Becoming everything – scattered actualizations with curious bodies-darkness-forest assemblage

craving for what might become
when thinking there is no secrets to be revealed by science (Barad, 2008)
in relation to what, you say?
don’t know, “might”, I said
don’t know what “might”, might be
it is not yet
it is however political
always

it is methodologies bearly sniffed with that craves (us?)
and philosophy
a monist one and others
crave for a language that ‘do something towards transforming
particular ways of knowing and producing knowledge’ (Dillard, 2000, p. 662)
‘a minor language’
several minor languages
characterized by ‘sobriety’, by ‘variation’
that is ‘a becoming-minor of the major language’
‘achieved by streching tensors’ trough our own language (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 116)

streching language with curious bodies, darkness and forest
collective experimenting, collective trying out
collectively seeking less painful research practices and ways of being (Greenhough & Roe, 2010)
in-between major-scientific-language and becoming-minor-language
turning away from light
the oh so bright light
away from the majesty of light
light as a force appreciated in philosophy, science and art
(Macauley, 2009)

turning our backs on becoming enlightened, perhaps
away from constant
away from the ‘the average adult-white-heterosexual-European-male-speaking a standard language’ assuming power and domination (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 116)

did we touch upon some of the same issues raised in an ‘endarkened epistemology’ (Dillard, 2000)?
did we work against the metaphors of research?
away from research as reciepe and towards research as a responsibility (Dillard, 2000)?
perhaps towards doing response-ability (Haraway, 2012)?

not overlook darkness
not undervalue darkness
not aproach darkness as malign (Macauley, 2009)
instead
morphing with darkness
cultivating our sensitivity towards the environment (Greenhough & Roe, 2010)
becoming creatures of darkness and forest
‘becoming-minor’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987)
become ‘far-seers’ with our ambiguities (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 222)

being in the in-betweenness
of major-scientific-language and becoming-minor-language as politics
might be that of hinging on to the production of differences
love duration through ‘philosophical intuition’ (Grosz, 2005)
strive to become pregnant with other realities


