

**Abstract:** The current architectural pedagogy is exposed to similar problems (of a push for standardization) as the ones that were faced in the late 20th Century. The systems of pedagogic nurture in academia, which were presented then were rejected by some, including Gilles Deleuze, who proposed a new-less structured way of teaching. Untethered by overly rigid definitions and expectations of good or bad scholarship his students were encouraged to pursue their own path of reasoning. This paper is an exploration of the way in which this approach was convened looking in particular at Deleuze's relationship with Bernard Cache as well as the interconnection of their work.

**Keywords:** Deleuze, Cache, multiperspectival, philosophy, postmodern

### **Pedagogical nurture through other means; A style of educating for architects by Gilles Deleuze**

While thinking of nurture, we can easily lose ourselves in conjuring images of safety, tenderness, and mindfulness of the idle object of our knowing care. Eager to protect and nourish it, we may find ourselves at risk of overwhelming its potential by treating it according to ready-made answers to old ethical or pragmatic questions; and while in this delirious state we can easily develop an expectation that the object of our attention will propagate and become an exemplar signifier of this safe, ethical approach. To these means we may propose methods that are designed to achieve our goals, which may or may not be aligned with the desires or abilities of the object of our care. Saying this, if we find the courage to release our loving grip we may see that the precariousness of liberty carries not only risks but also opportunities.

This essay suggests reflecting on forms of pedagogy that imply an over-nurtured and overbearing approach to the teacher-student relation and adopting an attitude that is not oppressive and is based on freedom to develop. The assertion here is that the higher education teaching proposes a model of education that stands the risk of not only excluding creative solutions or methodologies that allow investigating spatial matters but more pressingly individuals who may feel uncomfortable when faced with ready-made answers presented by the tutors. This paper discusses a situation where the rupture with established dialogues and development of new sentiments rejected both the nurture of the Modernist ways of seeing citizenry and architectural style that fosters it which came to establish determined expectations of architectural outputs. This rupture of approaching pedagogy of architecture did not

carry the methods of the old teachers (caring perhaps too much about style) so that the students-teacher relation could result in a different architectural ethos.

The case study here is not the only one of this kind in the long history of pedagogy relating to architecture; it is of the relation between Gilles Deleuze (whose philosophy can be seen as one that was not oppressive and not fixed on a single reference point and rather can expand as needed following a number of perspectives) Bernard Cache, an architect who claims that his designs are following the route of 'philosophy through other means'. As such the principal aim of this paper is to show how the relation between Cache and Deleuze was articulated in their work and allowed the teacher to propose a more refined and precise articulation of his ideas, while embracing and elevating those of his student's. The paper also describes how this approach was achieved through a rejection of a singular point of reference in the identity of an academic teacher and accepting that their dialogues can be understood differently. In convening this relation Deleuze allowed for his ideas to float free and be at times understood in ways that he perhaps didn't intend; in doing so he proposed a new system of nurture, one that advocated freedom from the hegemony of repetitive overtly rationally argued pedagogic solutions and tested ways of following social values; and by doing this, he also demanded a level of responsibility from those who were under his care. In this way, the core of his philosophy was to de-centralise thought and allow it to become multi-perspectival so that the ontology described in his writing (as well as that of his students) could become relational and non-dictatorial. This was not a sign of neglect or mean-heartedness but a careful rearticulation of nurture where the stress of pedagogy was played out differently – in a way that is much more difficult to define, setting out a field of possibilities for ideas to form. The route that this process took, accompanied by a pluralist pedagogic approach, allowed for the teacher's ideas to detach from conventional ways of seeing architecture.

The relationship between Deleuze's and Cache's academic life tightly intertwined; both referred to one another in their publications on several occasions. Deleuze openly complimented Cache's works by saying that it is 'inspired by Geography, architecture, and decorative arts, in [his] view [it] seems essential for any theory of the fold'<sup>1</sup>; the fold being here the representation of Deleuze's ideas of spatial and

---

<sup>1</sup> Giles Deleuze, *The Fold; Leibniz and the Baroque* (Continuum: London, 2006) p.144.

metaphysical relations in architecture. This paper is mainly based on key texts in which the relationship between Deleuze and Cache is made explicit and analyses the means through which both referred to one another's key ideas. Examples of these include Cache's *Terre meuble (Earth Moves)* first published in 1983 where Deleuze's rhetoric is implicitly engaged with as well as Deleuze's *Le Pli; Leibniz et le Baroque (The Fold, Leibniz and the Baroque)*. The paper here brings the two close together to make explicit the ideas of spatial qualities that they exchanged and goes on to analyse the spatial objects presented in these texts through their definition of the point of inflection.

Deleuze's pedagogic approach carries several issues that contradict contemporary trends of convening higher education. It stands the risk of the knowledge and experience of the teacher being mis-communicated or not internalised or the student's feeling anxious due to lack of guidance, clarity and inability of quantifying the learning outcomes. These issues, in the circumstances of contemporary higher education pedagogy leaning towards a model where the student becomes a client in a pre-defined transaction (money for knowledge), feels wrong. Saying this, it opens the discipline to innovation and more individuals to accessing the profession.

