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does Stein, reared by her mother after her father died when she was two, state that a child requires a mother and a father to develop as a whole being. Nor does Stein oppose gender role reversals within the family. Padua’s conservative Catholic convictions shape her inferences.

Of less importance, though reflective of a seeming haste in publishing this book, an array of technical defects appear, e.g., including multiple errors in the Bibliography (e.g., Stein is credited with authoring an essay by Mary Catharine Baseheart), misspellings, and typos. If Padua and her publishers had taken more time before bringing out this book, the strengths and contributions of Padua’s study to Stein scholarship would then not be so sadly compromised.

Joyce Avrech Berkman, University of Massachusetts Amherst

Deleuze and Space
Eds. Ian Buchanan and Gregg Lambert
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005; 245 pages.

_Deleuze and Space_ is a collection of papers that take up Deleuze’s concept of space in philosophical, political, architectural, geographical, cinematic and literary terms. The collection is a qualitative mixed bag.

Gregg Lambert’s “What the Earth Thinks” deals with Deleuze’s political space. Lambert convincingly argues that Deleuze’s geo-philosophy is different from other political, specifically Marxist, philosophies, by developing remarkably well Deleuze’s concepts of the Earth, the socius and deterritorialization. The paper also does a great job of clarifying without oversimplifying the barrage of Deleuze’s other political concepts (e.g., the primitive-territorial machine, the State-form). Tamsin Lorraine’s “Ahab and Becoming Whale: The Nomadic Subject in Smooth Space” approaches Deleuze’s space in philosophical and literary terms. The paper is an excellent discussion, encouraged by many clear examples, of the nomadic subject’s different experience of space. The paper also explicates well the meaning of and the relationship between smooth and striated spaces, the virtual and the actual sides of the real. Branka Arsic’s “Thinking Leaving” discusses Deleuze’s space in relation to his concept of thought. The paper argues that Henry David Thoreau’s work is an expression of Deleuze’s spatial thought—thought understood as a multiplicity not of some elements, but a pure multiplicity, that is, a multiplicity that is prior to and constitutive of all elements, ‘a staircase with no floors.’ The paper
also gives a good account of Deleuze’s anti-foundational nature of selfhood and perception. Paul A. Harris’ “To See with the Mind and Think through the Eye: Deleuze, Folding Architecture, and Simon Rodia’s Watts Towers” deals with Deleuze’s space in relation to architecture. The paper argues that due to its bottom-up rather than top-down approach to architecture, Simon Rodia’s Watts Towers is the material expression *par excellence* of Deleuze’s space. Even though, at times, it engages in too much unnecessary summary (e.g., the sections on Bernard Cache and Greg Lynn), this well-researched paper is an insightful and valuable contribution to the field.

Manuel Delanda’s “Space: Extensive and Intensive, Actual and Virtual” discusses Deleuze’s space in properly philosophical terms. The paper explains the ontological distinction between Deleuze’s extensive and intensive, actual and virtual spaces. The paper provides some clear elucidations of Deleuze’s space (characteristic for Delanda), but it does not contribute anything new that has not already been said in the *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*. Gary Genosko and Adam Bryx’s “After Informatic Striation: The Resignification of Disc Numbers in Contemporary Inuit Popular Culture” approaches Deleuze’s space in historic-political terms. The paper discusses the various ways in which the North American Inuit’s smooth space was striated as well as the various ways in which the Inuit responded to the striation. The paper is insightful as it provides a clear historic-political example of Deleuze’s smooth and striated spaces, however, it does not go far regarding the philosophical analysis of these concepts themselves. Also, the historic-political analysis needs to be better related to and integrated with the minimal philosophical framework that the paper does provide. Claire Colebrook’s “The Space of Man: On the Specificity of Affect in Deleuze and Guattari” approaches Deleuze’s space in philosophical and political terms. The paper first argues that Deleuze’s space, if it can even be called space, is to be understood in terms of his concept of the Outside—the multiplicity of genitive and internally differentiating forces that open life to new possibilities. The paper then discusses the ethical and political potentials of such a conception of space. While its aims are commendable, the paper tries to do too much too quickly and thus often lacks focus. For example, the discussion of Deleuze’s sense, although well-executed—Colebrook’s grasp of Deleuze’s philosophy is clear from her many excellent introductions—needs to be better related to and integrated into the overall discussion of Deleuze’s space and its ethical and political potentials. Gregory Flaxman’s “Transcendental Aesthetics: Deleuze’s Philosophy of Space” discusses Deleuze’s space in relation to Kant’s. The paper argues
that, unlike Kant, Deleuze succeeds in conceptualizing space in transcendent and yet non-representational terms—Deleuze's transcendental empirical concept of space (spatium)—and then proceeds to develop Deleuze's space. Despite its clear exposition and comparison of Kant's and Deleuze's spaces, the paper does not actually contribute anything new with respect to Deleuze's space itself.

