

7. The Acceleration Towards Cuteness (Interview with Maya B. Kronic and Amy Ireland)



1- First of all, as we wanna be polite : How are you ? Everything Ok ? Anything New?
Hope everything is alright and fantastic

Maya B. Kronic: At the time of writing, Amy is in Australia so we are reliving the traumatic period of separation during the COVID lockdown, when we were trapped on opposite sides of the planet. That was the time when the initial ideas for *Cute Accelerationism* began to germinate.

Amy Ireland: But this time around, we are not so ungrounded. We have proper, indoor, places to live! And we have an exact date for when we will see each other again, it's not an ongoing mystery, caught between the top-down power of the state and the bottom-up power of the virus.

1.1- Why the Cute ?

MBK: It's something that happened to us, and the encounter provoked us to think. There was a heterogenesis: multiple causes and sources of stimulation collided and were synthesised in order to bring *Cute Accelerationism* into existence

First and foremost, we were taken totally by surprise by realising we had fallen in love. Then we were bewildered by the parallels between this phenomenon and the core dynamics of accelerationism. At the same time, the experience changed us, and fidelity to those changes made it impossible for us to abide by the aesthetic and stylistic orthodoxies that had become calcified around accelerationism—whether the hard-edged, macho rhetoric of right accelerationism, or the bossy administrative tedium of left accelerationism. At this point, it became clear to me that *accelerationisms* were plural, and that ours was the cute one. The notion of 'cute accelerationism' was a joke at first, expressing the bewilderment and delight of that moment—but somewhere deep down we must have known that there was more to it than that.

It was only subsequently that we connected all of this with the question of cuteness as a cultural trend. As we began to look into that, we were confirmed in our intuition that there was something important here in relation to passionate surrender, transformation, the disruption of identity, time, and gender.

So it was only as a secondary repercussion of the initial encounter, which forced us to think, that we began to research the history of Cute and think about its future. The experience of becoming-cute drove the whole thing.

AI: The classic accelerationist ‘subject’ is not an agent but a patient. Rather than imposing an autonomous will on history, they are swept up by—and can channel—the currents of an outside but immanent force. This is why accelerationists talk about demons. The accelerationist subject is like the subject of a demonic possession. When you’re possessed by a demon, you’ve either let down your guard or your defences have proven ironically to be the medium of its ingress; either way, you’ve let something in, and suddenly both you and the world end up being transformed.

Cute also works like this. Try, earnestly, to interact with something cute without involuntarily *becoming* cute yourself—whether in speech or action, or by the adoption of new ways of relating to your body, digitally or IRL. It’s very difficult to resist. This is the source of cute’s enormous viral power, it moves very quickly from objects to subjects, makes subjects into objects, and moves from those objects to new subjects, *ad infinitum*, in an ongoing cyperpositive spiral fuelled by capitalism, the internet, and ancient biological cues everted into extravagant trajectories of mass cultural supernormalisation.

2- Why run towards Deleuze in the face of analysing a modern phenomenon ?

AI: One simple answer is that accelerationism is a philosophy of transcendental time, and all the OG accelerationists—Marx, Nietzsche, Deleuze and Guattari, Land, Plant—are philosophers of transcendental time. *Cute Accelerationism* is working in this lineage. If you want, you can trace it all the way back to Kant, who, incidentally, was pretty cute. He invented programming socks as well as transcendental philosophy.

MBK: Yes, the book was written entirely within the framework of a transcendental philosophy inherited from Kant via Deleuze and Guattari and Ccru.

One of the things I learned from Amy is to read Deleuze as an esoteric philosopher—not in the sense that he’s secretly referring to occult magical practices (although sometimes he is), but in the sense that beneath the philosophical surface there are secret keys that unlock subterranean passages between different sites in his work. These concepts often aren’t ostensibly declared or discursively explicated, but they structure the work at a deeper level. The egg is one of those—you can interpret it as a biological analogy or as an appeal to myth, and in either case you can refuse it as philosophically inadmissible. But if you allow yourself to follow where that concept goes, and understand the work that it’s doing in making it possible to pass between various different discourses and figures, it becomes a cipher that gives you access to a whole intricate assemblage.