This paper is structured in a way to exemplify the argumentation that supports its aim; in doing so the text is divided into five consecutive sections which follow. The initial one, comparing the state of architectural pedagogy at the time of Deleuze and in contemporary times; the second, analyses Deleuze's philosophy and his way of conducting dialogues to present the nurturing affects for architecture that are the subject of this paper; the third, indicating how Cache's rhetoric fits into the Deleuzean dialogues; the fourth, looking into Deleuzean philosophy in detail and how Cache's concept was referred to and how it nurtured a specific image of spatial relations; and fifth, concluding remarks.

### **Post-Modern Higher Education Architectural Pedagogy**

After The Second World War the shortage of housing and necessity to rebuild the desolated European cityscapes mobilised the architectural profession; faced with a multiplicity of challenges, architects started re-evaluating the core of their profession. Robert Oxman stipulates that the debates around design took what he

calls a more open form that contributed to a sense of renewal<sup>2</sup>. These, as he argues lead to the development of a new dimension in the architectural ethos and education by proposing new objectives and methods that could encapsulate the sombre and complex role that the architectural profession had to meet and one that the previous (Modernist) approaches did not.

Similar sentiments were expressed in The United States of America where the struggle to find an expression of identity instigated questions about the validity of the modern movement. In *Complexity and contradiction in architecture*, a piece that is an elaboration of his earlier intellectual work, Venturi calls his understanding of architecture 'impure' and 'distorted'<sup>3</sup>. he prefers to see 'inconsistent', 'rich', 'perverse' and 'messy vitality' in architecture as opposed to the 'obvious unity' that modernist architects who came before him seemed to prefer<sup>4</sup>. Venturi attacks the 'Corbusean Purism' of 'primary forms' that were so deeply rooted in modernist traditions of design. In his own words he 'welcome[s] the problems and exploit the uncertainties. By embracing contradiction as well as complexity, [he aims] for vitality as well as validity'<sup>5</sup>. His intellectual journey was accompanied by Denise Scott Brown who analyses the problematics of Colonial architecture in America by discussing the paradoxes of authenticity<sup>6</sup>. Her rhetoric explicitly referred to Venturi and touches upon a re-evaluation of assumptions about architecture typical of European nation-states which, as she claims, are being used to establishing similar passions across the Atlantic. When discussing Las Vegas Scott Brown develops a whole narrative unpicking the assumptions that create a uniform understanding of architecture carrying tired notions of attachment and nostalgia through the fixation on the architectural language.

In this atmosphere of reflection engagement with disciplines outside of architecture offered a respite and an avenue to propose alternative solutions that are not dictated by aesthetic style. Several architects including Peter Eisenman, Gregg Lynn

---

<sup>2</sup> Robert Oxman. 'Towards a New Pedagogy' in *Journal of Architectural Education*. 39:4(1986), pp.22-28.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Venturi. '*Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*' (Museum of Modern Art: New York, 2016) p.16.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p.16.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p.16.

<sup>6</sup> Denise Scott Brown. '*Words; Having Words*' (AA Publications: London, 2009).

and Philippe Rahm (just to name a few)<sup>7</sup> indulged in the literature and ideas put forward by Deleuze and started using his writing to inspire their design practice. In this sense, a departure from established conversations on architectural design was permissible and even encouraged. This approach to the architectural ethos opened the profession to be reinvented and stale ways of seeing architectural elements that were assumed as essential were to be re-articulated. Voices of people such as Robert Segrest, criticised Boyer Report in which the image of architectural education can be seen as overly nurtured and based on a narrow definition of social progress and a singular image of consensus suggesting a series of action points that should be taken<sup>8</sup>. Newton D'souza notices that in more recent times the architectural discipline is following suit, privileging a very narrow set of skills and ways to investigate space, thus depriving the profession of creative avenues in which spatial design can be accessed<sup>9</sup>. The unification of architectural pedagogy was also challenged by Linda N. Groat and Sherry Ahrentzen who suggested that the pedagogic discourse is being convened in a way that is abrasive not only to ideas but also to students who do not have the same aims after graduation as what was assumed by educators, thus alienating a huge portion of talented individuals<sup>10</sup>.

In the current architectural pedagogy in the UK the discipline faces more and more regulations which standardise the architectural design industry and discount the post-War debates which were contemporary to Deleuze. The overseeing body that regulates the discipline since 1837 is the Royal Institute of British architects. It's role is to ensure that graduates are able to operate in industry in a safe and knowing way. This regulation is specific to the discipline itself and aims at curating an environment for good and progressive practitioners to emerge. A much more generic form of regulation came in the form of the Dearing Report in 1997, which was a consensus of academic disciplines and pushed for a reform in the way Universities functioned to

---

<sup>7</sup> Adrian Parr. 'Politics + Deleuze + Guattari + Architecture' in *Deleuze and Architecture*, ed. By Helen Frichot and Stephen Loo (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2013) p.199.

<sup>8</sup> Robert Segrest. 'The Architecture of Architectural Education' in *Assemblage*. 33(1997), pp.76-79.

<sup>9</sup> Newton D'souza. 'Revisiting a Vitruvian preface: the value of multiple skills in contemporary architectural pedagogy' in *ARQ*. 13:2(2009), pp.173-182.

