Schizzing the ethico-aesthetic paradigm: emergent collectivity and care for the event

Interview with ERIN MANNING and BRIAN MASSUMI by LARISSA DRIGO AGOSTINHO and JEAN-SÉBASTIEN LABERGE

Abstract

In this interview, conducted May 3, 2019 in São Paulo, Erin Manning and Brian Massumi discuss SenseLab's practices in relation to the schizoanalytic clinic. It addresses the question of the schizz and the importance of the impersonal, the care for the event as an ethico-aesthetic commitment, neurodiversity in terms of movement and politics, Brazil and SenseLab's hubs all over the world, and finally the speculative challenge of an alter-economy based on surplus-value of life.

La Deleuziana: This issue of *La Deleuziana* focuses on the Schizoanalytic Clinic. We would like to know to what extent the practices you have developed with SenseLab are linked to this idea.

Erin Manning: Schizoanalysis grew into a core concern at SenseLab through a collective orientation toward event-based practices. We were influenced by Guattari's proposition that schizoanalyst can be a group, and were concerned to develop practices of the event deeply embedded in a collective ethos of event-based care. This has led us to focus on the production of subjectivity from the perspective of emergent collectivity.

One turning point was a very difficult episode where someone suffered a psychotic episode in the aftermath of an event.

Brian Massumi: It was a sudden crisis, which occurred after one of our events, and was related to the event.

Erin: We realized that we had to create techniques to survive in the aftermath of an event's unmooring. We could not ignore the fact that it was necessary to collectively address the disorientation brought by an event.

It was the Brazilians, when they arrived at the SenseLab around 2016, who named our practices as clinical. Before the Brazilians arrived, we would have not said that SenseLab's work was schizoanalytic, though we would have spoken about Guattari's important influence. I think we were still afraid of taking on the vocabulary of the

therapeutic given its personalizing connotations. But when the Brazilians began to define our work as schizoanalytic, a schizz took place, and we turned to schizoanalysis directly, beginning to explore how our practices might compose with the work done at La Borde and elsewhere. We were particularly interested in the extension of the schizoanalytic beyond the psychiatric institution into the wider sphere of the political.

Brian: We were profoundly influenced all along by Guattari, especially by the notion of heterogenesis he develops in *Chaosmosis*. This is the idea of a complex relational field catalyzes into an emergence at a critical point, where what emerge carries its own quality of experience and displays a logic that is irreducible to what came before. We thought of our practice as a practice of the event, active in that kind of catalytic relational field, welcoming emergence. We were very aware of the gap between the logic of established categories and normalized trajectories on the one hand, and on the other the complexity of a relational field, in which there are any number of tendencies bubbling up that don't necessarily come to direct expression. They may pass unnoticed, remaining what Erin calls "minor movements," or perhaps interfere or resonate with each other to create a third tendency that expresses itself instead. Every situation is inhabited by both logics, in uneasy tension. There is a kind of double logic, a logic of mutual inclusion in the event, of what Jean Oury would call the "normopathic" and potentially generative relational complexity.

We started using the word "schizz" before we started using the word "schizoanalysis." The schizz refers to the gap between the two logics just mentioned, the major and the minor, or the normative and the creatively relational. It also refers to a movement or gesture that cleaves away from the major into a renewal of the catalytic powers of the relational field. The schizz in this sense is a processual deviation, a creative line of escape or a wander-line. It is decisive, in that it makes a cut, across which the process continues differently. But it is never reducible to a subjective decision. It may occur at a subthreshold level, without our even noticing, or only indirectly in the way the flow-on effects carry us. A nonhuman factor in the relational field might just as well act as the catalyst as a human gesture. This is why schizoanalysis is more a question of affective attunement than decision in any sovereign sense, and why its practice is by nature collaborative, in the sense that it modulates a field of relation from a position within it, rather than exercising will upon it from a position of mastery. It is ecological, in the broadest sense of that term.

Erin: Our focus at SenseLab from the beginning has been on the impersonal, on the forces that move across more-than human existence. In the turn to schizoanalysis, we explore how impersonal forces move across an emergent collectivity. These impersonal forces should not be seen as opposed to the concept of the "person." The impersonal, like the transindivual in Gilbert Simondon, is what populates the "personal," a category

much more bounded. Too often, we take the "person" and its "personal" tendencies as the starting point. What if instead we asked what qualities of impersonality move across the "person" to expose it to its more-than? This would be a schizoanalytic question.