And then, ultimately, *Cute Accelerationism* is a book about becoming and its enemies, and Deleuze provides the philosophical resources that enable us to think becoming philosophically, in particular with Guattari in *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*,

Capitalism and Schizophrenia is very important to us, and in part this is because it provides the most sophisticated reading of the *ambivalence* of capitalism, which in turn allows one to escape the dialectic of condemnation of capitalism and facile celebration of its delights.

Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of intensification, acceleration, and decoding in capitalism is unsurpassed, I would say. I can only speak for myself and say that I feel like my understanding of all this work is still only at an early stage, and there is no reason to think that somehow it's 'been done' or is 'over' or whatever. There's nothing more dumb than taking that kind of attitude toward philosophers, as if they have a sell-by date or can be written off as mere juvenilia. This is the hateful and condescending side of Hegelianism and its moronic conception of the work of time and history. What's specific to philosophy as a discipline is its weird relation to its own history, where there is no superceding, no obsolescence, no proving wrong, but always a continual circulation and manipulation of that history.

Lastly, Although of course I confront certain philosophical problems and have read and appropriated the work of other philosophers, for me the thought of Deleuze constitutes a kind of metadiscourse about what it means to do philosophy at all—namely, his unique theory of Ideas according to which Ideas are not there to be voluntarily, introspectively analysed, but are 'out there' in the form of problems—fields of intensity or tension, the potential object of an encounter which then must be held on to, loved, and sustained (a 'Platonism of problems'). Any work I have done that matters to me has emerged out of encounters with problems that perplex, hurt, stretch, or oppress me and which leak out of any pre-existing theoretical concepts I try to catch them in—and from the subsequent attempt to hold to them, to continue to exert a loving pressure upon them in the hope of being able to construct theoretical models that will unfold them and propagate them to others. *Cute Accelerationism* in its entirety was the product of this way of working: we didn't pick out 'philosophically interesting' problems, the problems happened to us, we underwent them as a kind of ordeal, albeit an euphoric one—'passion' is the correct term—but they remained to be constructed in actuality.

AI: Deleuze is a philosopher of transcendental time. He's doing a kind of philosophy that deals with something that is not 'in' time, and since this thing isn't affected by the passing of time, it would be strange to say that the relevance of philosophising about it is. *Cute*

Accelerationism is interested in how this thing outside of time is leaving a trail in contemporary culture that happens to be extremely cute. We are trying to think the transcendental temporality of cute: what does it mean to participate in a virtual future that is dehumanising, desubjectivising, and denaturalising us, that is transforming us in the pursuit of ever-cuter configurations in ways that we haven't even begun to comprehend?

MBK: Accelerationism is inseparable from the question of transformation. As soon as you decouple accelerationism in its Landian form from productive temporal paradoxes of the *Terminator* type, it simply collapses either into technocratic planning or resignation to fate. Our approach is to affirm the supposed paradox and lean into the fact that accelerationism is about investing oneself in problems whose further development will retroactively prove to have been the cause of one's investment in them. (Again, the isomorphism with the event of falling in love should be clear). This implies a distinction between mere passivity—the figure of the 'dividual', Gilles Châtelet's 'cybernetic tapeworm' who merely satisfies their instincts, in doing so producing a reliable input and output for capital—and *desire-as-surrender*, which involves a certain investment, positive feedback, and a labour of remaining faithful to the problem, even at the risk of one's prior identity.

There are other philosophical influences in the book. In particular we have mitigated the potentially narcissistic-individualist notion of self-transformation by approaching it through a broadly pragmatist understanding of how real change, and the undermining of prohibitions on 'changing Nature', are socially-mediated, and the role played by collectivities in becomings.