<sup>10</sup> Linda N. Groat and Sherry Ahrentzen. 'Reconceptualizing Architectural Education for a More Diverse Future: Perceptions and Visions of Architectural Students' in *Journal of Architectural Education*. 49:3(1996), pp.166-183.

adapt to the challenging environment of higher education. It asked that all lecturers receive a higher education teaching qualification in the initial years of their teaching career. As such lecturers, who specialised in their own consecutive disciplines, were asked to undergo training that advertised approaches to teaching based on a unified Higher Education Academy's Professional Standards Framework. What is more, on 16 July 1998 the teaching and higher education bill which was passed into law. It asked that students be charged with fees for their student experience. Subsequently, the amount of money the students were charged changed over the years as did the financial support in the form of loans they were offered. In 2010 the fees increased substantially without a comprehensive debate in parliament about how this change will influence the role of the student body in the landscape of higher education. With the graduate contribution system in place, the students were not asked to pay up front but only when they can afford to do so. This allowed for more inclusion but the prospect of being in debt for a long period left a bitter aftertaste and asked the Universities to intensify the debate of what role the students have in shaping the higher education environment.

This disciplined the Universities to present the curriculum and importantly expectations of the course to the students before they enrol so they know what they are to expect but at the same time asked the teaching team to specify the teaching method and output before they meet the student, asking to standardise the bespoke and individual relation between the student and tutor. Even though more daring architectural programs ask for a creative reflection on idiosyncratic design briefs there is always a set of rigid expectations and outputs the students are meant to satisfy. This places pressure on the tutor to pre-envision the teaching strategy and disengage with the Post-Modern debates on architecture.

### **Deleuze And Students**

Deleuze approach to narrating his understanding of philosophy is difficult to engage with and uses architecture as a subject of his debates but also as a tool to explain his ideas. This is the reason that architects were drawn to his rhetoric. Architecture, as an art of orchestrating relations in space and without a fixed meaning, served well to dissolve the oppression of dictatorial enunciations and convey Deleuze's relational ontology and fit in with the Post-Modern debates on architecture. This meant that the nurture of academic ideas in conversations with him was intentfully

difficult to pinpoint and was not conforming with traditional pedagogy. At times, his focus was drifting into very personal and emotional territories. This attitude was to challenge and propose an alternative to Modern discourses<sup>11</sup> that present a very rigid set of right and wrong answers. This allowed his students to engage with his ideas on their level and, as opposed to repeating fixed notions, develop their own approaches.

One of the fundamental assumptions of Deleuzian dialogues is the elimination of the centre-point in his rhetoric that might have dictated questions, solutions, and answers which may suggest a tactical strategy of nurturing specific ideas. Instead of doing so, Deleuze proposes a framework that allows opening up and accepting different forms of dialogue; this manifests in the style of articulation that he operates with. One of the ways in which this attitude is expressed is the assumption of the roles between teacher and student in the propagation of ideas. In *What is Philosophy* Deleuze and Guattari write:

[T]he teacher refers constantly to taught concepts (man-rational animal), whereas the private thinker forms a concept with innate forces that everyone possesses on their own account by right ("I think"). Here is a very strange type of persona who wants to think, and who thinks for himself, by the "natural light".<sup>12</sup>

The text follows with a narrative of the importance and prevalence of the 'private thinker' persona in philosophy and their role in developing ground-breaking ideas that may not fit in with old, often outdated assumptions. In fact, the role of conducting philosophy is to encapsulate a friction in the relation between the state of knowing and state of naïve doubting, continually becoming the private thinker over and over. The notion of nurture here, as a concept that necessitates a leading and knowing hand, becomes challenged along with the hierarchies of the teacher-student relation.

Joe Hughes argues that Deleuze's reading is intently non-linear and consciously challenging the reader's habits and asks to forget conventions so that they can

---

<sup>11</sup> Peter Eisenman and Carlos Brillembourgh, 'Peter Eisenman' in *Bomb* 117(2011), pp. 66-73. p.68.

<sup>12</sup> Giles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1994) p.62.

adopt to a new, more open, and humble way of thinking<sup>13</sup>. Hughes argues that this aesthetic is deliberate and is an educational tool that helps to convey Deleuze's philosophical position<sup>14</sup>. He suggests that Deleuze's texts present a plethora of ways to dissolve a signifying reference point for his philosophy, implying a multiplicity of ways in which his ideas can be understood. An example would be the explanation of the same concept several times in the same text that changes certain details but maintains a single conceptual character. In this way, the concept that is put forward can be seen as almost vibrating around a defined mean position but is never truly static. Deleuze applied this method to the definition of a *refrain* in *A Thousand Plateaus*<sup>15</sup>. The *refrain* appears several times in the text, much like a repetitive chorus, each time adding to or moulding the previous definition. In doing so Deleuze is true to his own multifaceted and plural rhetoric and would not place himself in the centre of the debate but rather dissolves it and asks the reader to compose their own (at times fragmented) understanding. In *What Is Philosophy* Deleuze outwardly writes that a concept is 'a heterogenesis-that is to say, an ordering of its components by zones of neighborhood'<sup>16</sup>. Through this way of articulating, Deleuze proposes a new type of conducting philosophy – one that is non-oppressive and non-critical of other lines of thought. He rather allows thoughts to come together without being forced to fit in to comply with a forceful, transcendental ideology.