When the person-complex is enlivened by all that impersonally moves across it, the field of relation of personality expands to include the germs of an emergent collectivity. A group subjectivity is produced which cannot be reduced to either the one or the many. SenseLab begins here, building techniques that wrest impersonality from the more hardened enclosures of identity-based structures. We never neglect the importance of how identity emerges – we simply don't remain there. Schizoanalysis might be thought as the motor that attunes to all that weaves and contours that "I" we refer to when we contort our-selves as separate from a collective becoming.

A collective becoming is an ecology of practices. Or, as Alfred North Whitehead might say, a society of molecules. We are of course aware of all the ways in which bodies become trapped within identitarian frames by a society that confines them within a category. This happens all the time through the workings of racism, neurotypicality, ableism, gender. The question for SenseLab is what kinds of modes of existence are invented when what is most impersonal in existence is amplified. Because of the risks that come of this amplification, the work is also to create sites where other modes of living can be nurtured. Hence the focus on event-based care (care that is not reduced to the one, to the personal, but is woven across an emergent constituency). Very important to us is the constant reminder that when we speak of collectivity we are also speaking of solitude – the more-than one carries as a relational being. What I call "minor sociality" is a reminder that the sociality of an impersonality is an encounter with the more-than that populates us rather than the 1+1 of the interpersonal.

Brian: People sometimes react strongly against this commitment to the impersonal. They have been taught to think of the personal as the seat of feeling, and to mistake affect for emotion. Because of this, they think of the impersonal as flattening, where for us it's the opposite. The impersonal is more intense. It can register the more-than of the person—what might pass through the personal or pool around it, what might move it and condition it, but is no way contained in it. Feeling overspills and runs through. It is in and of the world. It rises from the understory and runs over into the overstory, connecting the infra-personal to the transpersonal. Its in-excess of the personal requires an ecological approach attentive to that movement and sensitive to the schizzes parsing it. There are practices for that.

Deleuziana: Can you give some examples? How do we provoke this kind of schizz that might bring a shift from the personal toward the impersonal?

Erin: I will give a concrete example. Yesterday we were at the Museum of Modern Art of São Paulo with a mixed group of disabled and neurodiverse folks. Upon arriving we were asked if we could do an activation. I was concerned to be asked at the last minute because the techniques we develop require an attunement to the environment – I was concerned about being singled out as leaders of an activity rather than working together as participants in a group process. So I asked not to be introduced but simply to be given a sign when the time was right for us to start. I assured her that either something would begin to emerge or not. We would go from there.

We used a technique we call composing, developed years ago and expanded in many ways by SenseLab. The seeds of this practice were brought by one of our collaborators, Mayra Morales, who is a choreographer, dancer and philosopher. The first iteration was simple: we were asked to engage with objects in a space by allowing them to pull us into movement. Composing became a practice of being ecologically moved rather than willfully moving. What I learned through the practice was that people move much more easily if they are moved ecologically, and particularly if an object does the pulling. This allows people not to feel self-conscious, their movement no longer reducible to them. Bodies begin to move collectively, pulled and drawn by the process itself. What we did yesterday was along those lines. I placed a chair in the centre of the space, upside down, and waited. A minute or so later, Brian brought a cup and turned it upside down on the chair, and then it went, and everybody started composing. Before long the space was alive with tendencies – the environment now populated with all that can lure us into a collective movement (a piece of paper, a shoe, a coat, a string, a piece of fabric). The schizzing of the environment was made possible not by the objects per se, but by the way they called forth movements unscripted. A sculpture began to emerge, then some play, movements both collaborative and solitary. Within less than five minutes objects were no longer objects, they were intercessors to a rhythm syncopated, some people running, some people walking, some dancing with the sculpture and with each other, and some remaining still. A composition came across those rhythms and it was beautiful. It could have continued for hours, but there was a lull after about twenty-five minutes and we stopped.

This is a simple example of how open the environment was to the schizzing. The schizz was already there in germ – the group had been meeting for many months and there was already a sense of collective tending for the field to respond to. What I felt moving through that very special environment was that more than one quality of time was alive. The schizz brought that out. If we have tried that same experiment in a room full of academics in a context rife with self-presentation like a conference, it would likely not have worked!

