


Streams



ENERGIES × METHODS × ATMOSPHERES × KNOWLEDGES

OCT 23-25, 2026
VANCOUVER





STREAM

S1. Absence and Its Afterparties

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Alana Brekelmans

University of Queensland
a.brekelmans@uq.edu.au

Bretton A. Varga

California State University
bvarga@csuchico.edu

Asilia Franklin-Phipps

SUNY New Paltz
asilia.f@gmail.com

DESCRIPTION

Absence does stuff in the world. It pushes, pulls, impinges. It orients bodies towards or away from unfinished pasts and unmade futures, producing (and unspooling) its own material-semiotic inventory and strange time-space as it gathers up that which is no longer, has never been, or is not-yet. This panel is an invitation to think with the ways we come to know absence, particularly through affects and materialities that trouble simplistic divisions between here and not-here, and how we respond to all this through practices of knowing and unknowing.

We explore absence as a violent yet seething and generative force that meddles with time, space, and the ways we navigate the overlappings of both. In doing so, we linger somewhere between emergence and dissolution. Absences born of colonial dispossession, ecological destruction, and social violence accumulate as residues in landscapes, logics, bodies, and institutions to unsettle temporality and move us towards the unfinished and uncanny (Gordon 1997, Gordillo 2014; Sharpe 2016; Snaza 2020, Stoler 2013). But absences also lean forward, with promissory narratives, anticipatory modes of governance, and cruel optimisms populating imagined futures with affective investments that consume the present (Adams et al 2009; Ahmed 2010; Berlant 2011; Coleman 2023). In this way, dreamworlds of progress haunt the present as a particular con/figuration of ghost (Tsing et al 2017). By evoking 'the afterparty' of absence we consider the non-linear time-space flickering between presence and absence. The Afterparty is where people stay too long, where memories sediment, where time gets strange, and where anything can happen. We consider the afterparty a site of unexpected knowledge production, a potential space for remaking damaged worlds. It is here, dancing with spectres and the speculative, that we can embrace what Avery Gordon (1997) terms the 'something to be done'. The arts and non-

Western epistemologies have long navigated knowledge produced by this time-space much better than conventional academic inquiry. What might it mean to take seriously the methods that these practices offer, departing from inherited ways of seeing, thinking and sensing and placing them alongside affective and new materialist theory/ies that have never neglected the capacities of absence and its myriad cuffs, folds, and tremors? We invite papers on hauntings, premonitions, ruins, decompositions, scars, slipstreams, archives, fermentations, investments, phantom limbs, altars, rot, quantum entanglements, wakes, barometric pressures, half-lives, abandoned mines and much more that explore the following questions:

- How are absences rendered knowable or unknowable?
- What does knowing or unknowing absences do to our navigation through time and space?
- What politics, orientations, practices, make residue or traces more noticeable?
- How are we provoked to know in excess of what is right in front of us? And how is that unknowing/differently knowing required of us in moments like the one that we are navigating now?
- How might knowledge practices and arts of making based in speculative care (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017), transcorporality (Alaimo 2010), and intra-relation (Barad 2003) help reconfigure trajectories into the past and future?



STREAM

S2. Affect-ionate Appetites: Desire, Disgust, and All the Feelings in Between

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Jennifer Lin Lemesurier

Penn State

jlemesurier@colgate.edu

DESCRIPTION

Living in the murky shadow of late capitalism is weird. And yet, we must eat.

To eat or consume necessitates yielding to the affective pressures that maintain certain appetites as credible, certain foodways as tenable, and certain identities as economically viable. As Ben Highmore reminds us, “because food is orchestrated around the body,” it “intensifies” the swirl of affects, both good and bad, that inform the intersection of physiological tendencies and cultural values (2010, 126). Consumption is shot through with hierarchies of the human/animal, laborer/consumer, technological/natural, racialized, whiteness etc... Eating ethically is an imperative that undoes itself even as it is spoken. Simultaneously, eating and consumption can be agentic, life-sustaining, and creative, a source of sensory pleasure and discovery. Generational wisdom, diasporic legacies, and innovative identity performances emerge from the possibilities found on the way to the plate. The intimacy of shared eating and consumption can be a gift. Or, food-related methods might trigger the question of “what more I could do for my soup,” a radical invitation to active engagement with the world that productively disrupts habitual forms of knowing and valuing (Mol 2021, 62).

