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Abstract
This article explores how philosopher Gilles Deleuze's theory of the fold is extended to architectural design, and how such an extension prompts 'event' in both the conceptual and realistic senses. In doing so, this article conducts two case studies: 1) the Rebstockpark Master Plan (1990-1991), and 2) The Aronoff Center for Design and Art (1988-1996). These two projects have similarities in that both were influenced by a Deleuzian theory of the fold in one way or another, which highlights that the world we live in is not so much homogeneous and fixed but rather multiple and in a perpetual process of becoming. While one can detect the influence of Deleuze's theory in these Eisenman projects, it becomes more prominent in the latter case—the Aronoff—given that it is a built project in which the architect's design conception provokes a multitude of events through the entanglement of various individuals' fabrics of everyday life. By looking at both the conception of the fold proposed by Eisenman, and my habitual encountering with his built project where his theory is actively implemented, I claim that the Deleuzian event is not just a spectacular kind prompted by Eisenman himself, but unfolds in more subtle ways.
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1. Introduction
More than two decades have passed since the theory of the fold first gained critical attention in architectural fields under the rubric of 'the digital'. Although such an issue is now considered more or less a historical reference, in my paper, I claim that theory and practice of the fold is a perennial inquiry that cannot simply be 'done', which is more than just a history in a fixed sense. Considering that the fold is a potentiality that could always generate events in relationship with varying environmental settings, as well as that such events are unpredictable and most often improvised, studies about the fold require procedures of continual reconsideration and refashioning.

While investigating the historiography of the fold is still a crucial part in exploring critical moments shaping the discipline of architecture, ways in which the fold is practiced in daily life in varying situations is also crucial to note, especially because, according to Gilles Deleuze, who first proposed the theory of the fold in a comprehensible manner, the folding process never repeats exactly the same, and always generates differences, although subtle and often left inattentive.

Deleuze's proposition of the fold provoked a society of multiplicity and contributed in generating a number of discourses in the fields of art, architecture, design, and related fields, all of which are roughly defined by the complexity of the world that is mediated through various digital apparatuses such as 3-D programs, the Internet, social media, and others. Hence, Deleuze's fold might be nothing new in today's digitized world in which terms such as 'post-digital', 'post-internet', and 're-mediation' prevail; however, considering that such an idea is at times narrowly understood in the subfields of architecture, either in reference to 'literal' fold as child's paper-folding play or as an 'absolute' source of causality that would lead to a material entity activated through design. These instances are still considered folding in an architectural sense; however, I propose to understand the concept more broadly, by considering folding to be an open system that is beyond the realm of architectural design. In order to explore such openness, one needs to pay more attention to ways that architectural works are designed and used in everyday life. Architectural fold is not only a kind of spectacle but also an extension from the everyday; in this respect, paying attention to ways in which those two seemingly different strata—spectacle and the everyday—coexist and bring forth 'events' that are enabled through disparate performances of a multitude of human and nonhuman agents in quotidian settings, is what I am interested in exploring in my article.

In doing so, I will focus on discussing two cases: the first is the Rebstockpark Master Plan (1990-1991) (Fig.1.), an unbuilt project proposed by Peter Eisenman, one of
the renowned architects whose work is directly related to issues of the fold; and the second is a built project by Eisenman that is the Aronoff Center for Design and Art (1988-1996) (Fig.2.). Both works were made in reference to different geo-cultural contexts, the former in the old residential district of Frankfurt, Germany, and the latter on the University of Cincinnati campus in Ohio, United States; however, looking at these two projects together along with the notion of the fold offers an excellent opportunity to explore how his theory of the fold is brought forth on both the conceptual and realistic levels.

Structurally speaking, this article is divided into three parts. First, I will overview the main points of the fold that Deleuze theorized; it will offer a ground from which to investigate how the concept was elaborated in architectural studies. The second part is to analyze the Rebstockpark project in detail, which will help us to understand how Eisenman develops the idea through his work, as well as to discuss how successful his practice of the fold was in that case. The last part is to explore the Eisenmannian fold in relationship with everyday life, by analyzing the Aronoff Center for Design and Art; this will be in particular based on my own experience of the building, which is subjective on one hand, but nevertheless prompts an inter-subjective mode of experience, from which to speculate the multiple relationships between his theory and its actualization in materialized ways.