Finally, *Cute Accelerationism* is a book that follows a time-honoured tradition of Urbanomic: to conduct that paradoxical and perhaps impossible operation that we call 'pop philosophy'. Is it possible to deploy the most involved, dense philosophical thinking at the same time as transmitting the joyful affect of a real encounter through a writing that is available to non-experts? You don't need to read all the extensive endnotes of *Cute Accelerationism* to 'get' the main text. We perform it as an audiovisual 'performance-lecture', which was its original form, in fact. The main text is short but overcharged, because everything we spoke about together over five years has been compressed into it. The notes are a secondary process that we carried out for ourselves, of unpacking and decompressing what we'd done, so as to ask from a philosophical point of view: *What Happened?*

In short, we didn't set out to write a book of philosophy or cultural critique. We were simply trying to describe extraordinary and unexpected things that were happening to us, and which transformed our understanding of ourselves and of the world.

Cute Accelerationism is more like a hyperpop song than a scholarly text.

AI: A song that samples from many diverse (and often unreferenced) sources, not just philosophical ones.

MBK: The large body of notes that accompanies the main text consists of, firstly, documentation of the research that we ended up doing, and secondly, attempts to develop a broader philosophical account of what we're talking about. This inevitably draws upon what we have worked on in the past. But it also reveals the *anastrophic* nature of what we're dealing with here. Falling in love is an event that propagates itself 'backwards' in time. Everything that happened before suddenly makes sense in light of its having led up to that event. Writing the book worked like that too. For instance, the long footnote about Deleuze and eggs includes all kinds of things that we had discussed and worked on previously, but now suddenly they all made sense in relation to *Cute*.

3- Considering the CCRU's history, would this be appropriate to be called "a successor" to the group's writings or intentions to any degree ?

MBK: From the point of view of cute/acc, obviously everything was leading up to cute/acc. This book samples from Sadie and Nick's work, Ccru lore, and the general spirit of those times, but everything is now played in a different key.

However, I recently looked back at one of the photocopied zines that I was making at Warwick University in the mid-nineties before Ccru even existed, and there's a text I wrote in there with anime girl illustrations talking about transforming the body and 'hormonal entertainment systems'. It all makes sense backwards.

more. Digispace is leaking into your system, destroying the memory banks.

The Schreberian real - liquified by the rupture of the integrating membrane. The screen disappears > Those fleeting homunculi, those talking birds, that God, those miracles. All these are real affects. And that mohicaned hedehog? Is that real? So it's me...?

The anticipation, the tension, the fulgurating colors glaring from the monitor, the *intensity*...begin to meld together, a ductile tissue of affect develops between hand eye and console. Tunnel-vision, hairtrigger-epilepsy. Distributed across a digi-haptic landscape, no longer individuated but moving as a massive.

In the zone of the schizo-otaku humans are search-engines, processing devices for a future that is all-too alien. The body is data.

kSPACE

As global vironet spreads, the game redistributes itself and eats unhealthily. Junk data gathered parasitically from *otaku* recombines into replicator-units. Second-level phaseswitch activates exponential demand, spiralling



cultural hysteria [what is happening to our children? AGES sucked retroductively through cyberoutines (orphanamnesia) auto-obsolesces parental control{generational hierarchy}]; pirated neurosoft swamping the markets; economies locked into cyberspace production. Technomics gets virtual and brings in Nintendo to rewire the stock market. Gluts of autonomous AI modules flood into areas of diuretic ventflux, hoizons of K-contam, trading meat as a fetish commodity. The demand for entertainment is still unsated, new frictions must be

engendered, new experiences created. Entertainment goes hormonal, bacterial, viral, genetic, *give the kids what they want.*

downLOADING

"Downloading, do not interrupt, irreversible biomolecular processes initiated."

A FakeSpaceCorp. reality engine implements itself and drops like a fine grid of filaments into the mind. Running Microsoft VRos 2.2, Variables lock in, probes scan neural nets, the vectors focus, engage...