Following from there and in terms of pedagogy Deleuze's approach is similar to the post-colonial attitudes put forward by people such as Paulo Freire<sup>17</sup> or Gert Biesta<sup>18</sup> who advocate dissent from politicised positions in a teacher-student relation and strive away from the normative ways in which education is convened. In fact in *What Is Philosophy* Deleuze suggests that for him pedagogy is a tool to keep his philosophy in check and not deviate into incomprehensibility<sup>19</sup>. In this way, he subjugates himself and his philosophy to the discussions he had with his students. This approach,

---

<sup>13</sup> Joe Hughes. *Philosophy after Deleuze* (Bloomsbury: London. 2012).

<sup>14</sup> Ibid p.5.

<sup>15</sup> Giles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, 'A Thousand Plateaus' (Bloomsbury Publishing: London, 2013).

<sup>16</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 1994. p.20.

<sup>17</sup> Paulo Freire. 'Pedagogy of the Oppressed' (London: Penguin Classics. 2017).

<sup>18</sup> Gert Biesta, *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy* (London: Paradigm Publishers, 2010).

<sup>19</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 1994.



without a strong and simple message, might seem disorientating however Deleuze's students could not help but attend his sessions. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbra Habberiam write on Deleuze's seminars at the University of Vincennes:

[The seminars] took place every Tuesday morning, in a tiny seminar room, choked with smoke, where only those who arrived an hour early would find a seat. Deleuze's 'explorations' would be informal and far-reaching with frequent questions and interruptions.<sup>20</sup>

The informality may here mean a less regimented or pre-planned format of a strictly policed central point in the discourse where Deleuze would be the leader nurturing ideas. Deleuze's way of thinking and articulating at the time was concurrent with major developments in architectural theory as discussed earlier in this paper.

The next two sections of the essay show how the relation between the ideas of Deleuze and one of his students, Bernard Cache is conveyed, embraced, and encouraged.

### **Cache And Deleuze**

Amongst the many architects who referred to Deleuze his student, Bernard Cache stands out as not only a creative designer but also an exceptional scholar of architectural history and theory. Cache studied mathematics, engineering, architecture, philosophy, and business<sup>21</sup>; he claims that his understanding of architecture was always from the position of an outsider and his journey to use Deleuze so prominently, amongst many other historical figures started when Cache attended Deleuze's seminars<sup>22</sup>. Cache considers his designs to be, in his words: Philosophie poursuivie par d'autres moyens (a philosophy attained through other means) which is a play on Carl von Clausewitz's, 'a continuation of politics by other means'<sup>23</sup>. In *A Plea for Euclid* he writes that designing architecture is a practice that deals with a translation of a multidimensional space into a 3-dimensional Euclidian

---

<sup>20</sup> Tomlinson and Habberjam, in Giles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *'Dialogues II'* (Continuum: London, 2006) p.ix.

<sup>21</sup> George Legendre and Bernard Cache. *'George L Legendre in Conversation with Bernard Cache'* in AA Files. 56 (2007): pp.8-19. p.8.

<sup>22</sup> Boyman in Bernard Cache, *Earth Moves; The furnishing of Territories* (MIT press: London, 1995).

<sup>23</sup> Legendre and Cache, p.9.

figure<sup>24</sup> and in *Objectile: Poursuite de la philosophie d'autres moyens*<sup>25</sup> Cache, similarly to Deleuze, refers specifically to Henry Bergson where he hints on the importance of the qualitative aspect of spatial perception.

His fascination with Deleuze is complemented by an interest in historical examples of design which may be seen as parametric. His practice works with landscapes of form to transform their conventional aesthetics and create new opportunities for functionality; some, more daring items push the boundaries of materiality. In 2019 Cache published *Projectiles*, which is a compilation of essays in which he explicitly references Deleuze and how his philosophy has inspired the designer's work. *Projectiles*, as Cache writes, 'is a commemorative essay that aims to evoke the extraordinary adventure of engaging with Gilles Deleuze's thoughts'<sup>26</sup>. The project does so through fixation on undulating forms, fascination with Baroque as well as Gottfried Leibniz and other historical figures. In his writing Cache challenges the problematics of sameness which come from the essentialist tie to established forms and means of production; in doing so he started advocating the virtues of total differentiation. His lecture *Towards Contemporary Ornamentation Manufacturing process* presents the virtues of parametricism and presents his work<sup>27</sup>; he suggests that his aim is a search for the dissolution of the object and an experiment in searching for a new and creative way of seeing a plane in the context of not only aesthetics but also structure.

This strive to attain an undetermined meaning of an element through industrial production is similar to the Deleuzean idea of the fallacy of a fixed identity. In *Earth Moves* Cache suggests that at the time of writing the book or weaving the narrative that came to compile its narrative it was 'no longer (...) possible to think in terms of identity'<sup>28</sup>. He goes further to suggest that it essentially leads to a 'dead end' by establishing a form that responds to an abstract situation in a given moment in time

---

<sup>24</sup> Bernard Cache, 'A Plea For Euclid', in *Anyone*. 24(1999), pp.54-59.

<sup>25</sup> Bernard Cache, 'Objectile: Poursuite de la philosophie d'autres moyens', in *Puf*. 20(1998), pp.149-157.

<sup>26</sup> Bernard Cache, *Projectiles* (AA Publications: London, 2019) p.15.

<sup>27</sup> Bernard Cache, 'Towards Contemporary Ornamentation Manufacturing process' <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E--F2xFhwGY>> [accessed 9 June 2020].