Because negotiations among multiple forms of eating and consumption are laden with affective assumptions, this stream invites participants to explore eating, appetite, and consumption as processes that engage and/or forestall a range of affective possibilities. Participants might explore these spaces through investigating discourses directly related to food and eating. For example, dominant rhetorics often maintain self/other boundaries through references to extreme or deviant eating, fostering atmospheres of fear and disgust that stick to certain bodies and populations. Participants might also turn toward the metaphorical, considering where the undergirding epistemologies of consumption ripple outward to other forms of behavior and thought. For example, patterns of consumption practices are rooted in or dovetail with broader flows of public feeling, and exploring those connections might provoke generative questions about both.

Possible topics might align with the following starting points or journey elsewhere.

- Which discourses encourage limits on the affect surrounding eating and consuming? What “feminist killjoy” perspectives are productive starting points to shake loose these formations? (Ahmed 2023, LeMesurier, 2023)
- Where are forms of racialization enmeshed in affects related to particular objects of consumption and/or demographics? (Wazana Tompkins, 2024)
- What forms of writing and composing about eating and consumption assume a universal body that is anti-Black? (Jackson, 2020)
- What eating-related discourses and rhetorics offer glimpses of a new “poetics of relation” or poetics of question that reconfigure relationships of eater/eaten? Food and the land? (Glissant, 1997)
- What “minor feelings” might reframe dominant epistemologies around food, eating, and appetite? (Hong 2020)
- What ways of eating and/or consuming, or forms of attention to eating and consuming, engage dominant affective infrastructures in surprising, subversive, mundane ways? (Stewart 2007)



STREAM

S3. Affective Built World: Body-Space Politics Beyond Utility

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Haoran Zhang

Macau University of Science and Technology
3250000870@student.must.edu.mo

DESCRIPTION

How might affect help us rethink the built world beyond utility, function, and other tangible measures of value? What becomes visible when space is approached not only as form, program, evidence, or infrastructure, but as something sensed, inhabited, remembered, and negotiated through bodies? And how might attention to body-space interaction open new conversations across geography, philosophy, psychology, sociology, media studies, anthropology, architecture, and other fields concerned with space, subjectivity, and lived experience?

This stream begins from a concern with a recurring tendency in the social-scientific and humanistic study of architecture: a pull toward the measurable, the instrumental, and the materially demonstrable. Questions of performance, use, evidence, policy, and representation often dominate how architecture is analyzed and justified. Yet built environments are never only functional or visible arrangements. They are also lived through atmospheres, intensities, attachments, estrangements, sensory pressures, memories, anticipations, and pre-cognitive orientations that shape how bodies enter, endure, avoid, or become with space.

Affect offers a way to engage these intangible but consequential dimensions of architecture without reducing them to either personal feeling or decorative atmosphere. In a Spinozist sense, bodies are defined by their capacities to affect and be affected, while Deleuzian readings of affect emphasize the relational and processual character of such encounters (Spinoza 1677; Deleuze 1988). Affect thus allows us to ask what space does: how it presses on bodies, modulates attention, organizes nearness and distance, enables or restricts relation, and participates in the making of subjectivity, collectivity, and power. Following Massumi, affect may be understood as registering bodily intensity prior to its full capture in qualified emotion or representation (Massumi 2002). In this sense, affect is not simply another theme to be added to architectural discourse, but a possible method for rethinking architectural knowledge itself.

While architecture remains one important point of departure, this stream is intended as a broader invitation to scholars and practitioners working on affect and the built world in multiple registers. We welcome contributions that engage embodied perception, spatial politics, environmental psychology,

non-representational theory, phenomenology, media environments, memory studies, urban atmospheres, and virtual or hybrid spaces. The stream is especially interested in how body-space interaction can be examined across built, social, psychic, philosophical, and geographic registers, and in how affect may connect these different ways of thinking space.