2. Deleuze's Fold and Architectural Thinking

One defining feature of Deleuze's notion of the fold is its doubling nature: a doubling of thought, doubling of matter, doubling of subjectivity, and doubling of a myriad of other aspects comprising the world. This process of doubling, however, does not mean that one element is simply divided into two in a literal sense, as if there were an entity given first and its deconstruction performed afterwards. Instead, doubling is a process of multiplication that does not have a clearly defined point of origin, such that elements generated through the doubling are never the same one another. Deleuze notes on this point:

"But the double is never a projection of the interior; on the contrary, it is an interiorization of the outside. It is not a doubling of the One, but a redoubling of the Other. It is not a reproduction of the Same, but a repetition of the Different" (Deleuze: 1988, 98).

Deleuze also notes that elements unfolding through doubling do not so much become subordinated to the original but rather continually produce worlds that are semi-autonomous by nature:

"...no matter how small, each body contains a world pierced with irregular passages, surrounded and penetrated by an increasingly vaporous fluid, the totality of the universe resembling a 'pond of matter in which there exist different flows and waves'" (Deleuze: 1993, 5).

According to Deleuze, folding resists solidified states of matter and memory. Things scattered around the world always have the potential of folding and unfolding, in ways that generate new territories as loosely tied to differing points of origin. Through the process of folding, things are always put in the process of becoming; some of them are excavated and thus 'actualized' in concrete material forms, whereas many others remain latent to develop, which Deleuze calls 'virtual,' be it poeitries, paintings, buildings, billboards, murals, consumer objects, image reflections over show windows, and a myriad of others comprising the world. Things that are actualized become part of the reality, whereas things folded in the virtual realm only have the latency to be 'possibly' actualized at some point in the future.

These two pair concepts—'the actual' and 'the virtual', and 'the real' and 'the possible'—are what Deleuze articulates in his theory of the fold, but it is crucial to distinguish their differences as well. If 'the virtual' includes multiple ways of realization drawn from the constituents of the world, 'the possible' refers to a predetermined sort of relationship. Actualization is similar to realization, but is more of a subtle condition with which things transform in relation to tactile, or environmental qualities such as temperature, humidity, or noise, such that forms of actualization always vary. Deleuze elaborates on this aspect:
"God chooses one world among an infinity of possible worlds: the other worlds also have their actuality in monads that are conveying them ... Therefore there exists an actual that remains possible, and that is not forcibly real. The actual does not constitute the real ... The world is a virtuality that is actualized monads or souls, but also a possibility that must be realized in matter in bodies" (Deleuze: 1993, 104).

According to Deleuze, the world where we live is just one aspect of the complexity that could always extend into a myriad of others, which produce multiple rhythms and differences, resonances and dissonances, disciplined patterns and its deviations. The 'Baroque House' is a diagram in which Deleuze elaborates his concept of the fold. This allegorical model addresses the following: the world that we live in consists of two different systems: 1) a windowless private room in the upper story where the soul resides; and 2) an open space comprised of multiple windows (apertures) and public rooms in the lower story. These two systems are not separated from each other but coexist and remain to be actualized through multiple interventions in everyday life (Deleuze: 1993, 4-5). What lies between the two worlds is a translucent, flat layer connecting them. Although the Baroque diagram seems to presume a separation between body and soul, like the way that Rene Descartes conceived the world of the everyday by considering bodily experience as an impediment, Deleuze complicates such a dualism, by claiming that "[e]ach soul is inseparable from a body that belongs to it, and is present to it through projection. ... The world is actualized in souls, and is realized in bodies" (Deleuze 1993, 119-120).

