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INTRODUCTION

In Delirious New York, Rem Koolhaas views modern architecture from a Surrealist perspective through the paranoid-critical method of Salvador Dali. Pcm is basically the systematic encouragement of the mind’s power to look at one thing and see another, and the ability to give meaning to those perceptions. A visual analogy-seeking mechanism that exploits the mind’s ability to hold two contradictory images at once, pcm was used by Dali in his paintings that read as double images. As such, pcm is a kind of dialectical thinking. Koolhaas’s adaptation of pcm can be defined as a way of directing coincidental oppositions into contradictory assemblages, i.e. chance encounters. His pcm activity involves systematically making multiple reinterpretations of the fragments of Manhattan.

Koolhaas presents pcm by narrating Dali’s and Corbusier’s trips to Manhattan in the 1930s. The “encounters” of artist and architect are juxtaposed as a polemic adventure in which the protagonists are the personification of confrontation between the unconscious, irrational fantasy of Surrealism and the conscious, rational didacticism of Modernism. Dali is the model; paranoia, the method. Koolhaas reveals how Le Corbusier’s conflation of New York and Paris in the Ville Radieuse recalls Dali’s method of alternative reading. He derives his notions of Manhattanism and retroaction from pcm. He subjects Manhattan to the Dalinian gaze in order to look at the “modern architecture” from different angles simultaneously.

Koolhaas got to Dali through Le Corbusier and his rivalry with Surrealism in the sixties, when he interviewed Le Corbusier for the Amsterdam-based weekly news magazine, the Haagse Post. He makes the conjunction, in Delirious New York, between the Surrealist’s revolutionary project and the architect who declared, “It is a question of building at the root of the social unrest of today; architecture or revolution. The artist and the architect represent the two faces of the avant-garde Modern Movement: its canonical, elitist, authoritarian tradition on the one hand and its concern with the irrational, exotic other on the other. This dilemma, of the Modern Movement’s split between the urge towards heterogeneity and the drive for autonomy and self-referentiality, was also already voiced by Walter Benjamin:

“To win the energies of intoxication for the revolution—this is the project about which Surrealism circles in all its books and enterprises...But are they successful in welding this experience to the other revolutionary experience we have to acknowledge because it has been ours, the constructive, dictatorial side of revolution? In short, have they bound revolt to revolution? How are we to imagine an existence oriented solely toward Boulevard Bonne-Nouvelle, in rooms by Le Corbusier and Oud?”

Koolhaas manifests the confrontation between avant-garde, revolutionary art and architecture through techniques associated with Structuralism, the revolution of poetic language. He moves from Surrealism to structuralism as he assembles his paranoid visions with a logic resembling the plurality of binary oppositions found in the work of Roland Barthes. Just as linguistic theory decoupled the basic dual relationship between a word and object where the former stood somehow for the latter, so is Manhattan a multiple bipolar structure, a
language of relations based on the common denominator of (apparent) opposites. Architecture is pluralised at the level of concepts, buildings and poetic devices, consciously and in an expanded frame.

REALISING SURREALIST GOALS

With Delirious New York Koolhaas realises the Surrealist dream of discovering symbols and myths in Manhattan. When the majority of the Surrealists arrived in New York after the war, they found America alien and as a whole a "land without myth." Looking for icons and symbols to give meaning to their environment, they found nothing in the city that would fit into the modes of thinking that they had brought with them from Paris and elsewhere. New York "lacked precisely that which gave resonance to the places from which they had come. Those sculptural and architectural icons that fulfilled the need for unifying symbols, the streets, buildings and squares resonant with the ever-present past, had few counterparts in the urban environments of the new world." For Koolhaas, America must have seemed surreal. A European who had dreamed of New York as a child and observed it from afar, he saw many things that a native-born American might never have noticed. Delirious New York is an examination of Manhattan during the time the Surrealists were there. It is as if Koolhaas experienced and recorded the "interpretive delirium [which] begins only when man, ill-prepared, is taken by a sudden fear in the forest of symbols."2

The notion of structuring through polarities is based on the surrealist chance encounter. Surrealism used the chance encounter to reconcile the contradictory conditions of dream (the unconscious, irrational) and reality (the conscious, rational). They and other historical avant-garde artists used the readymade as the linguistic expression of the collective unconscious. It was a mass-produced object that reflected the condition of modernity. Koolhaas refers to this condition when he connects the Empire State Building to automatic writing, the practice used to reveal unconscious desires. The Empire State Building is a readymade built by "anonymous" contractors: "The last manifestation of Manhattanism as pure and thoughtless process ... an automatic architecture, the surrender by its collective makers, from the accountant to the plumber, to the process of building taking place at the same time the European avant-garde is experimenting with automatic writing."3