It begins with an itch, an irritation, you see diagrams form and disform across the screen, the intervals between them become increasingly indiscrete as time itself seems to warp. As you gradually grasp the O/S, your body begins to bubble, growths appear and new organs emerge. You seem to be developing into something like a skin or a wet-wear VR suit, but far more complex, far more biological. The screen, and with it your aesthetic of space begins to melt. Suddenly you begin to feel good, you feel like you're going on holiday and wont be coming back, ever.....

AI: CCRU was about finding cutting edges of cultural production—microcultures enabled by Capital-driven technological innovation—and engaging, positively, in the transformative processes of dehumanisation, desubjectivisation, and denaturalisation they let loose. In the 1990s, this meant jungle, the internet, drugs, occultism, etc. Thirty years later, cultural production has moved on and the cutting edges have shifted. I think, if you want to continue to catch Ccru signal, you need to resist the urge to reproduce all of those 90s signifiers and instead try to figure out where the cutting edges of dehumanisation, desubjectivisation, and denaturalisation are in culture right now.

4- Considering other theorists like Nyx or Plant will we see a feminine insurrection towards addressing capital's issues ?

AI: As I see it, accelerationism has always been a kind of feminism. If accelerationism is about affirming and participating in those elements of capitalism that decode and

deterritorialise—or dehumanise, desubjectivise, and denaturalise—culture, then it is about participating in a process that is *structurally* feminine.

Along with the patriarchal institutions that support it, what gets most spectacularly uprooted and torn apart by these processes is the notion of the human. As Plant and other cyberfeminists have pointed out, ‘human’ is a term that has historically been used to exclude women, debarring them from possessing a level of subjecthood equivalent to that of men. So much so that, to paraphrase Plant, ‘to be human is to be a Man’. Nyx and Plant both make this distinction ultra-clear, and instead of, like more traditional feminists, asserting women’s right to an equivalent level of subjecthood to that of (human) men—a structural position whose power they can see, as accelerationists, is at odds with the future—they affirm the nonhuman, machinic and, emphatically for Nyx’s transfeminist g/acc blackpaper, nonnatural status of woman as a positive trait that places her in a position already aligned with futurity.

5- Will trans and enby people all around the globe be able to form great adventures of thought in the future based on the potentiality of their contestative identity ?

MBK: Euphoria comes first, contestation second, identity we can do without. One aspect of *Cute Accelerationism*, from my point of view, is that it’s a missive—a love letter, even—from someone who grew up during a period and in an environment where it was far more difficult to escape heteronormativity, to a generation who have been able to explode the whole question of gender and sexuality in such a way that we find ourselves in a ‘crisis’. I don’t believe we are going to resolve the problems this has produced any time soon, but the crisis is glorious. Nothing has settled, and everything—concepts, bodies, language—is up in the air. The greatest challenge now is to resist our own fear, uncertainty, and doubt and think our way through this mess, which is what we’re trying to do. *Cute Accelerationism* is a countergift to those who made it possible for me to become.

6- Is Technocapital gonna turn us all Feminine, Female or something in between ? Is a Plant-Kronic synthesis possible ?

AI: Yes. So long as we understand these as structures, not identities. :p

MBK: As we discuss in the book, self-artificialisation, and reversals between subject and object seem to be inherent to the Cute process. In fact one of the other things that brought us to Cute was a discussion about the importance of social media self-presentation for people who are gender-transitioning: once you disseminate your transition out into the world, you make your new self realer, even for yourself; in this case, cuteness involves honing

the just-right version of yourself (*felt cute*), via media which make you more malleable than IRL (...*might delete later*). Subsequently the new form can be transposed, bit by bit, into 'reality', possibly with further deviations. Collective social ratification is an unavoidable part of 'making your gender real', hence the importance of social media. And, as we say, we are fine with treating gender nonconformity as a 'social media plague'—on condition that we view it 'from the virus's point of view', which is as 'Plantian' a slogan as you could hope for.

7- Can an aesthetic project be constructed on the will to becoming-cute ?