Hence, Deleuze's theory of the fold is not just about an objective depiction of the world, but instead a subjective engagement in both material and immaterial ways. He claims that subjectivity does not operate through a fixed, closed system. Adrian Parr notes on this point: "Specifically, the concept of the fold allows Deleuze to think creatively about the production of subjectivity, and ultimately about the possibilities for, and production of, non-human forms of subjectivity" (Parr: 2005, 103).

According to Parr, the practice of folding produces both human and non-human forms of subjectivity. It means that the subject is a composite made of a myriad of 'monads' in the Leibnizian sense. As Deleuze explains, monad is the smallest unit comprising the world. It has "no window," but allows transitions between the inside of each monad and its outside, which thus constantly alters its nature. In addition, monads release what Deleuze calls "preindividual singularities," which are neither solely generic nor singular but mixed together and dispersed throughout the world we live in (Deleuze 1993, 63-64). Although monad has no windows, as Leibniz notes, it has "a manifoldness which changes," which then prompts "the specific nature and the variety of the simple substances" (Leibniz 1988, 48-50).

Such a Deleuzian notion of the fold was highly influential in the fields of architectural design and theory in the 1990s. In this respect, the special issue of the UK-based magazine Architectural Design, with the title "Folding in Architecture," is a hallmark in this regard. Released in May 1993, the issue consists of a series of essays that examine how Deleuze's concept of fold can extend to uncharted territories; it includes an excerpt from Deleuze's book, and essays contributed by notable architects and theoreticians such as Peter Eisenmann, Greg Lynn, Frank Gehry, Jeffrey Kipnis, Mario Capro, and John Rajchman.

The editor Gregg Lynn's introductory essay is particularly worth reading closely, since it summarizes the overall scope and goal of the issue. Lynn writes in this respect: "For the last two decades, beginning with Robert Venturi's Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture, and Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter's Collage City, and continuing through Mark Wigley and Philip Johnson's Deconstructivist Architecture, architects have been primarily concerned with the production of heterogeneous, fragmented and conflicting formal systems" (Lynn: 1993, 8).

Considering Venturi's book to be an early exemplar that explored the heterogeneity of architectural design, although his age was not fully matured in terms of the evolution of the digital, Lynn offers a brief geography of digital architecture in the 1990s. However, it is crucial to note that such attentiveness to the digital (and Deconstructivism) is not in itself an end goal; rather, as Kenneth Powell points out, these new trends in architecture derived from an aspiration to rethink "homonogeneity and orthodoxy in favour of an honest acceptance of discontinuity and disjunction" (Powell, 1993, 7), as well as "pliancy and smoothness" of the world we live in (Lynn: 1993, 8). In addition, as especially prominent in the works of Peter Eisenman and Bernard Tschumi, the term 'event' was more actively integrated into their design, with which they strove to mobilize their work in relation to large geo-cultural contexts and psychic dimensions. Then what would be the specific strategies in activating such concepts? An in-depth analysis of the Rebstockpark Master Plan by Eisenman will be a specific point of investigation in this respect.

3. Unfolding Events in the Rebstockpark

The site of the Rebstockpark project is located in the residential/industrial areas of Frankfurt: the siedlung housing blocks to the east, athletic fields to the west, the Autobahn to the north, and warehouses to the south (Eisenman: 1991, 12). And the boundary of the site is widely curvilinear. The small avenue coming from the siedlung penetrates the west-east axis of the site, although it gradually becomes curved towards the west. Demarcating lines towards the north, alongside the Autobahn, affects the arrangement of building blocks; they are divided into a few different zones. There is a central idea that distributes a number of different building
blocks across the location within the given site, but each unit is more or less influenced by nearby urban contexts instead of by a centralized plan (Figs.3.-5.).

Simply put, the subdivision of the site resulting in a complex pattern that consists of multiple lines that are both straight and intensely bent, is one of the main characteristics of the project. According to Eisenman, the site is not the most important thing to consider, but, to borrow his words, "a condition of singularity." He continues to explain on this point:

"The ground of Rebstock is no longer a datum or a base condition but rather is, in fact, something which already contains a condition of singularity; that is a groundlessness which can be said to be inherent in the notion of ground" (Eisenman: 1993, 25).