Brian: And we have tried! [laugh]

Erin: To schizz you can't just bring an existing structure - you can bring the conditions or techniques, but the practice itself has to involve an attuning to what is already at work in the environment. This is the fallacy of the workshop – that it is often a neutralized container brought to different constituencies for experimentation (without an active experimentation on the form itself). There is nothing wrong with that, of course – it's just important to recognize that if you want to create a collective attunement there has to be room for the practice itself to be shaped. I would say that eighty percent of the time we fail. The practice of schizzing and attuning is a practice of schizzing and attuning! It is a practice of perceiving, shaping, being shaped, reorienting, starting again.... It will often take a few years for a technique to become conditioning of new processes. It's that slow.

Brian: We often think with Daniel Stern, whose work on affective attunement is key for us. He shows that affective attunement isn't a question of imitation, and can't be reduced to call-and-response, or action-reaction. It's not imitation because it's about the differential, not resemblance. In affective attunement, people are acting differently together, joined by a rhythm. The rhythm is the line of the variation passing between their differing actions and reactions, which play on each other, in counterpoint or in variations on a motif. They typically cross modes, for example a sound being met with a gesture. There can be a sequencing between them, but there are also overlaps, and even when there's sequencing, the next gesture is already brewing as the last is under way, so its coming is modulated by what the last one is becoming. It might be more precise to say, not that they play *on* each other, but that they *play* each other. They are reciprocally driving and mutually anticipating, at once cause and effect of each other. They are in a relation of dynamic mutual inclusion. Imitation or clear-cut call-and-response, as in a polite conversation between two people, are pared-down limit-cases of a much more moving – and relational – phenomenon. But oddly, that's the model people think of: a back-and-forth dyadic model. For us, that's a lowest-degree relational dynamic, not the model of relation. It's the interpersonal, or the intersubjective, as opposed to the impersonally ecological. And you don't get a collective ecology by adding together dyads. It's a qualitatively different dynamic, involving the nesting of differentials in the same event, hatching a global rhythm. Yesterday, we were some twenty people, and many objects whose contributions in terms of modulatory potential were activated and collectively attuned to. That made for a whole lot of complexity in a small space and a short duration. There were people with very different perceptual worlds and abilities to move, but that was not an impediment, far from it. It added to the differentials in play, and that only enriched the collective rhythm. It became a dance of differential attunement, inclusive of people who can't dance.

The principle is that there must be a differential attunement, such that an emergent rhythm passes through the middle, as Deleuze and Guattari would say. For this to

happen, you have to deactivate the tendency people have to always bring the process back to their all-too-human selves. They have to enter into the process as part-subjects, from a particular angle of insertion into the emergent dynamic, inflecting it with their differences. An emergent collectivity is an integration of part-subjects. It is a collective individuation, from which the one is subtracted.

There are any number of techniques for this. A year and a half ago, two SenseLabbers, Diego Gil and Csenge Kolozsvari, started a practice they call schizosomatics. It's a movement-based practice, involving an emergent sensitization to the schizz. There are also materials-based and space-based practices, not to mention language-based practices. It is crucial to processualize language, to return it to the complexity of the relational field, toward emergently collectivity. This is especially important in the academic context, where language is habitually mobilized as a normative force overcoding the field. We've produced short videos where some of the people most involved describe these practices (http://senselab.ca/wp2/techniques-of-relations-videos/).

Deleuziana: How do you think about the relationship between theory and practice? When you speak in terms of research-creation, is it from an ethico-aesthetic perspective and against a certain scientificity that still prevails, especially in academic circles?

Brian: Yes, we've always thought about it in ethico-aesthetic terms. The ethico- refers to what we call care for the event – that attunement toward emergent collectivity we've been talking about that is involved in the production and variation of complex modes of relation that can't be reduced to the back-and-forth of a sequential interaction. But neither is it a harmony or community. That's not what attunement is. Its ethics is dissensual, in the sense that there are too many qualities of experience, too many intensities, too many tendencies activated, too many part-subjects, to fit neatly together as a harmonious togetherness or group identity. There are always jagged edges and areas of non-overlap that aren't averaged out or smoothed over. What we were saying earlier about the personal has to be said as well of the collective. An emergent collectivity is the more-than of the collective, in the same way were talking about the more-than of the person – and in fact, they're the same more-than. One process.

