'symptomatological' stance promoted by Deleuze's *Essays Critical and Clinical* (1993) in creatively continuing the cartographies that Foucault started to make; not just to draw together a wider *Onto-cartography* of machinic couplings (Bryant 2014); but also to thereby render visible (as Braidotti's work does) the machinic heterogeneses concerning what we are ceasing to be and what we are in the process of becoming together with new world-remaking couplings.

Geared at constructing alternative futures in fostering new conjunctions, making *Critical and Clinical Cartographies* (Radman/Sohn 2017) involves uncovering the genealogy of many of those conceptions that underlie present forms of planning as practices of managing life and death; for instance, how Stiegler's *'Il faut s'adapter'* (2019) just revealed the forgotten genealogy of the neo-liberal imperative of 'having to adapt'. The practice of making cartographies thus serves as a detox from the lethal stuff (starting with dominant *conceptions*) that is killing us. Writing this during the COVID-19 lockdown, I can only speculate on the many works that will follow Žižek in promoting a falsely-universalizing idea of some *pan(demic)*-humanity, bound purely-negatively risks of extinction. But these not only evidence a fundamental lack in taking responsibility, they also lack – in their panic-mongering and debilitating negativity – any '*response-ability*'. — An ability to respond *not in*differently to the biased auto(immunitary)-responses of a global economic system that functions by and thus strives to maintain 'order' generated by fostering and exploiting asymmetries and uneven distributions. Here many more cartographies of *what's going on in what's happening* must be made of our neganthropogenic milieus, regarding how 'architecture' (as any externalization of prevalent forces and asymmetries) is *technicised* (and how so differently) to therein speed up or slow down modes of social production, and thus transform living and dying by means other than life and death.

The ongoing reconceptualizations of spacing, the channelling of flows, selective interaction, or internalization processes, and boundaries may hold a new understanding of these interrelated transformation processes, and a transformative ethics. This will be distilled from revisiting what architecture – as a posthuman *technē* enabling us to live together in different ways – *does*, and experiment with what it is *capable of doing*. Such mapping would necessarily have to tool heterogeneous arrangements of architecture technically so as to help foster a *World of Many Worlds* (De la Cadeña/Blaser 2019). Perhaps, by coming to terms technologically with architecture's heterogenising function, and allagmatically with the fundamentally-*inclusive* mode of operation within its boundary-drawing techniques, we may finally arrive at a more ethical and critical vision of architectures constitutive function in transformatively-establishing mutually-compossible lifeworlds through more synergistic asymmetries. And this way, we may envision what architecture might be capable of becoming

otherwise in being geared towards the co-production of radically-inclusive forms of "togetherness that make us who we are", in differentially reinventing who 'we' are by overcoming what "threatened to keep us apart".[45] At least that's what I die for; and live by.

Bibliography

Ahmed, Sara. *What's the use? On the Uses of Use.* Durham/London: Duke UP, 2019.

Amoo-Adare, Epifania Akosua. '*Spatial Literacy: Contemporary Asante Women's Place-Making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Barad, Karen 'Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of how Matter comes to Matter'. *Signs* 28 (2003): 801–31.

Braidotti, Rosi. 'Affirmation versus Vulnerability: On Contemporary Ethical Debates'. In *Gilles Deleuze: The Intensive Reduction*, ed. Constantin V. Boundas, 143–60. London: Continuum, 2009.

——— "The Politics of 'Life Itself' and New Ways of Dying". In *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, ed. Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, 201–18. Durham/London: Duke UP, 2013.

——— *Posthuman Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity, 2019.

Brott, Simone. 'Collective Equipments of Power: The Road and the City'. *Thresholds* 40 (2012), 47–54.

Burns, Karen. 'Becomings: Architecture, Feminism, Deleuze'. In: *Deleuze and Architecture*, ed. Hélène Frichot and Stephen Loo, 15–39. Edinburgh UP, 2013.

Cache, Bernard. *Earth Moves: The Furnishing of Territories*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.

Deutscher, Penelope. *Foucault's Futures: A Critique of Reproductive Reason*. New York: Columbia UP, 2017.

Dixit, Laura Diamond (et all.), 'Who Builds Your Architecture?'. In *Asymmetric Labors: The Economy of Architecture in Theory and Practice*, ed. Aaron Cayer et al. (Brooklyn: The Architecture Lobby, 2016), 37–42.