To elaborate the point, an architect is to follow the given conditions of the site, but also to excavate the multiple layers through active engagements in creative ways. It is 'creative' in that he/she pays attention to the site's contexts, but not exactly in the sense of the historical contextualism that was proposed as an alternative form of practice with which to overcome the top-down modernist urban planning. That is to say, one needs not presume a hierarchical order between the given and its move, or between the ground and the groundlessness, in ways that things scattered on the given site are seamlessly groundless. Critic John Rajchman elaborates in this respect:

"... It [the matter of dealing with a given site] is concerned with a kind of depth that is not a ground, as with Rowe, but rather the 'groundless' depth of an intensive space in the extensive one that includes or frames it. ... For Deleuze this deep or groundless complexity is always virtual--disparation is always a virtuality in a space, a sort of potential for free self-complication" (Rajchman: 1998, 18).

Such a remark might thus give a justification that architects like Eisenman can be free in dealing with the site conditions, at times altering the topography or resonating some other aspects in order to maintain its contexts that those encountering the site could be sympathetic to.

By setting out the ground of the Rebstockpark to be groundless in a positive sense, Eisenman begins generating his own way of site planning, by actively utilizing mathematics as a critical means of design. Eisenman refers to the French mathematician Rene Thom's 'catastrophe theory.' In doing so, Eisenman activates 'events' in his design, by utilizing the seven series of drawings as primary materials. Each drawing represents a 'butterfly cusp,' and the juxtaposition of those drawings on the same plane generates the multiplicity of lines and planes, from which Eisenman strategically and selectively assembles fragmented territories that ultimately are the constituents of the project and bring forth events as the potentiality that could be performed by those who encounter the site with varying situations. According to Eisenman, such assemblage is a way of grasping the unrepresentable moments within the grid system that a typical planning cannot produce. In other words, he does not make clear by addressing the predicated scenarios of events, instead offering the possibility of events that fold and unfold in relation to the site, which undulate both vertically and horizontally. Eisenman makes a clear demarcation of the Frankfurt site, but, as imbricated through his application of the fold, the given site conditions are part of what he aims to generate, the complexity and heterogeneity of a site's performativity put in contact with local milieus. Thus, both a faithful survey of the given site and an imagination matter on an equal level: the inflections of the site instigated through computer tools are not subordinated to the sense of the place. Indeed, almost every spot within the site, such as the siedlung and near the Autobahn, is tweaked in ways that open up varied modes of experience, where one cannot clearly orient oneself by the surroundings, but is more or less lost in the specificities of the spot that shape the sense of the place.

If the zoning of the Rebstockpark is one thing, the displacement of building blocks in the site is another. Both strata are designed with different strategies and do not make a clear visual and spatial harmony, but they are eventually entangled together, shaping what Eisenman
aims to highlight. A few different types of buildings are distributed in terms of function, either commercial or residential, which loosely follow the curvilinear contour of the site. The early form of the Rebstockpark drawing looks similar to the one of siedlung, in which building blocks are predominantly rectangular and in line with the perpendicular lines inside and outside. However, this rectangularity gradually moves. Particularly noticeable are several intersections between drawn lines with differentiated densities and intensities, intersections folding and unfolding that ultimately generate what Eisenman refers to as ‘events.’

While analyzing the site planning informs us how Eisenman generates events through displacement and landscaping, it is also worth looking at some of the buildings in detail, which illustrate how such an idiosyncratic urban design operates through the morphology of architectural design. Eisenman writes on this:

"The nature of the fold is that it replicates multiple cusp figures in the type suggesting further iteration in the development of each building. Folding as a morphological discourse allows for the possibility of any fold, no matter how slight or delicately poised, to reconfigure its context entirely with the simple unfolding of a minor cusp" (Eisenman: 1991, 42).