The ethico- here is aesthetic because the attunement to potentially catalytic factors in the environment mutually includes different modes of perception, accompanying different movements, postures, and positionings. It plays on different qualities of experience, and plays their composing. It is not aesthetic in a way that can be reduced to a person's pre-given sensibility, or even to human sensibility in general. It is in ecological relation, involving dimensions of the person that are infra-conscious or liminal to consciousness, or tantalizingly out of its reach, but still felt, as what I call a

lived abstraction, presenting for feeling the more-than of its present constitution. That makes it a kind of speculation.

For that reason, we also speak of speculative pragmatism, the pragmatic element being the idea we already mentioned that there is a practice for this. There is no method, but there are techniques, techniques for conditioning the field of relation, immanently modulating it. The techniques bear artfully on relation, rather than on discrete objects, in instrumental fashion.

Erin: We have talked a lot about research-creation and have worked to build a vocabulary around art and philosophy as ecologies that are not reducible to each other, but we are increasingly uncertain about whether the assimilation of research-creation to neoliberal capital (in the context of the university) has not advanced to a point that the concept has lost its edge. We still of course deeply believe in practices that are transversal and continue to work hard to consider how research-creation produces singular modalities of value that cannot be subsumed to academic work proper and the methodologies that frame it. My piece "Against Method" in *The Minor Gesture* explores this question in more detail.

When SenseLab started in 2003, research-creation was a new term developed for the national and provincial funding agencies as a way of recognizing art-based practices in the university (prior to that artists without PhDs could not apply for academic grants). As it entered into the discourse, we tried to turn it, before it could be claimed by and for the increasingly market-driven forces taking hold of the university. What we wanted from the outset was for philosophy to be seen as creative. We were never particularly worried about art being philosophical – for us art has always created the seeds for philosophical research. We were more concerned with the academic claim on art that would instrumentalize both creative work and the theoretical scaffolding that would be imposed to give it generally recognized value within the neoliberal economy. We wanted art and philosophy to be approached on their own merits, the hyphen working not to superimpose them but to reveal what could be generated by their coming into contact. Our belief was that the coming into relation of art and philosophy would allow each to develop in new ways, producing a hybrid field of thought and creation.

When SenseLab began reading Stefano Harney and Fred Moten's *The Undercommons*, the concept of study began doing the work of research-creation. Study as developed by Harney and Moten is the lived exploration of tendencies that shifts the conditions of sociality. Study is what does us as much as what we do. Research-creation as SenseLab understands it is study: a practice that does not decide in advance how to value its process.

Brian: We wanted, again, to schizz research-creation, to cut to the hyphen, and practice it as a transductive relation – in other words a relation of mutual becoming in a zone of overlap. The overlap between creative practice and philosophy is possible, on the one hand, because a concept is not thought as opposed to experienced. A concept must be lived, as Deleuze said. That is its vocation. A concept is like a little kernal of potential, a bundle of potential percepts, affects, movements, and actions that can seed itself in a non-philosophical field of relation and unfold in it. You can sow a concept in the prepared ground of a movement practice, for example, and it will grow in that different soil to produce a different kind of effect than it does in philosophy proper. The soil is already a meeting ground, because a movement practice, or any other kind of creative practice, is chock full of concepts that it enacts in movement or material. Every movement practice is an enactive interpretation of what a body can do and how it can relate. It is a lived proposition about sociality, temporality, rhythm … The philosophical thinking cannot come out of the encounter unscathed. It is schizzed – deviated, repotentialized – as is the creative. Double becoming.

If you look at it from both sides at once, you have a lived proposition about the relation between thinking, moving, making, and what staging it in this way might do. The proposition is felt in the form of a differential affective attunement by an emergent collectivity – a subject of the encounter, processually inextricable from it. This is a lived speculation, and carries an exemplary force. The mode of relation exemplified is the harbinger of a mode of life. This makes the practice proto-political: the creation of a people to come, as Deleuze would say. Having dodged the institutional conditioning towards insertion into the neoliberal capitalist economy, it can potentially grow into a political direction, when a third domain is added to the transductive field: that of activism. The SenseLab has always tried to work this triangulation between the philosophical, the artful, and activism.

