

—I am Theodor Barth, professor of *theory & writing*, working in the design field: 60% of my time at KHiO's design department, rest of my time in other departments at KHiO and outside of art-school.

I perceive my mandate to work *with* and *for* the art-field, with an inflection added by feminist STS theoretician quoted by Bojana Cvejic in our blurb for the present session: which is the criticality of dissenting within.

So, working with the arts, dissenting within and working for the arts. In this order. It could be a candidate contract for my work as a theoretician with designers. This takes me to the second point: dissenting within.

What is dissenting within? Does it articulate disagreement or different understandings? Well, staying with that trouble certainly with help to clear things out. That is whether it is disagreement or misunderstanding.

Since a topic emerged during a warm-up exchange we had yesterday evening, with this quality, I will start with that. Taking privilege of the role of a theoretician, which sometimes is to be untimely. That topic is *work*.

We either misunderstand or disagree with each other on that topic: work. Are we working today, in this session? I think the majority agreed that we are not working. And maybe leisure is key to many artist's ethos.

That is, working extremely hard but posing that work as leisurely. Maybe it has to do with freedom. I want to ask whether it hinges on a liberalist, and perhaps even romantic, idea of freedom: by romantic I mean the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

I want to see if I can articulate a Marxist critique of work in the contemporary setting. That is, moving my attention beyond our group to society at large. Moving from leisure to *fun*. To what one might call the *ethos* of fun.

That is, it is not enough to have leisure; we should also have fun. The opposite of fun is misery: being miserable. To have fun, one must have money. Without money no fun. So, to have fun we must earn money. Work!

If cast in a Marxist an understanding this idea of work is deeply alienated: that is we are disowned from our work, by the economic system. And hence also of the *value* of work. My idea of work runs the opposite way.

I value my work as a theoretician—and some others do too—because I work with artists on the reception of art. And this is work, I can tell you! I think this is the care of art: the claims, against all odds, to ownership in/of work.

#### Care of the questions (session blurb):

—How do we care for others beyond the neoliberal imperatives to take care of

—How do we care when we speak truth and when we position our speech in the public

—What does it mean to take care of, rather than only produce, what one makes, does and works with: art, theory, institution, technology, and public?

—What are the transpositions of care into artistic research which is itself pledged to the care of art, the care of research, and the care of third parties?

Keywords: *community*-building in the art-field; *valuing* the art-field; finding a third way *between* magnanimity and pusillanimity; *inter subjectivity* and dissent.