'Cusp' is here not merely an endpoint between lines in a geometrical sense, but more to do with what Deleuze calls an 'inflection,' a tension where a continuity stops and is disrupted by outside forces, which destabilizes a given equilibrium and opens up multiple possibilities of events. Deleuze explains that "inflection … is the pure event of the line or of the point," and the singularity of a line or a point already implicates its multiplication in contact with given milieus (Deleuze: 1993, 15). Either curved or folded, even stretched, by a force, a point, line, or plane disrupts solidified entities and generates new terrains from which things might be brought forth in unexpected manners. Simply saying, multiple cusps produce multiple events, and Eisenman applies this theory of event to design through advanced digital techniques. Eisenman begins his design with rectangular hexahedrons, but their interventions become more complex, as multiple lines and planes that are diagonal, curved, or zigzagged complicate its point of origin. So the process of juxtaposition generates multiple possibilities of events, which are however not simply the result of a cause-and-effect relationship that has lost its 'origin,' but the multiplication of origin itself that does not seek to find the origin from the past conditions.

So it is at least clear that what is prominent in the Rebstockpark is the activation of folding as a threshold, which generates events in non-predicted manners. The inflected lines comprising the site create differing modes of experience, and the variations of building typology bring forth the strata of folds in which the 'uncanny' prevails, in the sense that the seemingly banal fabrics of the site appear extraordinary, although momentarily. Context is here considered crucial, but only in the sense that there is no prior definition of context detached from the fabrics of the given milieu; instead, as instigated by Thom's catastrophe theory, context is an uneven, non-autonomous, and malleable entity that is dependent upon the changing conditions of everyday life. But the catastrophic condition where events arise does not mean that a given milieu is a complete chaos from its birth; instead, such a condition is gradually and consistently altered through multiple interventions and improvisations. Eisenman's design is the prime exemplar in this respect. Walter Benjamin also considers origin to be meaningful only when it works as a condition from which the process of "restoration" and "reestablishment" is at play through an 'eddying' (thus under radically destabilized) condition (re-quoted from Boetzkes: 2010, 81).

4. Experiencing Non-spectacular Events in Everyday Life: The Aronoff Center for Design and Art (1988-1996)

While the Rebstockpark is a project in which Eisenman develops his theory of the fold on a conceptual level, in this section I propose to explore how such a conception is at play within the realm of everyday life, in ways to examine the relationship between a provocation of theory and its activation. This analysis is based on my own experience of the building, which goes back to a two-year period from 2006 to 2008, during which I was pursuing my master's degree in Architecture at the University of Cincinnati (The building is most often called DAAP, which is an abbreviation of its full name: College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning) (Fig.6.).

Aronoff Center for Design and Art is a renovated work: the existing structure was comprised of a group of buildings, which include the L-shaped main body, Alms Building, and Wolfson Center, upon which Eisenman made an addition that is the Aronoff. While the structure is rather conventional, featured by its rectangularity, Eisenman's addition manifests itself by his signature style, prompting a curved mass that looks similar to the existing body and thus brings forth an extraordinary field where a range of events might take place.

The Aronoff Center is an exemplar, which illustrates, as D.S. Friedman notes, "how high-design affects campus life" within the Cincinnati campus area (Friedman, 2005, 15). The Center is part of the broader masterplan of the school, as the school invested a lot of effort for landscape design, which was carried out by Hargreaves Associates over a period of two decades, as well as for constructing works of architecture designed by a number of renowned architects such as Frank Gehry, Michael Graves, Thom Mayne, Bernard Tschumi, Charles Gwathmey, and Eisenman himself. For this reason, the campus is somewhat similar to a gallery space where artworks are carefully displaced. However, given the relaxed atmosphere of the campus, as well as the surrounding urban area, those works are perceived not as flamboyant spectacles to which people always pay attention, but rather a familiar place where events are latent to unfold in unconscious ways.
The Aronoff Center is located at the corner of the campus and is not easily detectable, since it stands low on the ground level and makes itself entangled with the surroundings. What makes the building peculiar is the mode of interior experience: According to Friedman again, while maintaining the existing "eight-foot wide corridor," Eisenman "doubles, shifts, and rotates" through which to transform the building's experience into an extraordinary kind (Friedman, 2005, 17) (Fig.7). Since it is comprised of a set of small-size building blocks that are connected through passages, which Heather Chitwood calls a "chevron," turning every corner within the building could release certain kinds of event spatially and visually (Chitwood, 2000, 24) (Fig.8.).