MBK: If so, only in the sense in which one can become one's own project, become both the agent, the patient, and the product. And we think it would be a mistake to see this purely as a question of 'aesthetics' in a narrow sense. Cute is an underlying abstract thing that is slowly emerging into human culture and producing multimodal aesthetic phenomena, but it is also a process that we enter into, a set of procedures for disassembly and augmentation.

AI: Although, as Maya says, cute goes beyond aesthetics in a narrow sense, aesthetic properties like visibility, style, fashion, performance, texture, sensuality, taste—all of these things that typically belong to the domain of art are indispensable to any project of becoming-cute, because the cute feedback loop, at least at this juncture in history, runs through the presentation of oneself to others in a social environment. Maybe you could say aesthetics are necessary but not sufficient to cuteness.

Meanwhile, if the contemporary cultural instantiation of cuteness has an aesthetic theory that corresponds to it, it would be something like Azuma Hiroki's database of *moé*-elements. *Moé* is a feeling of affection for a two-dimensional character. It's a specifically nonnatural, nonhuman affect. The intensity of *moé* can be tweaked by playing with configurations of *moé*-elements. *Moé*-elements are ontologically diverse, non-totalisable fragments (cat ears, glasses, sleepiness, a way of speaking, a particular personality type) that individually become the site of libidinal investment for connoisseurs of cute manga and anime characters, and which can be transposed onto and across characters in various combinations for the sake of maximising the sensation of *moé*. The database of *moé*-elements is the product of the diverse personal tastes of its contributors, and the *moé*-elements that constitute it become in turn the raw material for the evolution of new tastes, and, taken out of the context of *moé*, they can become maps for producing cute versions of ourselves. The cat ear phenomenon is a case in point.

To go one step further, I think that when we look at the database model—at this socially constructed register of libidinally invested signs that, as fragments, operate at a level below

that of personal identity, and which can be added, subtracted, reshuffled, and recombined at will—we are looking at the future model of gender. All queer people, even those who are hard masc or hard femme, secretly know the gender binary is over. We all still work within its residual codes, but once you've stepped beyond it, it quickly becomes apparent that it is little more than an ancient relic and that it continues to exist purely for the sake of ensuring queer intelligibility for a cis hegemony desperately in need of orienting coordinates.

8 - Does the book follow a precise methodology towards grasping the main ideas of it ?

MBK: The methodology was, first of all, to give in. In the name of being faithful to our experience, the book does what it says: it commits to the bit, becomes cute, and opens itself up to ridicule, shame, and embarrassment. What we tried to do was to avoid judgement and abandon critical distance. We accept that cuteness can be used in all sorts of ways in culture, but we concentrate on the aspects of Cute that strike us as 'accelerative'.

In the process, we discovered that we have a strange, complementary relation to writing. I struggle with very local intensities, sensory experiences, concentrating hard on them and trying to unlock what it is that perplexes me in them, and that's what leads me to concepts that I find satisfying. Amy likes to start from a massive-scale abstract big picture.

AI: Hehe yeah. It works very well, because when Maya gets overwhelmed, and feels like they have all these little fragments, but they are not yet sure how they are going to connect them together, I can be like, 'Don't worry, I got you, I can see the whole thing and I know the general shape and progression of all the arguments, this bit is going to go here, and this bit is part of that, you can relax'. But then I am hopeless with details. I know what part has to go in what slot, or what is required at a certain point to make sure that everything holds together logically, but then sitting down and crafting those elements in minute detail, especially the sensory stuff, that all takes aeons for me. Maya comes up from below, and I dive down from above, and we meet in the middle, it's a very nice way to write.

Speaking of the overarching structure of the book, it's organised into sections that recreate the plateaus in *A Thousand Plateaus*, including cutified versions of the images that each of the original plateaus begins with. Between them they present an aetiology, an etymology, a history, a libidinal economy, a topology, a symptomatology, a theory of sex, a theory of gender, and a survey of alternative theories of cute (and their shortcomings).