THE PARANOID-CRITICAL METHOD (PCM)

Pcm is an interpretative and creative methodology conceived by Salvador Dali that begins with the simulation of paranoid delirium. Koolhaas uses pcm to intellectualize, objectify, his work and give it meaning. While Delirious New York is a work of history on the places and skyscrapers of the vernacular Manhattan, it is also the affectation of paranoia and delirium to ground his work in the framework of the critical avant-garde. The chapter "Dali and Le Corbusier Conquer New York" demonstrates and explains Koolhaas's adaptation of pcm. The fifth chapter of Koolhaas's book was initially submitted as an article entitled "Theft of New York" to Oppositions and appeared in Architectural Design (1978).

Dali began to be interested in paranoia as it became a popular subject for medical research in Paris. Paranoia was a term already in use in classical Greece to mean delusion or derangement that could occur after an anxious or terrifying dream. It was recognized in 19th century as a form of psychosis in which all kinds of unrelated experiences, images and events were associated and perceived to have causal connections or relations to one central idea, becoming an obsession that was coherent for the subject of the delusion but meaningless to an outside observer. Medically, it was defined as a condition "lending itself to the coherent development of certain errors to which the subject shows a passionate attachment," in which the "errors" are typically worked into an organized system.

Dali recognized that paranoid delirium, when simulated, had potential as a method of critical interpretation. Pcm was to be the "critical exploitation of the unconscious." The logic of the paranoid state of mind could be exploited, as "a form of mental illness which consists in organizing reality in such a way as to utilize it to control an imaginative construction." Paranoiac delirium was determined by the desire of the paranoiac. The delirium would become critical, he proposed, after the fact—when the subject deliberately subjected a chain of associations that was determined by desire to analysis. For Dali, this was a way to elaborate and maintain his own neurotic complexes, which he called "irrational knowledge." In this context his
well-known statement "The only difference between myself and a madman is that I am not mad" takes on more specific meaning. Echoing Dali, Koolhaas "proposes a tourism of sanity into the realm of paranoia."^5

**AUTOMATISM VS. PCM**

Dali conceived pcm as a critique and transformation of automatism. Although pcm was in effect a kind of automatism, the identifying practice of the Surrealist movement founded by André Breton, Dali took great care to distinguish paranoia from the hallucination provoked by automatic writing: Paranoia was voluntary and active as opposed to automatic writing, which was a passive mental state. The significant difference between pcm and automatic writing resides in their respective attitudes towards reality. Automatism was a form of realism, the recording of "mental facts" that expressed the "true functioning of thought," a part of Surrealism’s "future resolution of dream and reality into a kind of absolute reality, a surreality, if one may so speak ... not a matter of opposing surreality to the real but to pushing out the boundaries of the latter in order to include areas normally excluded from it." Dali, on the other hand, wanted to substitute the world of his imagination for the real world. He was critical of automatic writing’s detachment from real circumstance, and believed that all states of automatism should intervene on the "level of action." Pcm was in contrast to automatism an active and concrete way of interpreting the world, as well as a "method" of circulating those symbolic perceptions in life. Pcm addressed real circumstance in order to de-realize it. It was a form of "de-realization." This was the paradox of Dali’s method. Paranoid activity "uses the external world as a means to assert the obsessive ideas, with the disturbing characteristic of making [the] ideas reality valid to others ... the reality of the external world serves as illustration and proof, and is placed in the service of the reality of our mind."^8

Koolhaas re-words Dali’s ideas concerning the paranoiacs distorted relationship with the real world and paranoid-critical activity’s subversion of reality when he writes:

"Paranoid-Critical activity is the fabrication of evidence for improvable speculations and the subsequent grafting of this evidence on the world, so that a “false” fact takes its unlawful place among the "real" facts. These false facts relate to the real world as spies to a given society: more conventional and un-noted their existence, the better they can devote themselves to that society’s destruction."^10