Similar to Eisenman, critic Frederic Jameson also writes about the spatial navigation of the Aronoff, pointing out that Eisenman multiplies every one of us' "human limits and imperfections" in order to register "sheer movement and sheer nonlinear velocity in your human, all-too-human equations" (Jameson, 2003, 60-69; re-quoted from Jonah Rowen's unofficial notes). In other words, according to Jameson, every spatial encounter of the Aronoff is carefully implemented so that it provokes extraordinary sensibilities, thereby making them unable to sustain their ordinary sense of space. Jameson's comment reminds me of his famous critique about the Westin Bonaventure Hotel that is included in his canonical book Postmodernism (1991), in which he claims that the hotel, designed by John Portman, is perceived like a labyrinth where one loses his/her sense of space due to the complex spatial patterns and the difficulty of way-finding. The hotel does not clearly show its entrance, has a lobby that is located a few stories up from the ground so that people often lose their way from the beginning, and the building skin deludes the eyes of the beholder because of its reflexive glasses, which makes it difficult for one to focus on looking at the building itself, since most of the surface reflects back the surrounding cityscapes of Los Angeles. Similar to such a postmodernist claim that Jameson develops, Eisenman considers his building to be a place where a "state of distraction" is activated, and "causes one to pay attention without simultaneously grounding you" (Chitwood, ibid., 10). Eisenman also explains that his building encourages visitors to immerse themselves in it, "as if it were habit" (Chitwood, ibid., 10). Inspired by Walter Benjamin's aesthetics in the age of mechanical reproduction, Eisenman claims that the Aronoff could be part of habitual experience, as well as a threshold encouraging one to redefine the relationship between oneself and the given milieu.

While it is true that both Jameson and Eisenman take the Aronoff Center as a medium for developing their postmodernist claim, what is equally crucial to note, which is however at times not fully recognized, is that 'habit' is entangled with the fabrics of daily life around the building. Put differently, if 'spectacle' is one of the defining features of the Aronoff Center, the unpredictable strata of 'everyday life,' or something that is non-spectacular but immersive and habitual is what Eisenman seems to be interested in but not discussed enough in the Eisenman scholarship of the virtual, and the fold. If he admits that the fold is essentially a territory open to anyone, one can try to understand the building as a kind of affective machine in which various sensory dimensions, which include distraction, fascination, curiosity, indifference, and a lot of others, perpetually fold and unfold.

In this respect, elaborating my own experiences of the Aronoff Center would be an interesting way of exploring how the building becomes 'actualized' in a Deleuzian sense. This individuated narrative of spatial navigation might start from the comparison between some official photographs of the building seen from the outside, and my habitual engagement with it. While the former focuses on illustrating the conceptual aspects of the building, the latter slightly deviates from them. For instance, it takes some time for one to see the designated front of the Eisenman work, until which he/she is to encounter some infrastructural elements such as construction fences, landscapes decorated with grasses and trees, and nearby structures that are rather modernist in their architectural styles. In other words, although the Aronoff Center does not have a front and back in a precise sense, encountering his sophisticated design needs some routinized movements, which might also be aspects of "distraction" that Eisenman himself claimed as discussed above. However, it can be argued that getting distracted is not so much a negative experience but rather a mode of encountering the building in close relationship with the surroundings, in ways that one is not simply preoccupied with the figure-ground relationship in perceiving the work.