Now into more general questions

9 - How is your life looking now, with the development of the world and local politics ? Will your work be able to address or at least represent your state of mind in these heavily overwhelming times ?

MBK: There seems to be a general sentiment that things are impossible. But since we have encountered a joy and an intensity that we had previously thought was impossible, that's what we write about. We suggest that, at the level of micropolitics, the disarming effects of Cute upon behavioural norms, particularly those related to male power, make a difference. But we don't claim at any point to be solving social problems or driving political change with philosophy, it would be presumptuous of us to do so and we both find it a distasteful pretention. Above all, we are profoundly uninterested in telling people what they, or 'We', should do.

AI: The power of silliness, irreverence, and joy to create agency and undermine power cannot be underestimated. Take, for instance, Bataille's example of the soldier waiting to be executed by firing squad who looks up at his killers and smiles. Nevertheless, we have been passing through a very conservative intellectual, political, and cultural moment. It's as if everyone feels like the only way we can demonstrate the seriousness of our political commitments is through a kind of performative austerity. I think this is a mistake. And I hope that the things we have been writing and the way we have been writing them will go some way toward counteracting this endemic grimness.

10- Is your contact with ex-CCRU members over ?

MBK: No, we're still in touch with Steve regularly, Amy is working on a forthcoming book with Anna that includes an essay by Suzanne, and she hangs out every now and then with Anna and Nick. Urbanomic just published a Florian Hecker book that features an essay by Luciana. We talk to Sadie every couple of years. You know, everyone has their own projects and has found their own way, but in all cases it owes something to CCRU, and the connection is still there.

11- Has your relationship with Amy changed your vision on anything particular?

MBK: Yes, it changed everything. Everything that's in the book I wouldn't have arrived at without her.

AI: :)

12- Is true anti-capitalist love exclusively lesbian, as many claim ?

MBK: We say that cuteness is *at least* hermaphroditic, since Cute involves a set of phenomena that upset the polarity between supposedly male and female behaviours and affects. But when we look at moé, it becomes clear that we are beyond not just the idea of bipolarity, but even its hermaphroditic overcoming. We are in a world where gender and sexuality are being totally disassembled and reassembled in a multitude of different, thoroughly asymmetrical ways.

Whether this is ‘anti-capitalist’ is another question. As already mentioned, we stick quite closely to the Deleuzo Guattarian reading of capitalism, and prefer to say that the accelerative forces unleashed by capitalism enable certain modes of lovecraft (desiring-production) that run counter to the mechanisms of power inherent to capitalism’s reterritorialising tendencies.

13- Is insurrection coming ?

MBK: Certainly not in the form dreamt of by nineteenth-century revolutionaries.

14- Is moe ultimately the same as other anime-based forms ?

MBK: Moé, as we describe in the book, is a word for a type of burning love for anime characters or for particular features of those characters. It is associated with anime and otaku but is not necessarily limited to them. Any kind of passion or desire for the inanimate participates in moé.

AI: As a style or genre, moé is often combined with other subgenres, like denpa (i.e. *Serial Experiments Lain*), but it has a distinct set of tropes, and a distinct stylistic history that comes out of shojo manga—using rounder lines, subtracting detail, dispensing with shading, complex sparkle patterns in characters’ eyes, paying attention to frills, ribbons, folds, etc.—it’s always actively avoided realism.

15 - Is the Internet nowadays the main focus of theory and philosophy ?

AI: Yes, but in a complicated way. Everything theoretically interesting that is happening right now is happening online, but the people who know what's happening are moving too fast to theorise it, and the people who might be able to theorise it don't know what's happening.

MBK: There are those who are fully participating in the cutting edge of online culture, and are unable to reflect upon it, and there are those who reflect upon it but don't really get it. Methodologically I feel that it's necessary to go all the way to the point of losing yourself in online culture in order to understand where we are culturally. Leave only the slightest, most tenuous possible thread to haul yourself back out of the mire into a place where you can actually think about the horrors you've experienced.