Papers in this stream may explore, but are not limited to:

- Affect as method in architectural research
- Body-space interaction and pre-cognitive encounter
- Architecture beyond utility, function, and evidence
- Atmosphere, mood, sensation, and orientation
- Spatial politics and the affective life of power
- Memory, attachment, estrangement, and architectural experience
- Embodied phenomenology and affect theory
- Architecture in dialogue with geography, philosophy, and psychology
- Non-representational and more-than-representational approaches to space
- Virtual, mediated, and hybrid spatial environments
- Adaptive reuse, obsolescence, and affective transformation
- Methods for studying intangible dimensions of built environments



STREAM

S4. Affective Oceanic Encounters in the MAKEing

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Vivienne Bozalek

University of the Western Cape
vbozalek@gmail.com

Nike Romano

Cape Peninsula University of Technology
niker@icon.co.za

DESCRIPTION

This panel plunges into oceanic waters to frolic between the boundaries of methods and explore what might happen when we swim away from Knowledge towards an energetics of the otherwise. Inspired by the littoral zone—a shifting space between high and low tides and affected by earth's proximity to the moon—the panel considers watery Methods, Atmospheres, knowledges and Energies. Through its dense, dynamic, permeable, affective atmosphere, the ocean invites an “energetics of the otherwise: for sensing, imagining, and connecting with new found energies, not in ways that ignore the piling up of violence upon violence, but on the contrary in ways that attend to the sparking up of energies within the debris, for thinking and connecting and caring otherwise” (Barad 2025, p 407).

We invite contributions that explore the sea as a space of affective contagion, where the watery potential of swimming-with MAKEs fresh imaginaries to animate and enliven ecological and political entanglements otherwise. Contributions for the panel might be inspired by, but are not limited to, the following questions:

- What forms of "knowing-otherwise" emerge when the human is no longer the apex predator, but a clumsy, displaced visitor, a transient dweller (Oppermann, 2025) in a marine ecology? How might these watery embodied knowledges (with a lower case k) un/make, refresh, reboot, wash through us in unquantifiable ways?
- What political, ethical, ontological and epistemological lessons can be learned from oceanic creatures, and what Stacy Alaimo (2025) refers to as 'creaturely aesthetics' in the ocean? How do they disrupt conventional scientific epistemologies and a colonising environmental gaze? Consider for example practices such as the echolocation of the toothed whale, shapeshifting of cephalopods, sessility of kelp forests, the lateral line of fishes and cleaning stations in coral reefs?

- The ocean can be regarded as a litmus test for ecological planetary damages. How do human activities such as releasing effluent and factory waste into the ocean, deep sea mining and other invasive and destructive acts impact on the planet including the ocean and its creatures?
- What happens when we immerse ourselves and become-with the porosity of the ocean and the shock of cold water? How might such encounters untether humans from conventional notions, such as the bounded self?
- How might group ocean swims or communal snorkeling practices be creatively regenerative for collective capacities to deal with fascist and other contemporary destructive challenges?
- How could affective oceanic encounters queer taken-for-granted assumptions like space, time and matter and bring indeterminacy's radical potential to the fore?
- How do indigenous and local histories of swimming, diving, and navigating unsettle and decentre Western, rationalist paradigms of Knowledge? How do haunted histories of segregation, privatisation of coastlines, fishing livelihoods and generational trauma shape the affective atmosphere of the beach and the ocean for marginalised bodies?