**THE DALINAN GAZE**

Dali linked vision to particular states of mind. The Dalian gaze is the mind’s eye described by the statement, “to know how to look is a whole new system of spiritual surveying.” Pcm is basically the systematic encouragement of the mind’s power to look at one thing and to see another—i.e. to perceive different images within a single given configuration and to give meaning to those perceptions. It is a visual analogy-seeking mechanism that exploits the mind’s ability to hold two contradictory images at once. Dali used it for his many paintings that can be read as double images. Dali meant his couplings to be not just shockingly paradoxical but also to stand for psychoanalytical symbols. He argued the importance of knowing how to look properly. Everything depends upon the ability of the author, he said, whose gaze transforms the object. The images produced by the paranoiacs associative mechanism are objectified after the fact, interpreted as symbols. The associations could theoretically and practically be multiplied, endowing the visual aspects that make up the world with various meanings. Dali’s method aimed for the systematic interpretation of images and the insertion of those interpretations back into the world. Pcm sought to materialize images of concrete irrationality with the most imperialist fury of precision, in order that the world of the imagination ... may have the same objective evidence, the same consistency, the same persuasive and communicable thickness as the exterior world of phenom-
nal reality.” The unconscious mind becomes tangible in vision.

**PARANOIA AS METHOD**

Compare Koolhaas’s conceptualization of the New York Athletic Club with Dali’s *Suburb of the Paranoid-Critical Town: Afternoon on the Outskirts of European History* (1936). Dali depicts three separate, self-contained architectural spaces arranged horizontally across the landscape composed like three different stage sets. Each portrays a world that represented places Dali knew well. His painting incorporates images from other artists such as De Chirico and the two figures from the *Angelus* in various manifestations. The NYAC juxtaposes activities such as apartment, golf course, restaurant whose only relationship is their physical adjacency. Each floor is a different “performance.” This quintessential skyscraper, the essence of the 20th century, contains the garden of paradise, where Adam and Eve and temptation (the apple, mark of knowledge and loss) have been usurped by two boxers eating oysters at an institution dedicated to the body.

Dali’s diagram of pcm demonstrates the desire to make unproveable conjectures tangible. Dali explicitly expressed this aspect:

> The paranoid mechanism, through which the image with multiple figurations is born, supplies the understanding with the key to the birth and the origin of the nature of simulacra, whose fury dominates the horizon beneath which the multiple aspects of the concrete are hidden.”

Koolhaas architecturalizes and overlays double meaning onto Dali’s diagram of pcm. The likening of pcm to reinforced-concrete construction—“infinitely malleable at first, then suddenly hard as a rock”—describes the process by which dream images are “hardened”—solidified, made tangible—through interpretation. The truly pc moment comes when the calcified images begin to liquefy and a stream of associations flows forth. Koolhaas makes architecture a literal metaphor for the paranoid-critical method:

> “Diagram of the inner workings of the Paranoid-Critical Method: limp, improvable conjectures generated through the deliberate simulation of paranoiac thought processes, supported (made critical) by the ‘crutches’ of Cartesian rationality.”

“Dali’s diagram of the Paranoid-Critical Method at work doubles as diagram of reinforced-concrete construction: a mouse-gray liquid with the substance of vomit, held up by steel reinforcements calculated according to the strictest Newtonian physics; infinitely malleable at first, then suddenly hard as a rock.”

The blob of the pcm diagram is one of the spherical objects Dali used in his writings and paintings as metaphors of the eye. Dali refers to the power of the eye to wander: “For us, an eye no longer owes anything either to the face or the static condition or the idée fixe; it must no longer expect anything from the idea of continuity. Quite the contrary; we learnt several days ago that the eyes, just like grapes, have a proclivity for the craziest velocities and that both have a gift for launching themselves into the most contradictory pursuits.”

The blob also represents the creative process manifested as sexual desire. This is seen in the painting *L’Angelus* by Auguste Millet, called by Dali the “the most troubling, enigmatic, dense, richest in unconscious thoughts.” Dali explains the various levels of delirious interpretation he made with this painting in his book published in 1963. Koolhaas explains Dali’s interpretation thus:

> From what is at first a 19th-century cliché—a couple on a barren field, saying prayers in front of a wheelbarrow with a pitchfork stuck in the earth and a basket and a church spire on the horizon, Dali reshuffles the contents and fabricates his own tableau in which he discovers hidden meanings of sexual desire: the man’s hat hides an erection; the two bags in the wheelbarrow become an image of the couple; the woman, with the pitchfork, becomes (literally) the image of man’s desire, and so on.”