Ferreira da Silva, Denise. "On Difference without Separability". In *Incerteza Viva*. São Paulo: Fundacion Bienal, 2016), 57–65.

Foucault, Michel. 'Space, Knowledge, and Power', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 255–56. London: Random, 1984.

Fourquet, François and Lion Murard (eds.), 'Généalogie du capital I: Les équipements du pouvoir', pub. as *Recherches* 13 (Dec 1973); repr. as *Les équipements du pouvoir* (Paris: Union Générales d'Éditions 10/18, 1976).

Gorny, Robert A. 'Reclaiming What Architecture Does'. *Architectural Theory Review*, 22, no. 2 (2018), 188–209.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*. New York: Columbia UP, 2008.

Guattari, Félix. *The Three Ecologies*, trans. Pindar/Sutton. London: Athlone Press, 2000.

Haraway, Donna. 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988), 575–99.

——— *Staying with the Trouble*. Durham/London: Duke UP, 2016.

Hunchuck, Elise. 'Making Space: On the Need for Intersectional Feminism in Architecture School'. *Funambulist* 9 (Jan–Feb 2017).

Massumi, Brian. *Parables for The Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002.

McKittrick, Katherine (ed.). *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*. Durham/London: Duke UP, 2015.

Meillassoux, Quentin 'Subtraction and Contraction: Deleuze, Immanence, and Matter and Memory,' in *Collapse* 3, ed. Robin Mackay, 63–107. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2007.

Nail, Thomas. *Theory of The Border*. New York, Oxford UP, 2016.

Rabinow, Paul. 'Artificialty and Enlightenment: From Sociobiology to Biosociality'. In *Incorporations*, ed. Jonathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter, 234–52. New York: Zone Books, 1992.

Radman, Andrej. *Ecologies of Architecture: Essays on Territorialisation*. Edinburgh, EUP, 2021 [forthcoming].

Rawes, Peg (ed.). *Relational Architectural Ecologies*. London/New York: Routledge, 2013.

Saldanha, Arun. *Space after Deleuze*. London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Seyfert, Robert. 'Beyond Personal Feelings and Collective Emotions'. *Theory, Culture & Society* 29, no. 6 (2012): 27–46

Sherman, Jeremy. *Neither Ghost nor Machine*. New York/Chichester: Columbia UP, 2017.

Stiegler, Bernard. *Technics and Time 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*, trans. Beardsworth/Collins. Stanford UP, 1998.

Tsing, Anna. 'Earth Stalked by Man', *Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 34, no. 1 (Spring 2016): 2–16.

Wallenstein, Sven-Olov. 'CERFI, Desire, and the Genealogy of Public Facilities', in *SITE* 2 (2002), 12–14.

——— 'Genealogy of Capital and the City: CERFI, Deleuze and Guattari'. In *Deleuze and the City*, ed. Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson and Jonathan Metzger, 111–27. Edinburgh: EUP, 2016.

Notes

1   As the following overview will be touching on about a hundred of works, most of which are well-known works, the choice was made to not cite works upon mention when they can be easily identified and found through their author and *Book* or 'Article' title. Instead, aside from work cited in the paper itself, priority was given to references of lesser-known works, and/or 'articles' (here consistently marked by quotation marks) that the map had to include with shortened titles. If not otherwise noted, the given date indicates the original publication year. Note that in the diagram, wherein, due to layout-constraints, the publication dates may have been adapted by a year.

2   See Charles Jencks, 'Evolutionary Tree to the Year 2000', in *Architecture 2000: Predictions and Methods* (New York: Praeger, 1971), 46–47. For related reworkings, see esp. Joe Day, 'Genealogy as Diagram: Charting Past as Future', *Log* 17 (Fall 2009): 121–26; Alejandro Zaera-Polo and Guillermo Fernandez Abascal, 'Architecture's "Political Compass"', posted on Dec 16, 2016, at https://www.archdaily.com/801641/; and Andrej Radman and Stavros Kousoulas, 'Architectural Collective Enunciation: A Question of Forming Relays' (April 2018), TU Delft.

3   Michel Foucault, 'Space, Knowledge, and Power', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Random, 1984), 255–56.

4   Re-translated in Michel Dehaene and Lieven de Cauter, *Heterotopia and the City* (London/New York: Routledge, 2008), 13–30.