Deleuziana: There is also an important ethical and political aspect of your work that is highlighted in your engagement with neurodiversity, which is a concept that is still quite unknown outside a few North American circles. Why neurodiversity? Where does it take you that is important for you?

Erin: What is really important to understand is that while Brian and I can sit here and gives what sounds like quite a composed story of SenseLab, in fact nothing is that clear when it is happening. Everything SenseLab does is in response to something pragmatically reorienting the field. We are moved by what finds its way to us. Neurodiversity was like that. Much of my own philosophical work had been on the question of movement – trying to articulate a philosophy of movement that wasn't limited to displacement. Doing this work, I became more and more aware of how movement as I was trying to define it didn't figure in most accounts of the political. From

Politics of Touch on I was especially attracted to modes of thinking-feeling that escaped the bounds of the "modern political subject." Today I would say that what I was discovering was the way in which neurotypicality, as a dominant discourse, frames the subject as outside of movement - and how neurodiversity escapes that framing altogether. I began to articulate this in the final chapter of my book *Relationscapes,* in a chapter called « Thought in Motion » that asks whether it might be possible to consider that the workings of thought extend beyond the linguistic (and beyond consciousness). As a dancer I had a strong sense that thinking happens in movement – and that the thinking didn't need to move through language in order to do its work. It was this chapter that started a conversation with several classical autistics for whom the concept of thought in movement made a lot of sense. The contact with neurodiverse folks had an enormous impact on my work – here were thinkers teaching me how to position the subject differently and how to value the perception of the uncategorized in experience. This led to *Always More Than* One, a book I think of as having been written in co-composition with the autistics I was in conversation with at the time.

All of this to say that by turning my attention so squarely to neurodiversity, SenseLab as a wider collective became attuned to the neurodiversity in our midst, which had of course always been there. This recognition (and all the techniques born from a thinking in movement) in turn led to more neurodiversity as it became clear that we were committed to taking seriously the issue of composing environments that would be sensitive to and engaged with difference.

Over time I began to be better able to articulate how neurotypicality was a systemic category rather than one reducible to a person. I consider neurotypicality to be allied to whiteness. Neurodiversity is an expression of a field of differences that trouble the expectations neurotypicality sets in place as regards knowledge acquisition and deployment, body movement and expression, cognition and sociality. Neurotypicality polices ways of knowing, limiting what is definable as the human. Bodies are excluded from neurotypicality because of their inability to fit within the strict stabilized contours of its accepted expression.

Understanding neurodiversity this way allowed me to begin to locate neurotypicality as an epistemic paradigm through which the political was written. But it would be false to consider this movement of thought without the practice of SenseLab continually feeding and shifting the thinking.

Brian: The original convergence between Erin's and my work was around questions of movement. As I was writing *Parables for the Virtual* I understood it to be about movement first, and affect second, as a helper concept to fill out the account of movement as qualitative transformation, and not as simple displacement. I was especially interested in movements in intensity: the way the world is already incipiently moving before it expresses itself as a displacement in time and space. Erin came

independently to the same concern, for which she coined the term "preacceleration." In preacceleration, that is to say in incipiency, every stirring is directly relational, a potential recomposition of a field of realtion. What I would now term the neurotypical, learning from Erin's work, backgrounds that dimension, and mutilates it. Its logic, which is discretizing, categorizing, individualizing, induces a miscarriage of the people to come. Such is whiteness.

Deleuziana: It's your third visit in Brazil. The first was a brief visit around 2006 for a conference in Fortaleza, and the second was a full month at the end of 2017 for a series of events in São Paulo, Florianopolis, Rio de Janeiro and Campinas, where you both gave talks about the concept of immediation. You're also here in São Paulo today in relation to your immediation project. How do you see the relation between immediation and Brazil? How did the Brazilian hub emerge and take consistency?

Erin: The connection intensified in 2016, during the coup that forced Rousseff out of office, when we were contacted by a several Brazilians seeking to have conversations about the ethico-aesthetic in the context of the political upheaval. We found the issues raised deeply important and started to have conversations about the relationship between the clinical, the philosophical, and the political.

This encounter changed SenseLab (as encounters always do). Our first impulse was to create a network of all the Brazilians contacting us (by then there were about 20 of them) so that they could work together and find techniques to combat the horror of what was happening around them. We contributed some funds to facilitate meetings between them and also assisted those who felt they needed to get out of the country. What was important for us was to bring people together and then to learn from them. This was the impetus of our first collective trip to Brazil in 2017, which brought together SenseLab participants from North America, Europe, and Australia with the emerging Brazilian hub. Our role was to participate in what had been facilitated, and so most of that visit was spent meeting collectives and learning from their practices.