*L’Angelus* a cliché that is given “a new lease on life.” This is the crux of Koolhaas’s investment in pcm: to “reshuffle” and give “subversive depth and resilience” to cliché. Koolhaas’s vision is made pre-
dominantly out of cliché and symbol. A cliché is a convention, stereotype, typology. These are received forms related as being public, comprising the "facts" and artifacts that make up the world as we know it. Koolhaas looks at the mass culture of modern architecture. He looks at how others have looked at its basic paradigms, in so doing revealing new and unsuspected facets of the clichés and myths constituting its construction. (A cliché is also another name for the mold, also called a stereotype, into which copper is deposited. This old-fashioned printing process is used in newspaper composition and layout where one letter or image could be reused in different ways. Koolhaas no doubt became familiar with this kind of tool while working in the Haagse Post layout and composition department.)

DEMONSTRATION

Koolhaas's pc activity involves systematically making multiple reinterpretations of the fragments of Manhattan. He redirects pcm's aspects of signification in order to look at "modern architecture" from different angles simultaneously in Delirious New York. His readings of modern architecture are integrated into a symbolic order in SMLXL.

His adaptation/adoption of pcm can be defined as a way of pushing coincidental oppositions into contradictory assemblages, i.e. chance encounters. The work as a whole is marked by the collision of "unsuspected correspondences." Koolhaas finds the points of convergence between supposedly exclusive notions—such as indeterminate specificity, Nietzschean frivolity, reverse epiphanies and voluntary prisoners, just as Dalí's "method" pairs the (ostensibly) incompatible mental states of paranoia and criticism. It is a kind of dialecticism that encompasses his attraction to paradox and to literary tropes of oxymoron. In utilizing pcm Koolhaas rethinks not only the dialectics posited by modernism, such as form/function, but also the dialectical way of thinking that is itself defined as modernist. Modernist dialectic thinking involves synthesis and differentiation. Koolhaas invokes the Surrealist double and its blurring of meanings.

Koolhaas defines pcm as a "delirium of interpretation" that "ties the loose ends left by the rationalism of the Enlightenment finally together." The Enlightenment was characterized by use of catalogues and models. PCM addresses "the fact that all facts, ingredients, phenomena, etc. of the world have been categorized and catalogued, that the definitive stock of the world has been taken." It is "conceptual recycling" that "proposes to destroy ... the definitive catalogue, to short-circuit all existing categorizations, to make a fresh start—as if the world can be reshuffled like a pack of cards whose original sequence is a disappointment." Manhattan is "a catalogue of models and precedents: all the desirable elements that exist scattered through the Old World finally assembled in a single place."

MANHATTANISM AND RETROACTION

Koolhaas derives from pcm his notions of retroaction and Manhattanism—both strategies of return that, like pcm, bear a logic determined by the author’s desire and challenge received ideas.

Like pcm, Manhattanism is situated in the realm of the unconscious. Just as PCM aimed "to systematize confusion and thus help to discredit completely the world of reality," so is Manhattanism's "complex ambition—to stimulate confusion while paying lip service to clarification ... undertaken with the explicit intention of avoiding its logical conclusion."

Koolhaas uses pcm/Manhattanism to conceptualize his own work. Just as PCM is the "conscious exploitation of the unconscious," so is his work "a sequence of architectural projects that solidifies Manhattanism into an explicit doctrine and negotiates the transition from Manhattanism's unconscious architectural production to a conscious phase." Koolhaas will "concretize" Manhattanism, the inexplicit doctrine, i.e. "unformulated theory"—he consciously formulates its unconscious production.

According to Koolhaas, pcm is retroactive—it "existed long before its formal invention." Retroaction is when an event is registered only through a later occurrence that recodes it. Just as "Dalí proposes a second-phase Surrealism through PCM" so Koolhaas proposes a "second coming of Manhattanism" through retroaction.

Through retroaction Koolhaas reads the history of Manhattan as a reflection of his desire. He finds the world is littered with historical artifacts that can be subjected to pcm. Thus amidst the postmodernist search for meaning in its evocation of pre-modern history, Koolhaas finds in pcm a
strategy for reconceptualizing history for his own. He finds a manoeuvre which would negotiate between his use of history and the autonomy required by his desire to be modern, that established a way of confronting the past that took neither an historicist nor a tabula rasa approach and a means to meaningfully reconstruct history’s fragments. Koolhaas’s book is in fact a game loaded with historical reference that shows an ironic pleasure in faking the past while presaging the future. It calls Manhattan a Rosetta Stone. Retroaction is present in Koolhaas’s autobiography both as a series of delays in the story of his activities and in recalling a technique of scriptwriting. Manhattan is retroactive and retroaction derives from pcm.