5   See Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space* (Cambridge: Univ of Cambridge, 1984).

6   See Sven-Olov Wallenstein, 'Genealogy of Modern Architecture', in *Essays, Lectures* (Stockholm: Axl, 2007). See also his analysis of 'CERFI, Desire, and the Genealogy of Public Facilities', and idem, 'Genealogy of Capital and the City: CERFI, Deleuze and Guattari', in *Deleuze and the City*, ed. Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson and Jonathan Metzger (Edinburgh: EUP, 2016), 111–27.

7   Pub. first as François Fourquet and Lion Murard (eds.), 'Généalogie du capital I: 'Les équipements du pouvoir: villes, territoires et équipements collectifs', pub. as *Recherches* 13 (December 1973); repr. as *Les équipements du pouvoir* (Paris: Union Générales d'Éditions 10/18, 1976). For an overview of the CERFI research, see Wallenstein's 'CERFI, Desire, and the Genealogy of Public Facilities', in *SITE* 2 (2002), 12–14, which also includes translated excerpts; and idem 'Genealogy of Capital and the City: CERFI, Deleuze and Guattari', in *Deleuze and the City*, ed. Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson and Jonathan Metzger (Edinburgh UP, 2016), 111–27. See also Simone Brott, 'Collective Equipments of Power: The Road and the City', *Thresholds* 40 (2012), 47–54.

8   Fourquet and Murard (eds.), *Équipements du pouvoir*, 18–20 [my trans.].

9   On this point, see also the related elaborations by Gökhan Kodalak in this volume.

10 See Rosi Braidotti 'The Politics of "Life Itself" and New Ways of Dying', in *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, ed Diana Coole and Samantha Frost (Durham/London: Duke UP, 2013), 201–18; here 204–209.

11 Penelope Deutscher, *Foucault's Futures: A Critique of Reproductive Reason* (New York: Columbia UP, 2017), 95.

12 Paul Rabinow, 'Artificialty and Enlightenment: From Sociobiology to Biosociality', in *Incorporations*, eds. Johnathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter (New York: Zone Books, 1992): 234–52.

13 Laura D. Dixit, Kadambari Baxi, Jordan Carver, and Mabel O. Wilson, 'Who Builds Your Architecture?', in *Asymmetric Labors: The Economy of Architecture in Theory and Practice*, ed. Aaron Cayer et al. (Brooklyn: The Architecture Lobby, 2016), 37–42.

14 Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity (Durham / London: Duke UP, 2003)

15 Mabel O. Wilson, 'Other Monumentalities', lecture at KTH School of Architecture, April 16, 2015. Recording available online at https://youtu.be/cZU49XznUnA.

16 Mpho Matsipa, 'Order of Appearances: Urban Renewal in Johannesburg' (PhD. diss.), Univ of California, Berkeley, 2014.

17 Epifania Akosua Amoo-Adare, 'Feminist Positionality: Renegade Architecture in a Certain Ambiguity', in *Spatial Literacy: Contemporary Asante Women's Place-Making* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 7–27.

18 See also Elise Hunchuck, 'Making Space: On the Need for Intersectional Feminism in Architecture School', *Funambulist* 9 (Jan–Feb 2017)

19 Anna Tsing, 'Earth Stalked by Man", *Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 34, no. 1. (Spring 2016), here 4–7.

20 See Bernd Bösel's article, 'Affect Disposition(ing): A Genealogical Approach to the Organization and Regulation of Emotions', *Media and Communication* 6, no. 3 (2018): 15–21; and Robert Seyfert, 'Beyond Personal Feelings and Collective Emotions: Toward a Theory of Social Affect', *Theory, Culture & Society* 29, no. 6 (2012): 27–46; here 31. Sara Ahmed, 'Affective Economies', Social Text 22, no 2 (Summer 2004): 117–39; and Marie-Luise Angerer, *Ecology of Affect: Intensive Milieus and Contingent Encounters*, trans. Gerrit Jackson (Lüneburg: Meson Press, 2017).

21 Karen Burns, 'Becomings: Architecture, Feminism, Deleuze', in *Deleuze and Architecture*, ed. Hélène Frichot and Stephen Loo (Edinburgh UP, 2013), 15–39. On 'folding', see also Michael Speaks's preface in Bernard Cache, *Earth Moves: The Furnishing of Territories* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995).

22 Cache, *Earth Moves,* 24; cited in Elizabeth Grosz, *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth* (New York: Columbia UP, 2008), 14; see here 1–24.

23 Quentin Meillassoux, 'Subtraction and Contraction: Deleuze, Immanence, and Matter and Memory', in *Collapse* 3, ed. Robin Mackay (Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2007): 96–97.