Brian: We have never claimed that what we're doing is unique. There are many initiatives all over the world that resonate with SenseLab. We are always keen to connect with other groups working in a similar vein and learn from them. Brazil is particularly rich in them. I think it's related to the particular cultural history of Brazil, which was marked by artists like Hélio Oiticica and Lygia Clark, whose relational-art work, as Erin mentioned, we see as a kindred practice of care for the event and emergent collectivity. This connection is made more pronounced by the early take-up of the thought of Deleuze and Guattari, in particular through Guattari's travels in Brazil in the 1980s. The ethico-aesthetic paradigm has been doing its work here for awhile, and

schizoanalysis has been taken seriously here as in no other place in the world. So, there was a kind of pre-meeting already in place for us here.

The concept of immediation is connected to the process philosophical gesture of positing the event as the elementary unity of the real. Events are always live in the present. The idea is that whatever of the past affects the present does so because it has been reactivated as a formative force for this occasion. In Whitehead's terms, it makes ingression. It does this selectively, partially, from a particular angle. Even systemic conditionings have to angle themselves into an occasion. They have to presentify themselves, and that affords the present an opportunity to inflect them, even as it undergoes their formative force. This creates a tension, an intensity, a certain pressurization of the situation, where something has to give. This tension can release the kinds of minor movements we were talking about before that delineate lines of escape and foretell potentials as yet unspoken. Nothing is ever entirely played out in advance. This is very much counter to theories of ideology, where general strutures are thought to effectively contain potential, in a foundational act of social-political pre-formation. In immediation, it is all about the singular, without any firm foundation, only patterns of ingress of conformal forces that have to worm their way in. Every situation is tense with the tussle between forces of conformation vying to make ingress and forces of futurity stirring new potential. This makes every moment the site of a political struggle, in potential, and about potential. It gives the everyday a sense of urgency. SenseLab always endeavors to live the urgency. We get the sense that many people in Brazil understand this intuitively, especially in times like this when the urgency has ripened into an emergency.

Deleuziana: And this potential can take us to the question of the "surplus-value of life" that you have recently developed in the *99 Theses,* as well as SenseLab's collaboration with the Economic Space Agency that moved you toward the question of value, thought in relation to the financial market, and related to the clinical, aesthetical, ethical and political aspects you were already working on.

Brian: The idea of surplus-value of life is that when there is an emergence in a complex field of relation, a field-effect is produced that cannot be reduced to its individual parts, and that directly expresses the quality of the event – what manner of event it was. This is part of the concept of immediation. The emergent effect has a qualitative reality that asserts itself as the character of the event. It expresses what the event was "like." But that's a weird expression, because when we talk about what something was like, we're actually talking about what was unique about it. We're talking about its incomensurability, directly felt as an aesthetic quality, an aesthetic value – its eventness. The very feeling of it is an affirmation of the event, in the sense of an assumption of what it brings as the necessary springboard for what might come next.

This lived affirmation of the event, immediating the potential it carries, is surplus-value of life. The surplus refers to the emergent effect being in excess of the individual factors it spins off from. It is the more-than of the event, qualitatively affirmed. It carries the kind of exemplary force I was talking about before. The project of *99 Theses* was to try to articulate this sense of value to other forms of value, in particular capitalist surplus-value. The mad premise of SenseLab's alter-economy work – the 3E Process Seed Bank – is to propose a qualitative economy of the emergently incommensurable as the seed of a post-capitalist economy. (http://senselab.ca/wp2/3e-process-seed-bank/)

Erin: I think that what is implied by the economy connects to what I was saying previously. The context in Québec, in Montréal where the SenseLab is based, is really dynamic. Québec is full of exciting anarchist movements. There is no need for those people to come to SenseLab, they already have their practices. We don't want to claim a territory. SenseLab is a transversality that wants to invent a cross in the necessity of what emerges. When we put something in the world like an alter-economy or an event, our aim is to give it to the world so that somebody else can continue it. We always feel overwhelmed by the limits of our own thought, the feeling that we cannot go any further and that we need help!