One can find the interior design of the Aronoff Center as a continuation of his deconstructivist design strategy as shown in the exterior, although its habitual encounters get entangled with various people's routines. The central hall on the ground level, and a set of semi-ground levels
both of which are complexly related to each other creates a visual spectacle, which is also the main spatial feature of the building. The openness of the hall with a series of bent promenades creates a dynamic but stable mood, whereas passages connected to the hall are much smaller and generate an abrupt contrast regarding sense of space. The so-called 'chevrons' become prominent when one walks from the hall to nearby areas, including passages, rooms, staircases, and elevators. The building's pastel tonality is also an interesting point to look at, in the sense that the tonality becomes multiple in different areas of the building, including the surface, the interior walls and ceilings, and the patterns on the ground. In addition, signs for direction within the building are installed at most of the areas in which an abrupt spatial turn is to take place. In this respect, way-findings in the Aronoff are not extremely painful, which might be different from how Jameson described the Bonaventure hotel as a case where the sense of distraction becomes extreme.

While newcomers to the Aronoff could easily detect formal and structural variations of the interior that are undoubtedly moments in which events unfold, those who are already familiar with the building (such as staff members and students) could likewise engage themselves with the process of unfolding, which might be, however, done in rather non-spectacular ways. For instance, it takes some time for one to recognize that sculpted walls and ceilings inside the building extend to 2-dimensional patterns inscribed on the ground, by which Eisenman implements the entire architectural sphere as an unstable unity. If tourists focus more on the impressions of the idiosyncratic design overall, residents may not always be astounded by them but still resonate with those parts within the context of daily life, such as chatting with friends and heading towards classrooms and looking up/around without fully paying attention to the building design itself. As Eisenman addressed with the notion of "distraction," which implicates a complex affectivity that is formed at the crossroads of attention and inattention, being unable to recognize every bit of design detail could, although it may sound paradoxical, encourage one to perceive the possibility of event. In other words, it can be argued that event in the Aronoff is twofold: one as noticeably spectacular spatial settings in key public areas, and another as minutia of the building that are not part of the design, which is mingled with various occupants' daily lives (Figs.9.-12.). The downstairs cafeteria is one of the popular places in the building, and the triangular space with acute angles in multiple ground rooms, staircases, and elevators. The building's pastel tonality is also an interesting point to look at, in the sense that the multi-layering of lines and planes in the building marks the building's identity, but its mode of experience unfolds in unexpected ways. The second case, the Aronoff Center, is a work that Eisenman proposed around the historic site interrupts the existing spatial order and thus brings forth new formality and also a set of events that unfold in unexpected ways. The second case, the Aronoff Center, is a work that Eisenman proposed around the Rebstockpark is a prime example that illustrates how Eisenman brings forth possibilities of event through his folding strategies, which is inspired by Deleuze's theory of the fold, in the sense that the multi-layering of lines and planes in the historic site interrupts the existing spatial order and thus brings forth new formality and also a set of events that unfold in unexpected ways. The second case, the Aronoff Center, is a work that Eisenman proposed around the Rebstockpark is the fact that Benjamin's notion "distraction" becomes a crucial part of the work. The curved mass and a series of bent lines and blocks mark the building's identity, but its mode of experience simultaneously provokes attention and inattention, since what is prominent in the project is not its monumentality per se, but various possibilities that one can navigate the building without knowing the entirety in a clear way, although without being fully disoriented.

Insofar as the term 'event' is essentially aleatory and thus not something that can be fully planned out in advance, in Eisenman's project, events are produced in relationship with individuals' affective and perceptive instances. By the same token, my experience of the Aronoff Center brings forth event in a Deleuzian sense,
which is private by nature but nevertheless public through serial encounters of the given environments, and myself, although such events could be at once spectacular and mundane. Eisenman's articulation of the fold is still at play in the Aronoff; however, it is my claim that such 'architectural' event is not so much an end point but rather a threshold provoking a myriad of others, which perpetually fold and unfold through the entanglement of differing fragments that are at once human and nonhuman, predicated and open-ended.

**Note**

_The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque_, written by Deleuze, was originally published in 1988 in French and translated into English five years later.
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