<sup>28</sup> Bernard Cache, *Earth Moves; The furnishing of Territories* (MIT press: London, 1995) p.15.

or an understanding thereof informed by the past. Rather, he suggests following contemporary philosophical strands to 'work beneath the surface of identity'<sup>29</sup>.

To exemplify his point, Cache discusses the functions of transformation that compose any architectural form: 'inflection, vector and frame'<sup>30</sup>. He describes mathematical equations and presents his conceptualisation of the point of inflection<sup>31</sup> (which is the subject of this paper). The description is based on graphical ways of finding a topographical form which have maxima and a minima singular points – by which Cache means graphs that don't follow further down-into infinity beyond a defined minimum point and up-beyond a specific maximum point. In such cases, the graph folds back in on itself. Cache follows that the points between the two extremes are points of inflection<sup>32</sup>. He writes that '[i]n this way, the inflection represents a totality of possibilities, as well as openness, a receptiveness, or an anticipation'<sup>33</sup>.

He then suggests that this state of inflection is not a stable one and that rather than indulging in their character architecture seems to be more likely to seek more established ideas that signify a specific meaning to inform design. In this vein Cache also mentions the Kantian idea of 'interiority' which is an aesthetic manifestation of common interest- a concept that comes into Kant's philosophy at the same time as intersubjectivity and without which the aesthetic judgment of an object or even a piece of architecture would be difficult<sup>34</sup>. Cache comments that the art of architecture is to recognise the variations in probabilities on site. He notes the difficulty of designing in this way by writing:

'The rigid form of the [architectural] frame cannot coincide with that of an effect that is always subject to variations and is only probable. That is why the frame belongs to a register of autonomous forms whose principle must still be defined.'<sup>35</sup>

Cache's text in *Earth Moves* is complemented by images showing three-dimensional objects; several more abstract items are presented and juxtaposed against one

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. p.2.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. p.16-17.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid. p.17.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. p.17.

<sup>34</sup> Magdalena Ostas. '*Feeling, Absorption, and Interiority in the Critique of Judgement*' in University of Nebraska Press. 18:1-2(2010), pp.15-30.

<sup>35</sup> Cache, 1995 p. 29.

another in a series of photographs<sup>36</sup>. The scale and material are difficult to discern; they undulate and change in shape almost like objects made of a fluid or viscous material and in the process of responding to a series of forces warping, twisting, and extending out. The elasticity of these bodies makes one wonder what shape the object takes when observed from a different perspective. The impression of their dynamic appearance is only anchored by the light reflected by the objects (that appears to indicate a glossy surface) and their texture (which is always parallel to its base and appears to be too regimented to represent a malleable piece). The objects do not have an easily identifiable purpose, they simply are, more-so they are in a state of joyful and stressless ambiguity - almost balancing on a cloud.

Much like the points of inflection, the objects seem to represent a type of suspension of production where their functionability is yet to be determined or is rather unspecified in the field of possibilities. To paraphrase Cache, the objects *represent a totality of possibilities, as well as openness, a receptiveness, or an anticipation*. The composition of the objects within their context can be misleadingly understood as apolitical in the sense that they do not explicitly serve any purpose in the production of a predictable affect. Without a clear and rational purpose, the aesthetics of the items may be said to emphasise the process that produced them. The lack of familiar associations to function allows the objects to operate on the periphery of politics as an opportunity to engage personal sensations, or the emotionality of wonder, uncertainty, and bafflement. In this way, it must also put the designer in a precarious state of not knowing how their design will be received without the safety of an established pattern that may sanction the form through a standardised schema or an affiliation with an institutionalised marketability of predictable aesthetics. Thus, thinking of the process as opposed to the end-result of the labour that constructed the items is not at all apolitical but engaging the designer in a complex set of very personal sensations. They also ordain an affect in which the possibilities of responses to the design become de-centralised from familiar concept and liberated from a standardised approach. In this sense, it can be said that the idea of multi-perspectivity to engage with the objects is extended as it not only becomes physically complex but also emotionally challenging.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. p.121.

## Deleuze And Cache

Cache's writing was explicitly influenced by Deleuzian rhetoric and was picked up by Deleuze himself while discussing Baroque. The objects of the writing are the same and the foundation stone for the philosophical framework in both Deleuze and Cache is relational ontology, but the nuance in the specificity of concepts varies. This suggests that a lineage can be traced between the two but its core assumptions are signified by an area of semantics rather than a carefully nurtured argument. In one instance, a key concept from *Earth Moves* was incorporated in Deleuze's writing on the architectural fold and published a few years later under the same title. *The Fold* touches upon Baroque which, as Deleuze suggests, has deep foundations in mathematical physics and curvilinearity<sup>37</sup>. Deleuze proposes that Baroque is not a prescribed aesthetics with an ideal set of rules and ratios as well as a serene and calm composition but a particular attitude to design. Helen Hills suggests that for Deleuze, Baroque offered a theoretical decomposition of a sense of subordination leaving the composition open to infinity<sup>38</sup>. Hills suggests that Baroque destabilises and redacts points of reference from relations and assumptions of the role of the detail in the whole composition. In describing this, Deleuze refers to the Baroque thinkers: Dutch physicist Christiaan Huygens and Swiss historian Heinrich Wölfflin. He also introduces German Philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz who is an important figure in *The Fold*; it might be said that the way he was presented outlines the extent of Deleuze's fixation with the idea of infinity, humility, and plurality in accepting and propagating ideas. Leibniz writes:

Now, as in the ideas of God there is an infinite number of possible universes, and as only one of them can be actual, there must be a sufficient reason for the choice of God, which leads Him to decide upon one rather than another (Theod. 8,10,44,173,196 sqq., 255, 414-416)<sup>39</sup>

Gregory Flaxman suggests that Deleuze proposes a more sophisticated idea than just the design style in *The Fold* and by referring to Leibniz and Baroque he outlines a

---

<sup>37</sup> Deleuze, 2006.