24 Brian Massumi, *Parables for The Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2002), 203–204.

25 Levi R. Bryant, Onto-Cartography: An Ontology of Machines and Media (Edinburgh UP, 2014), 9.

26 Karen Barad, 'Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of how Matter comes to Matter', *Signs* 28 (2003), here 822. Haraway had earlier called this the 'material-semiotic'; a concept aiming "to portray the object of knowledge as an active, meaning-generating part of apparatus of bodily production. ... Their boundaries materialise in social interaction. Boundaries are drawn by mapping practices; objects do not pre-exist as such. Objects are boundary projects. But boundaries shift from within; boundaries are very tricky. What boundaries provisionally contain remains generative, productive of meanings and bodies' (Donna Haraway, 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988), here 588, 595.

27 Rosi Braidotti, *The Posthuman* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013), 86.

28 See Braidotti, 'Affirmation versus Vulnerability: On Contemporary Ethical Debates', in *Gilles Deleuze: The Intensive Reduction*, ed. Constantin V. Boundas (London: Continuum, 2009), here 146.

29 Here after Braidotti, *Posthuman Knowledge* (Cambridge: Polity, 2019), 2, 12.

30 Sara Ahmed, *What's the Use? On the Uses of Use* (Durham/London: Duke UP, 2019), 40; Jeremy Sherman, *Neither Ghost nor Machine* (New York/Chichester: Columbia UP, 2017), 14/146 and 114.

31 Derek Woods, 'Scale Variance and the Concept of Matter', in *New Politics of Materialism*, ed. Ellenzweig/Zammito, 200–24.

32 Arun Saldanha, *Space after Deleuze*, (London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2017), 99 [my emph.].

33 Saldanha, *Space after Deleuze*, 96–98.

34 Thomas Nail, *Theory of The Border* (New York, Oxford UP, 2016), 35–40.

35 Robert A. Gorny, 'Reclaiming What Architecture Does', *Architecture Theory Review* 22, no. 2 (2018), 188-209.

36 See Félix Guattari, *The Three Ecologies*, trans. Pindar/Sutton (London: Athlone Press, 2000), esp. 27–69; here after Peg Rawes (ed.), introduction to *Relational Architectural Ecologies* (London/New York: Routledge, 2013), 1–17; see also Andrej Radman, *Ecologies of Architecture: Essays on Territorialisation* (Edinburg UP, 2021 [forthcoming]).

37 Donna Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble* (Durham/London: Duke UP, 2016), 58ff.

38 See Esther M. Choi's talk 'At the Edge of Everything Else', *From Here; For Now* 1 (June 17, 2020), at https://fromherefornow.com/.

39 Bernard Stiegler, *Technics and Time 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*, trans. Beardsworth/Collins (Stanford UP, 1998), 177; 17/135.

40 See Sanford Kwinter, 'A Discourse on Method', in *Explorations in Architecture; Teaching, Design, Research*, ed. Reto Geiser (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2008), 40-45; idem, 'Neuroecology: Notes Toward a Synthesis', in *The Psychopathologies of Cognitive Capitalism 2*, ed. Warren Neidich (Berlin: Archive Books, 2014), 313–33. Andrej Radman, 'Involutionary Architecture: Unyoking Coherence from Congruence', in *Posthuman Ecologies: Complexity and Process after Deleuze*, ed. Simone Bignall and Rosi Braidotti (New York/London: Rowman&Littlefield, 2019), 61–85; idem, 'Architecture's Awaking from Correlationist Slumber: On Transdisciplinarity and Disciplinary Specificity', *Footprint* 10 (2012): 129–41; here 133.

41 Stiegler, 'General Ecology, Economy, and Organology', trans. Daniel Ross in *General Ecology*, ed. Erich Hörl, 129–50.

43 See esp. Sylvia Wynter, "Human Being as Noun? Or Being Human as Praxis? Towards the Autopoetic Turn/Overturn: A Manifesto", unpublished essay (2007); here cited after *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*, ed. Katherine McKittrick (Durham/London: Duke UP, 2015), 9–89.

44 Here after Braidotti's video lecture 'Posthuman, All too Human', Durham Castle Lecture Series, Durham Univ, January 25, 2017, available at https://youtu.be/gNJPR78DptA; here at 0:37:25–38:11).

45 Simon Springer, "Caring Geographies", *Dialogues in Human Geography* (2020), 1–4.