



What happens when we deny ourselves the reference to *subjects* and *objects*, and devote ourselves *entirely* to 'going in': not limited to *thinking about* our topic, but *living with* it? Living with the people that care about it—often in ways *differing* from the way we care. Hatching care for the work.

And what are the *facts*—the achievements of knowledge—that we can lean on, as move *further in*: to gain precision in our personal attitudes, errands, approaches as manifested materially in the work itself? What are the differences that make a difference in the realm of care, beyond things human?

When is care stagnant, oppressive and stifling? If the distinctions within the work of care are intuitive, it means that we will have to be aware of the different layers of our engagement with our topic, and how they *affect* each other. Hence the relevance of linking *care* to the layered dynamics of *affect*.



When we talk about how the different aspects of your current work with theory *affect* each other, it is rather straightforward: **1)** your project in the spring; **2)** how your current work with theory will make you *move*, in how you think about the spring; **3)** the internal consistency of the theory piece.

However, if we consider the word 'affect' straight on, what does it mean? Sometimes it names an *emotion*. At other times it denotes something closer to a physical *effect*. One possibility is that we don't have to care whether it is the one or the other (in a realm where the difference is not so interesting).

An alternative possibility is to consider the *affect* as something distinctive—as does Deleuze—which is *neither* subject *nor* object. It is then the principle of how bodies are moved as bodies (whether living or dead). So, it is a kind of limbo, between-space or interstice linked to liminality (*limen* = doorway).

Neither-nor, betwixt and between, half-life and undead, now and then—things associated with passage and the occasional. Are we satisfied with this? When we are doing research *with*, *through* and *for* the arts (artistic research, in *one* definition) we may have problems accounting for it to others.

[María Puig de la Bella Casa](#) suggests that it might be otherwise. She makes a different bid, that sounds almost the same, but is really quite different: "*Thinking with, dissenting within, and thinking for.*" Example: in your theory you are expected to *also* reference people/views you don't agree with.

It makes all the *difference* between a *discussion* and a *celebration*. Doing theory is *more* than 'throwing a party' for sample views that are *all making the same point*, and going in the *same direction*. Simply because *caring for* a subject—especially if it *new* to you—is not really that straightforward.

It has to be developed with deliberation/discussion *for* and *against*. What is care in *this* case/instance? That's when it becomes interesting. You pick a subject for your theory also because it offers that kind of *resistance*. *Others* are not external to your subject matter, rather you are living *with* them.

Care of the subject matter, to whom you discuss it with, for the work that comes out of it. This is what is called [criticality](#). If sustained and you reach a critical threshold—*limen*—it will hatch new repertoires (i.e., new skills linked up with new spatiotemporal categories). The score and its stakes change.

It is *not* a change in time, but a change *of* time: when your theory is finished your sense of time will be affected. Which is the time of your project in the spring. This is the realm of the affect. It is when the configuration of what makes up an assemblage—the pieces of a project—shifts and changes.

Then the question remains: should you start afresh each time this happens. Or, it is simply what the *winding path* towards *depth*, and *precision*, in *any* interesting project *looks like*? Say your theory specifies in a 1st elementary configuration, working it out will bring a 2nd, and making it readable a 3rd.