<sup>38</sup> Helen Hills. ed. *'Rethinking the Baroque'* (Ashgate Books: London. 2011).

<sup>39</sup> Gottfried Leibniz. *'Monadology'* (Anodos Books: Whithorn. 2017). Paragraph 53.

way of understanding spatial relations in their totality<sup>40</sup>. In this light Deleuze is detaching Baroque from expectations of a classically single-perspectival and limited view and identifies a wider range of possibilities.

Deleuze reaches out to contemporary architects and makes a specific reference to Cache's description of the point of inflection from *Earth Moves*. Deleuze writes:

Bernard Cache defines inflection – or 'extrema' (extrinsic singularities, maximum and minimum), it does not refer to coordinate: it is neither high or low, neither right nor left, neither regression nor progression. It corresponds to what Leibniz calls an 'ambiguous sign'.<sup>41</sup>

He follows on to add that the event of inflection can also be referred to as a point of view, from a virtual point and ideal state that only exists in the soul of the perceiver to its real manifestation that has a physical place, position, and site.

'To the degree it represents variation or inflection, it can be called point of view. Such is the basis of perspectivism, which does not mean dependence in respect to pre-given or defined subject: to the contrary, a subject will be what comes to the point of view, or rather what remains in the point of view. That is why the transformation of the object refers to a correlative transformation of the subject (...)'<sup>42</sup>

Here, Deleuze unfolds the complexities of relational ontology and the idea that objects and subjects change one another through their assumed positions in space.

A sentiment that Deleuze repeats almost word for word throughout the book is the notion that inflection is associated with subsequent development of a sense of inclusion. If the inflection is an ideal beginning that introduces the subject into a relation with an object and allows for a mutual transformation without pre-given concepts then it might be assumed that this point is a blank slate – a pre-inclusive state of openness from which an inclusion into a relation can begin. In the point of inflection and at the outset of a relation any object will come across as, (following Deleuze:) 'manneristic, not essentializing'<sup>43</sup>. Saying this the ideal state of the beginning is precarious; any deviation left or right on the function from this point may spoil its character and give it an essentialising and non-manneristic quality by drifting to the maxima or minima on the function that may indicate a strong identity. If then,

---

<sup>40</sup> Gregory Flaxman. 'Gilles Deleuze and the fabulation of philosophy' (University of Minnesota Press: London. 2012).

<sup>41</sup> Deleuze, 2006 p.15.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. p.21.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. p.20.

change leads to a sense of inclusion then it would stand to scrutiny that inclusion, demands a signifier of identity. Deleuze also writes on organisms in a pond:

In fact, it is the inorganic that repeats itself, with a difference of proximate dimension, since it is always an exterior site which enters the body; the organism, in contrast, envelops an interior site that contains necessarily other species of organisms, those that envelop in their turn the interior sites containing yet other organisms.<sup>44</sup>

This sense of interior sites can be seen as a way of including into a larger universal whole and plays on sentiments for Kantian interiority. This concept of interiority was also discussed in *Dialogues II* (first published in 1977) with Clare Parnet<sup>45</sup>, yet another of Deleuze's students. It might be said that the event of establishing a signifier that can be shared, such as the definition of a pond or species, an inclusion into the event of *being in* or *being part of* can take place. Deleuze explores this conceptualisation of how these spatial narratives come to being that defines not only intellectual movements but also interior sites.<sup>46</sup> Interiority here can be understood as real but at the same time is a misleading account of the state of unified composition as any change in perspective of the elements involved in their envelopment can put in question their unity that can be shared and re-assemble the parts forming a new interiority.

To illustrate Deleuze's point, the narrative of *The Fold* is inexplicably intertwined with architecture as well as art that was produced in the Baroque spirit. He suggests that 'painting needs to leave the frame and become sculpture'<sup>47</sup>. This preference for a 3-dimensional form in his understanding of Baroque is facilitated by the reminiscence for several craftsmen which define the intellectual development of Baroque. While mentioning exceptional artists he lingers on Gian Lorenzo Bernini and lists several of his art pieces. Examples include the bust of Louis XIV and the Blessed Ludovica Alberoni; Deleuze signifies one sculpture especially, that of *The Ecstasy of Saint*

---

<sup>44</sup> *ibid.* p.10.

<sup>45</sup> Deleuze and Parnet, 2006.

<sup>46</sup> This state should not be thought of entirely as simply physical or only metaphysical nor should they be considered as a metaphor; Deleuze explicitly resents treating his writing as allegorical. Deleuze and Parnet in *Dialogues II* explicitly state that this engagement with other branches of knowledge is simply that as opposed to a carefully constructed metaphor which may suggest a level of transcendentalism. Deleuze and/or Parnet write 'It is never a matter of metaphor; there are no metaphors, only combinations' in Deleuze and Parnet, 2006. p.117.