STREAM

S5. Affective Politics and Energetic Transductions Across Art and Design

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Jonas Fritsch

AIR Lab, IT University of Copenhagen
frit@itu.dk

Kristina Mah

School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
drkristinamah@gmail.com

Christoph Brunner

Erasmus University Rotterdam
brunner@esphil.eur.nl

DESCRIPTION

Energy and energies have emerged as core concepts in increasingly expansive research across the natural sciences, the humanities, and the arts. In Western contexts, energy is conceptualized as a force of life, a materializing commodity, a physical quantity, an analytic perspective, an economy, an ecological concern, an experiential encounter, and more. Complementarily, but also differently, non-Western perspectives such as Daoist philosophy introduce relational, regenerative, and cosmological alternatives that challenge extractivist logics. Douglas Kahn has insisted on working with “energies” in the plural while emphasizing their artistic, aesthetic, and affective dimensions. Similarly, Bruce Clarke staged STS-oriented discussions of energy and thermodynamics in *Energy Forms* (2001) and later expanded this discourse toward literature and the arts (2002). More recently, these debates have opened onto historical arcs linking thermodynamics and labor within historical materialism to discussions of energy in embodied and affective contexts (Daggett 2021). Likewise, the relation between life and energy has formed a philosophical line extending from evolutionary biology and vitalist philosophies, positioning energy as a transsubstantial force beyond mere quantification (Caygill 2007). These lineages resonate in our globally entangled present and position energy as a resonant concept across contexts and domains. Beyond naming the major processes and devastating projects of modernization, the field of the Energy Humanities has argued that moving away from fossil-based energetics requires the crafting of new experiential spacetimes and worldings “reimagined in the wake of the experience of the expanded, extended selves of fossil fuel modernity” (Diamanti and Szeman 2020, p. 141).

Energy and its intersection with affect, as a force exceeding both the numerical and the emotional, can already be found in the writings of Gilbert Simondon from the 1950s onward. In his relational account of the physical, organic, and psychological (social), he draws on the concept of potential energy, as developed in early twentieth-century physics, to propose a radical approximation of material (actual) and potentiating (virtual) tendencies in the fabrication of procedural reality. On this basis, Simondon proposes what might be called a “human energetics,” radically rethinking the humanities in relation to the natural sciences. We find this especially resonant with the artistic, affective, and materialist understandings of energy outlined above.

In this stream, we are interested in interrogating the ways in which energy and energies, in deep resonance with affect, might contribute to ongoing investigations of processes of intensification and transduction in contemporary technologically infused experiential fields across human, non-human, and more-than-human bodies and dimensions. Building on Simondon's proposition of a human energetics and Eastern somatic and contemplative traditions such as Daoist practices, we wish to explore how energetic transduction might be not only theorized but also practiced and navigated across art and design—and beyond. We invite contributions that energetically and affectively engage with, question, creatively problematize, and further explore topics such as:

- How can we rethink and redesign not only the fossil-fueled energetic foundations of modernity, but the entire notion of energy, in order to imagine more livable futures today?
- What energies are needed to grow collective capacities to make life otherwise?
- What affective politics are enacted across technoscientific stratifications, and how might an energetic approach open up possibilities—and potential—for countering such developments?
- What is lost or gained when energy is theorized as affective, relational, and embodied rather than quantifiable and transferable?
- What forms, methods, and encounters might cultivate “sympathetic resonance,” not as a spiritual retreat from politics but as one of its energetic foundations?



STREAM

S6. Affective Traces Across Generations

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Tiina Lempinen

University of Oulu
tiina.lempinen@oulu.fi

Helena Ristaniemi

University of Oulu
helena.ristaniemi@oulu.fi

DESCRIPTION

The past is porous and intertwines with the present in myriad ways; time lives in bodies, objects, spaces, beliefs, traditions, and practices (Barad, 2017; Barad, 2019). Within Baradian thought, past, present, and future materialize and intra-act; the past is a material and entangled force mattering in the present, carrying responsibilities for justice and response-ability. These temporal entanglements are affectively charged: the past becomes present and is felt through bodily sensations, atmospheres, and intensities. Past and future actualize through the everyday practices, experiences, storytelling, memories, and values of family, kinship, and local communities, but also through corporeal knowledge, silences, and breakages.

