


el formato digital es incapaz de transmitir). Web y materia se complementan recíprocamente, alimentando sus aspiraciones mutuas, como lo hacen los llamamientos a manifestarse a través de las redes sociales y su experiencia física final en las plazas públicas de nuestras ciudades ¿Dialéctica fundamental físico-digital o sensibilidad en tránsito? Aún es difícil de determinar. En el caso de las revistas, la mayoría nace de la coyuntura de la crisis económica internacional de 2007-8, y no pasan en muchos casos de sus siete primeros números, por lo que su continuidad y arraigo está aún por definirse. Lo que sí parece es que la proliferación de estas *zines* deja claro que la crisis de la construcción no ha significado ni mucho menos una crisis de las ideas, y que las nuevas generaciones parecen estar dispuestas a replantear su entendimiento de la disciplina desde posturas socio-políticas más amplias, más heterogéneas y mucho más imprevisibles de donde queremos encasillarlas.

I.

"The rise and rise of independent magazines: New Architectural Magazines, the freedom of the press and the rebirth of the author", en *Abitare* 512, Milan, 2011 (165-71)



1 PORTADA DEL LIBRO

RESEÑA 4: RESEÑA LIBRO

**SIMONE BROTT,
ARCHITECTURE FOR A FREE
SUBJECTIVITY: DELEUZE
AND GUATTARI AT THE
HORIZON OF THE REAL
(ASHGATE, 2011)**

THERE IS NO OUTSIDE OF
SUBJECTIVIZATION, OR
ARCHITECTURE IN THE ACT OF
BECOMING

AUTOR:

José Vela Castillo

"There is no outside of subjectivization" states Simone Brott near the end of her collection of insightful essays. And it could be said this is a very good résumé of her book; a résumé and a demand, and a polemical assertion as well as an obvious corollary, or, in more than one way a desire projected toward the uncertain conditions of architecture and architectural theory today.

There is no outside of subjectivization as there is also no outside of metaphysics proper, a more common affirmation that nevertheless does not appear in the text, maybe because, as is well known, Deleuze was not really interested in this problem. Yet this unresolved dialectical operation in thought necessarily touches upon the main subject of the book: the systems or processes of subjectivization that are identified (in architecture) as having significance now and, perhaps, for all time.

In a time, here and now, where the known metaphysical Ego, the Cartesian subject, has both faded away and yet seems to outlive its present disastrous condition anyway, Brott's project both maps the surfacing of a different (free) subjectivity that overrides the frontiers between "interior" and "exterior" (exploring the given concepts of time and space as preconditions of any perception, beyond Kantian identification between interiority and time and exteriority and space) and the apparent exhaustion of architectural theory in favor of a projective approach.

In Brott's view architecture is always on the verge of becoming, of becoming as an

independent entity that could enable a broad field of alternative subjectivization, one that does not appear as such to a prior existing subject, but one that, in fact, engages itself in a field of impersonal effects in the very process of perception/affectation. If in some ways the baroque concept of “affects” is present here (and I think not by accident, given the deep relationship between Deleuze’s thinking and that of Spinoza and Leibniz), “affects” affect us, building through a field of “impersonal effects” a detached and mainly aesthetical subject that negates (and transcends) the given (and fixed) subject-object distinctions of Descartes.

If architectural subjectivity is to be staged as a myriad field of affects or a constellation of *impersonal effects*, the main concern will be to allow the affection into us of these effects, acknowledging an “us” that is in constant flux and in an unending process of becoming, one that constitutes manifold temporal agencies, and one that conjoins both matter and perception (if they are not the same) in an unstable and ever-changing subjectivity (hence the *processes* of subjectivization as key event).

At this point, it is interesting to note some relations and differences between Deleuze/Guattari-Brott’s project concerning the subject and Derrida’s approach to it. Of course the Deleuzian project is intentionally *held at a distance* from the textuality grounding Derrida’s deconstruction. In this way, Deleuze proposes an “empiricist” approach apparently at odds with Derrida’s well known hauntings. For example, in a famous issue of *Cahiers Confrontation* (no. 20, Winter 1989), after the question Who comes after the subject?, Deleuze’s answered, more or less, nothing comes after the subject — because “there is none” in the first place (there will be only *singularities*). Meanwhile Derrida, interviewed by Jean-Luc Nancy, elaborated a complex genealogy of the topic. Interestingly enough, in one very cogent moment Derrida retraced the subject (and the complex — ject, the motion buried in sub-ject/pro-ject/-jection) to a topological “concept”: “Mais à la place «du sujet», il y a quelque chose comme un lieu, un point de passage singulier”. As Derrida says, maybe this is not exactly a place, but a kind of instance, un

“«qui» assiégé par la problématique de la trace et de la différence, de l’affirmation, de la signature et du nom dit proper, du jet (avant tout sujet, objet, projet) comme *destinerrance des envois*”. The point is that this precise instance is the “subject” of two related questions (two subjects); the one of hospitality and the one of the gift, with both of them intimately related with this non-place/place, and — ultimately — with the place of architecture as analogue for subjectivization (knot of impersonal affects) versus subject (knot of individualized/personal consciousness).

What is interesting here, and what Brott develops so thoughtfully in Deleuze and Guattari’s oeuvre, is the intimate relationship between subjectivization (subject beyond the putative metaphysical subject) and architectural effects: architecture being not only what triggers such, but what allows the different processes of subjectivization to happen. Hence the importance, that Brott traces sharply, of an “architecture with a proto-ethico-aesthetic strategy to circumvent the long pathology of the absent subject, and to discover something new — an image of subjectivity yet to come” (page 118).

Architecture for a Free Subjectivity proposes, beyond its balanced history of Deleuzian ideas on subjectivization and the troubled reception of both Deleuze and Guattari in the architectural milieu of the USA and the deep relations between Guattari and the Japanese atmosphere of the ’70s and ’80s, an important new-old program and paradigm: that of an “architecture without qualities”, an architecture that opens the path to the unexpected, an architecture that in its motionless configuration *through* processes and immanent affections retraces a new ethico-aesthetic agenda for the time to come.