



LAURENCE A. RICKELS. PHOTO
BILL STERN.

Laurence A. Rickels

Theorist

Chair, German and Slavic

Languages, U.C. Santa Barbara

same time associated with the transferential seductiveness of foreign bodies. But what has emerged by the time of the recent movie *Interview with the Vampire* is a new and improved local culture of cuteness, that overlay of replicant interchangeability and immortality which covers over the ambivalent facts of life. What interests me here are the transfusions which bring on and ward off passing away into the short-circuited commemoration brought to us by mass suicide fantasies of replication, over and against the reproductive standards of mourning.

How does this relate to your description of L.A. as a screen to hallucinate and project ambivalence on?

On California's big screen we've always projected the problems we're having with identifying and identifying with missing persons. But L.A. really takes place

in front of the small screen and thus within TV's cult of liveness. There is in fact a split-level dysfunctionality operating between the two screens that unites them just the same (and as usual) within one family unit. I'm thinking of the early *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* movies where the couple triumphs over the vampire or monster reduced to the status of symptom of sexual disturbance. The audience of couples can thus leave behind the ghostly underworld which the short-term sex therapy has busted. This diversion away from cryptology and technology through or to sexology is so characteristic of L.A. world culture. But the original crypt-driven momentum still glides beneath this overlay. While TV doesn't tune in big-screen haunting, its acting-out reception in front of the tube is the favorite "haunt" of perpetual adolescence. And film in turn, again at least since the thir-

ties, has doubled as owner's manual to the newer media of liveness. I'm thinking of the way in *Bride of Frankenstein* the two brides' reanimation apparatuses converts them into live connections in contexts of telephonic and televisual access.

Why have you chosen Freud as the key text to understanding Southern California, as opposed to, say, a "Deleuzian" take on the region?

My work inhabits the tension between the big and small screens, between the couple and the group only to the extent that it remains within the frames of Freud's discourse; one we inhabit even deep down in every pocket of resistance. This transferential frame distinguishes my work from the anti-Oedipal interventions of the Deleuzers, their one-sided going-with-the-flow of psychosis. But to go psychotic they first have to restrict the whole metabolism of mass-media culture, namely all of psychoanalysis, to one reducing plan of interpretation, a package deal which can thus be dismissed or disowned. To this day the disownership of psychoanalysis is the most pathogenic of the articulations we're facing now in the make-believe world and work of cultural studies.