PARANOID EUROPEANS IN AMERICA

The fifth chapter of Delirious New York entitled “Dali and Le Corbusier Conquer New York” interprets the notion of double reading central to the paranoid-critical method as the battle between two opposing forces that attract/repel each other. He tells the story of Salvador Dali’s and Le Corbusier’s adventures in Manhattan. The artist and architect reflect and represent two faces of the avant-garde European Modern Movement, Surrealism and Modernism. They personify the confrontation between conscious, rational didacticism and unconscious, irrational fantasy. Dali’s project is strictly verbal and therefore its conquest of New York is complete. Le Corbusier’s is literal and architectural, “therefore more implausible that Dali’s.”29 “Dali and Le Corbusier Conquer New York” also establishes Le Corbusier as the personification of “modern architecture.” As such he is the alter ego of Manhattanism: “Le Corbusier’s urbanism contains no metaphor, except that of Anti-Manhattan, which is, in New York, unseductive.”30 Koolhaas “discovers” Le Corbusier was paranoid. When the French architect arrived in America with the Plan Voisin, he found that skyscrapers already existed in Manhattan. Why did he need to invent skyscrapers when they already existed? “It is Le Corbusier’s all-consuming ambition to invent and build the new city commensurate with the demands and potential glories of the machine civilization. It is tragic bad luck that such a city already exists when he develops this ambition, namely, Manhattan.”35 Ultimately, Manhattan’s skyscrapers they were more convincing than Le Corbusier’s, whose urbanism was essentially boring and banal. In the Plan Voisin, Everyday life will regain its eternal immutability amidst the essential joys of sun, space and vegetation. To be born, to die, with an extended period of breathing in between: in spite of the optimism of the Machine Age, the Old World vision remains tragic.”36 Corbusier needed justification that his work was better than what already existed and didn’t need improvement. Koolhaas ridicules Le Corbusier’s failure to find a patron in New York which led him to seek commissions in other parts of the world and mocks his feigned indifference to publicity and concomitant attempts to position himself as leader, prophet and visionary. Le Corbusier is “a paranoid detective who invents the victims, forges the likeness of the perpetrator and avoids the scene of the crime.”37 Le Corbusier represses his paranoia in contrast to Dali, who critically and self-consciously cultivates it.

It is to ameliorate this situation that Koolhaas shows how the French/Swiss architect unwittingly used Surrealist techniques: The “Plan Voisin” is planned, it seems, according to the early Surrealist theorem Le Cadavre Exquis, whereby fragments are added to a body in deliberate ignorance of its further anatomy.” Koolhaas subjects the architect perhaps most associated with dialectics to further dialecticism.38 Le Corbusier’s pairing of Manhattan/Ville Radieuse, Plan Voisin/Paris and Paris/New York in Urbanisme is evidence that his “method of operation show(s) many parallels with Dali’s pcm.” It
is the proof that "Architecture is inevitably a form of pc activity."²³

WALLACE HARRISON

Juxtaposed to the paranoid-critical method in—Delirious New York is the chapter preceding "Dali and Le Corbusier Conquer New York" on the work of Wallace Harrison. Harrison’s UN building is juxtaposed to Le Corbusier’s unbuilt scheme. For Koolhaas, Harrison embodied American professional skills and the unconscious of Manhattan. Harrison’s lack of doubt enabled him to build the UN. The 1939 World’s Fair exhibition designed by Harrison had unknowingly rediscovered the sphere and the tower, the two archetypes of Manhattanism. The brilliance of Manhattan disappeared during the era following World War II, manifest by the appearance of the curtain-wall glass boxes, buildings X, Y and Z, at Rockefeller Center.

POSTSCRIPT

After the publication of Delirious New York, one of Koolhaas’s preoccupations became the place of the avant-garde architect within the profession. By this time, OMA had already been criticised for its investment in representation to the detriment of practice, by Demetri Porphyrios in “Pandora’s Box” in Architectural Design. Koolhaas reacted to this critique by signaling his interest in the professional skills of the architect who was Raymond Hood’s assistant at Rockefeller Center, mounting in 1979 at the Institute an exhibition on Harrison. The structuralist activity in Delirious New York linked avant-garde art, Surrealism, to the pragmatic architecture of Manhattan and the modernism of Le Corbusier. Upon the publication of SMLXL, almost 20 years later, the pcm’s aspects of signification would be redirected and integrated into a symbolic order reflecting the logic of Koolhaas’s desire to look at “modern architecture” from different angles simultaneously. SMLXL expands and augments its predecessor, to “bring together in a living and viable way the most different and the most contradictory elements in the greatest possible freedom.” (quoted from the well-known interview of Benjamin Buchloh with Gerhard Richter)
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