<sup>47</sup> Deleuze, 2006 p.140.

Teresa<sup>48</sup>. The composition of this piece consists of St. Teresa on a cloud and an angel standing over her, holding her tunic, and aiming an arrow at her heart. Her persona is warped, twisted, and extended in a dynamic way almost as though it was elastic and weightless; her tunic becomes the most suggestive element of the composition, loosely covering her figure without redacting the expressiveness of her posture. Her eyes, half-open and her lips uncontrollably gasping for air make her experience both intimate and intense; one cannot help but share St. Teresa's passions in this fleeting, suspended moment in which Bernini managed to capture her story. Deleuze's eye is caught by the extraordinary folds of the tunic that clothe her body; those, as he suggests, play a more significant function than just decoration<sup>49</sup>. We will probably never be sure what exactly Bernini was thinking of when crafting the sculpture but Susane Warma offers a compelling interpretation. She writes that St. Teresa was here presented in a state of ecstasy that she, herself describes as experiencing 'true revelation' at the moment of her death when the angel violently yet gently pierces her heart with an arrow that represents the love of God<sup>50</sup>.

There is no clear front nor a distance from which St. Teresa's experience should be admired, the space around her is defined by the statue and indirectly attempts to include its perceivers into the story of the Saint. Even though the sculpture is framed by columns and access to it is restricted with each step closer and to the side of the sculpture adds to the experience of being with or even being St. Teresa and sharing the passions that misshape her body. Each change in viewpoints does not just add to the aesthetic qualities of the sculpture but can change the meaning of the depicted event. Each, in itself, may be seen as a point of inflection and an introduction into her story. If one views St. Teresa from the side, one could miss her face entirely. This would make the angel the focal point of the composition. However, if one were to see the sculpture from the other side, one could miss the angel's hand holding Teresa's tunic redacting the violent aspect of the event. The totality of the composition in this way needs to be seen from many angles, each revealing a new aspect of St. Teresa's story that Bernini generously presents us with.

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> St. Teresa quoted in Susanne Warma. 'Ecstasy and Vision: Two Concepts Connected with Bernini's *Teresa*' in *The Art Bulletin*, 66:3(1984), pp.508-511. p.508.



To see them all is not only to know the full story but to become included in Teresa's ecstasy. Moving around the sculpture is to become part of it again and again. Like the images on a film reel each emerging from the last and becoming a new one in the future, the moments of perceiving the sculpture offer a new sensation through movement adding to the story shared by so many scholars and theologians. In this way, the piece should be perceived in movement in the space around it as one walks slowly taking in all the complexities of the multifaceted and multi-cavernous or multi-folded geometry. But the sequence in which the elements of the sculpture are seen can also distort the story as any new noticed element will be infected with the memory of the last. The folds that Deleuze is so interested in exemplify this logic, even though the folds are made of marble they seem much softer and much more delicate, falling slowly and gracefully almost in motion; each carved into the stone from a different angle so that the crevices which they enclose cannot be peered into at one glance. It can be understood that the folds which Deleuze discusses in his book are much more than a physical manifestation of stone and can be thought of as a link between what is imminently here and that which is metaphysical or present only in memory. If we understand a change of perspectival position as a new situation where we discover a new image of the folds in St. Teresa's appearance then each perspective will offer a new point of view, a chance to reorganise the role of the self in the composition of the interiority. It will then become a point that denotes a noticeable change in the understanding and appreciation of the form.

The sculpture as a piece of stone is a point of inflection but it is by necessity polluted with the signifiers that ordain it – it is infused with the stories of the turbulent passions of the saint. The sculpture is nothing more than a block of white marble but the ideas that it represents are designed to fold it in or overlap it with a much more elaborate meaning, a shared story of a saint's violent death, and the sensations she went through. The multi-perspectival character of the sculpture provides a space which varies the storyline of the Saint's passion with changes of the points of view that it can be admired from. The interiority around it then can be said to be including the perceivers into St. Teresa's story albeit always associated with a layer of relativity and frailty in its composition, it will always be fragmentary and incomplete. The meaning of this peace as an element of spatial design becomes a vibration around a mean central position.

## **Concluding Remarks**

After the Second World War the late-20th century architects and educators of architecture started a debate criticising efforts to consolidate and standardise the profession. Voices against uniformity in the architectural education argued that it may be too abrasive and result in a stagnant, and exclusive image of architecture. At the same time, formal reports were written calling for a uniform approach to all subjects in higher education. They asked for a much-needed reform of the Universities in the United Kingdom. These calls ran in parallel with the changing role of the student body that asked for a pre-conceived curriculum and pre-planned learning outcomes from each academic subject, which made the engagement with individual students not bespoke.

A model of higher education which should be included in the debate about how to change the architectural pedagogy is the engagement between Gilles Deleuze and Bernard Cache. Even though Deleuze did not specifically aim at teaching architectural design, his rhetoric is deeply spatial and touches on ontology which cannot exist without the concept of relationality. This was picked up by Cache whose architectural designs are the embodiment of what he calls 'philosophy through other means' and a reflection on his engagement with Deleuze. There is a definite relation between Deleuze and Cache in their research, as stated in their publications and references in their work. Cache's projects play on relational ontology as do Deleuzean texts, while Deleuze referred to Cache's rhetoric in his development of the fold as a spatial concept. In explicitly referring to Cache's work, Deleuze exposed his way of nurturing ideas that followed his philosophy.