Ian Buchanan's "Space in the Age of Non-Place" discusses the notion of space in relation to postmodernity. The paper does provide some useful context for the discussion of space, but other than the short oversimplified final section, it does not manage to engage with Deleuze's space whatsoever. The paper neither argues anything regarding, nor provides any kind of worthwhile interpretation of, Deleuze's notion of space. Other than its more general comments on the notion of space, it is unclear why this paper should even be included in this collection.

John David Dewsbury and Nigel Thrift's "Genesis Eternal: After Paul Klee" discusses Deleuze's space in relation to art and geography. The paper tries to explicate that elusive, but all important, side of Deleuze's space—the intensive, the virtual, the immanent space. As opposed to shedding new light onto this difficult matter, or even making an attempt, the paper settles for an endless string of quotations that are never explained and that lead nowhere. The paper fails at the only task that it sets for itself.

Hélène Frichot's "Stealing into Gilles Deleuze's Baroque House" discusses Deleuze's space in relation to architecture. Beyond its dramatic equation, to say the least, of the architect with a pickpocket who 'steals' Deleuze's concepts for architecture, it is unclear what exactly this paper is trying to do. The paper is an uninspired collection of explanations of various concepts none of which are then, save for one (i.e., diagram), related to architecture (or even to space for that matter).

Réda Bensmaïa's "On the 'Spiritual Automaton', Space and Time in Modern Cinema According to Gilles Deleuze" tries to discuss Deleuze's space in relation to cinema. Other than the unoriginal, exhausted and undefended claim that cinema has the power to relate thought to the Outside, it is unclear about what this paper is supposed to be. Also, due to its various scattered and unnecessarily jargon-laden claims about the Whole rather than the set, it is unclear why this paper should be included in this collection. It seems much more concerned with time than with space. Tom Conley's "The Desert Island" tries to discuss Deleuze's space in relation to geography vis-à-vis Deleuze's early essay "Causes et raisons des îles désertes." At times, the paper seems to want to make an argument for Deleuze's desert island as a kind of space of difference and repetition. At other times, it seems to want to develop some kind of
important relationship between mainstream geography and Deleuze’s desert island. Whatever its aim, the paper fails at both things that the reader justifiably expects from it: it neither successfully relates Deleuze’s early essay to his other texts nor does it provide a kind of helpful textual, conceptual analysis of the early essay. In the end, the paper reads like a bad summary of, almost a wannabe literary reflection on, the original.

Overall, Deleuze and Space is no more than a fair collection. It is by no means the kind of excellent book that the introduction—which, on a side note, offers too many misleading and overenthusiastic summaries of the papers, not to mention the faux pas it commits, i.e., opposing Deleuze’s virtual to the real (7) and opposing Deleuze’s two kinds of substances (8)—suggests it is.

Saša Stanković, University of Guelph
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Jacques Derrida accounts for ethics, philosophy and religion in terms of each other, in such a way that many are extremely critical of him. By writing this clear, thorough and well-ordered presentation of Derrida’s thinking Zlomislic not only gives an excellent introduction to Derrida but he also answers the objections of the critics, revealing in several cases their misunderstandings of Derrida’s arguments. Whereas traditional philosophers tend to explain their ethics as based upon their logic, metaphysics, psychology and epistemology, Zlomislic clearly shows why for Derrida it must be the other way around. The first four of the book’s five chapters show how the gift and task of Biblical ethics implies: (1) a new logic of paradox concerning the question of violence, (2) a new ethics of excess concerning the question of responsibility, (3) a new psychology of the de-centered subjectile concerning the question of personhood and (4) a new epistemology of embracing uncertainty in relation to the question of justice. So, Derrida’s ethics, which focus upon questions of violence, responsibility, personhood and justice, take a Socratic aporetic, or Okhamist nominalist, or Humean passionate or Kierkegaardian existentialist approach. In this way, self contradictions can be avoided and there can be the most consistency and adequacy. In always working with truth and method