16- Maya, would you consider yourself a multi-disciplinary thinker ?

MBK: I've gradually resigned myself to admitting that I am a dilettante who has *some* knowledge of *a lot* of things.

Since I began Urbanomic in 2007 what I've been interested in is finding a way to do philosophy in a non-academic setting, producing some kind of cultural machine that can survive for a while and produce items that otherwise wouldn't exist. That necessarily implies a conception of philosophy that connects it to other things. Almost all of our projects and publications have lain somewhere on a border between philosophy and music, science, art, or some other practice or discipline.

17- Any particular connection / reflections on the religious and or spiritual ?

MBK: I am and have always been a nihilist; I believe that life without God is the greatest intellectual and cultural adventure, and I am sad whenever I see someone returning to religion.

AI: Same. I will never not be a nihilist. I'm a fan of mysticism though, and anchoresses. And my friend Bogna Konior is always telling me extremely based things about angels and nuns.

18- How do you feel about essentially in a very contradictory sort of way being the historian on the CCRU?

MBK: It's definitely Amy who is the historian of the Ccru. The truth is that I only belonged to the Ccru in the early days, before any of the material in the *Ccru Writings* was produced, although I played some part in developing the microculture from which that all grew. What I

do know is that there is a huge post-Ccru trauma where everyone who was involved doesn't really know what happened and has a sense of the loss of an incredible intensity that was once experienced. Since Amy was in touch with almost everyone involved, she helped me to see that—to understand that it wasn't just me who, decades later, was disturbed and perplexed by what may or may not have happened. Since then I've been circling ground zero trying to work out what I can salvage.

AI: I have a big personal archive of Ccru material, and maybe I even have one of the most exhaustive, multidimensional accounts of Ccru history stored in my brain, but none of that has ever been the basis of my engagement with it. You can't stand outside of Ccru and write a commentary on it and think that you've understood it. You have to participate in it. Find the cutting edge of inhuman cultural production, tune into the signal, build a microculture that feeds off it. Cave Twitter and the Vast Abrupt were examples of that happening for me. Cute/acc is another one. Writing a history of Ccru is a job for someone else.

MBK: Sorry, but realistically, it's your job, otherwise it will end up being shit, haha.

19- Building Urbanomic up to what it is today is an impressive feat, but what sort of issues were encountered along the way? I remember reading a list of submissions banned from Urbanomic just as an example of such an issue that you had, in this case with your readers and their writing.

MBK: I'm not sure what you're referring to, I've never banned anything as far as I know!! Do you mean the list on the website of the type of contributions we don't welcome? It's a joke, but not entirely—we get sent a lot of stuff, none of which we have time to read, and it often falls into those categories. I can't actually remember a single time that someone has sent me something and I've decided to publish it, actually. It just doesn't work like that. I've been personally involved in everything, it's all come through gradually building a web of contacts and friends.

AI: And sometimes working closely with those personal contacts, urging them on, while they slowly and painstakingly produce a book they would otherwise never have thought it possible to write, as was the case with Gilles Grelet's *Theory of the Solitary Sailor*. Maya is a brilliant editor, because they do stuff like this.

20- "Do you think we could ever see a revival of the collapse journal?"

MBK: Yes, eventually, we even have specific volumes planned for the future. Everything else took over, and also, given the growth in scale from volume 1 (273 pages) to volume 8 (1013 pages), it seemed difficult to know where to go with it next. But for me, the idea of *Collapse* is still a touchstone for what Urbanomic is about.

21- "Fisher said "Land was our Nietzsche" in his essay Terminator vs Avatar. Do you relate with this sentiment? Did Land embody a sort of Nietzschean 'Spirit' for the group during his CCRU years, being by all measures and Hyper-Nietzschean, and how did this spirit manifest if it was present?"

MBK: I've written before about my experience of meeting Nick and the influence he had on me. The question of Nietzscheanism is an interesting one, because in some respects, yes, but in some, definitely not, and less so now than ever.