Deleuze did not want to present the students with his ideas but create conditions for them to question the world. In a way, it could be said that he aimed at becoming a 'private thinker' and de-centralise the dialogues in his 'choked with smoke' office. This pedagogical approach was pluralistic and allowed for concepts to emerge without a strict discipline for what form they may have or a rigid expectation what they should become. This is evident in the way Deleuze continued his dialogue with Cache in their professional life.

Both Cache and Deleuze discussed the idea of the 'point of inflection' and both used Kant and Leibniz to signify the quality of this concept. For both the point is

relational as well as temporal and signifies a blank slate that is open to a range of possibilities to include into a multiplicity of events. Looking at the designs which came from Cache's office it could be said that he tried to encapsulate its qualities in a physical object – a form that is suspended at the moment of becoming something concrete. Deleuze refers to Cache's text in which he describes the point but refuses to engage with Cache's design-thinking returning rather to Baroque art that tells a very specific story. The reference is an acknowledgement of the relation between the two and a specific link of Deleuze's philosophy to architecture; however, the deflection of the key medium used by Cache may suggest that perhaps Deleuze's understanding of the point or philosophy in general is different. It might be the case that for Deleuze the point cannot be physical and for him it can only exist in a virtual state while the physical world and architecture are already too inclusive in a Kantian interiority. It could also mean that for Deleuze the dissent from the point of inflection happens at the level of emotionality and perhaps this is where the differences between the two arise.

The dialogues between the two show how Deleuze aimed to decentralise the dialogues between him and his students, nurturing the rise of concepts in a free way and giving rise to an affect that is multiperspectival and freed from rigid expectations. This attitude gave rise to a new form of architecture inspired by new developments in technology and unbound by requirements of learning outputs. It is this freedom that perhaps we should recognise as one that carries value even though it does not carry the burdens of overly nurtured and controlled design sensibility amongst students.

## References

Gert Biesta, *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy* (London: Paradigm Publishers, 2010).

Denise Scott Brown. *'Words; Having Words'* (AA Publications: London, 2009).

Bernard Cache, 'A Plea For Euclid', in *Anyone*. 24(1999), pp.54-59.

Bernard Cache, *Earth Moves; The furnishing of Territories* (MIT press: London, 1995).

Bernard Cache, 'Objectile: Poursuite de la philosophie d'autres moyens', in *Puf*. 20(1998), pp.149-157.

Bernard Cache, *Projectiles* (AA Publications: London, 2019).

- Bernard Cache, *'Towards Contemporary Ornamentation Manufacturing process'* <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E--F2xFhwGY>> [accessed 9 June 2020].
- Giles Deleuze, *'The Fold; Leibniz and the Baroque'* (Continuum: London, 2006).
- Giles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *'A Thousand Plateaus'* (Bloomsbury Publishing: London, 2013).
- Giles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *'What is Philosophy?'* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1994).
- Giles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *'Dialogues II'* (Continuum: London, 2006).
- Newton D'souza. 'Revisiting a Vitruvian preface: the value of multiple skills in contemporary architectural pedagogy' in *ARQ*. 13:2(2009), pp.173-182.
- Peter Eisenman and Carlos Brillembourgh, 'Peter Eisenman' in *Bomb* 117(2011), pp. 66-73.
- Gregory Flaxman. 'Gilles Deleuze and the fabulation of philosophy' (University of Minesota Press: London. 2012).
- Paolo Freire. *'Pedagogy of the Oppressed'* (London: Penguin Classics. 2017).
- Linda N. Groat and Sherry Ahrentzen. 'Reconceptualizing Architectural Education for a More Diverse Future: Perceptions and Visions of Architectural Students' in *Journal of Architectural Education*. 49:3(1996), pp.166-183.
- Helen Hills. ed. *'Rethinking the Baroque'* (Ashgate Books: London. 2011).
- Joe Hughes. *'Philosophy after Deleuze'* (Bloomsbury: London. 2012).
- George Legendre and Bernard Cache. *'George L Legendre in Conversation with Bernard Cache'* in *AA Files*. 56 (2007): pp.8-19.
- Gottfried Leibniz. *'Monadology'* (Anodos Books: Whithorn. 2017).
- Magdalena Ostas. *'Feeling, Absorption, and Interiority in the Critique of Judgement'* in University of Nebraska Press. 18:1-2(2010), pp.15-30.
- Robert Oxman. 'Towards a New Pedagogy' in *Journal of Architectural Education*. 39:4(1986), pp.22-28.
- Adrian Parr. 'Politics + Deleuze + Guattari + Architecture' in *Deleuze and Architecture*, ed. By Helen Frichot and Stephen Loo (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2013).
- Robert Segrest. 'The Architecture of Architectural Education' in *Assemblage*. 33(1997), pp.76-79.
- Robert Venturi. *'Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture'* (Museum of Modern Art: New York, 2016).
- Susanne Warma. 'Ecstasy and Vision: Two Concepts Connected with Bernini's *Teresa*' in *The Art Bulletin*, 66:3(1984), pp.508-511. p.508.