Temporal entanglements thus challenge linear, progressive notions of historical time bound to colonial, capitalist, and nationalist networks, opening instead toward relational and plural temporalities (Barad, 2019). Drawing on this, memories and experiences of the past can be approached as relational, affective, and sociomaterial processes. This simultaneously resonates with diverse knowledge systems, for example, with Indigenous worldviews where time is often considered spiral, place-based, and relational, and where histories of land, ancestors, humans, and more-than-humans are inseparable (e.g., Marker, 2018; Lehtola, 2022; Simpson, 2017).

Exploring affectivity, temporality, and generations is essential for addressing contemporary social issues. Experiences such as discrimination, oppression, disadvantage, and violence can affect across generations, but so can resistance, support, and community-building practices. Leaving affective traces across generations, these legacies are not fixed but rather continuously formed and reconfigured. This stream encourages mapping those lines of flight (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) that open up possibilities for change and transformation across generations. We invite explorations of how affective traces of collective events do not transmit or become inherited linearly across generations, nor reside exclusively within the psychic realm, but materialize, for example, through myths and silences (Cho, 2008), communal relations (Walkerline & Jiménez, 2012), and everyday material-affective

practices (Huuki & Juutilainen, 2016). We challenge stream contributors to move beyond pathologizing and individualizing understandings of trauma and adversities and, in doing so, to resist neocapitalist forces that produce, direct, and capture desire and affect.

This stream invites contributors to explore trans/inter-generationality through dis/continuities, fractures, and changes. We encourage especially analyses of how temporal entanglements and affective encounters produce the social world across and beyond generations. Presentations may examine themes related to trans/inter-generationality from empirical, theoretical, and methodological perspectives. How does the past become affectively present in everyday lives? What kinds of tensions and frictions arise at the intersections where the present collides with the values, beliefs, and practices of previous generations? What methods can be used to trace and map trans/inter-generationality in affect research?

Our stream invites presentations and discussions on, but not limited to:

- Affective approaches to tracing and mapping trans/inter-generationality
- Alternative approaches to linear and chronological temporalities in studying trans/inter-generationality
- Ethical considerations and responsibilities for researching sensitive and cross-cultural questions on trans/inter-generationality
- Creative examples of how to attune to trans/inter-generationality in affect research
- Resistance and refusal as ways of knowing and/in being across generations and temporalities
- Gender, sexuality, class, and ethnicity as trans/inter-generational phenomena
- Trans/inter-generationality in Indigenous studies, for example, meanings of past generations and temporalities
- Memory studies and the body as an archive of past experiences and future orientations
- The transmission of trauma across generations
- Childhood and youth as entanglements of transgenerational family relations
- Kinship beyond traditional family relations: how kinships are built in more-than-human communities across time
- Entanglement as a method in affect studies of generation



STREAM

S7. Curatorial Affects

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Jennifer Fisher

York University, Toronto
jefish@yorku.ca

DESCRIPTION

This stream will focus on the generative affects of the curatorial. Curating involves configuring atmospheres, moods, energies and modalities of connection that transmit affect (Brennan 2010; Blackman 2016). Immersive installations, phantasmagoric projections, intimate performance, site-based biennials and civic events mobilize art as events that convey affect (O'Sullivan 2001; Fisher 2016). The curatorial might be considered as a field of capacious relationality where artworks comprise points of intensity for exhibitionary enactments that trace lines of variation (Seigworth 2022). Artists and curators configure spatial contexts in a number of ways—to situate artworks, generate intensity and mediate social bonds. Curatorial labour also extends to mobilizing personal networks, where generating relational climates produces energies essential to underwriting curatorial production in often under-funded and precarious conditions (Reckitt 2016). The curatorial field can be extended to modalities of display that encompass the performative style of subcultures, fashion shows, and decorum. Where museums, galleries, art world events, and artworks themselves function as contact zones where affect is transmitted, this panel invites submissions that inquire into how curatorial affect shapes relations between artworks, intuitions, spaces, audiences, social networks and sensibilities. A range of contributions are sought, from exhibition case studies, curatorial memoirs and auto-ethnographies, to speculations into modalities of curatorial agency governing the transmission of affect.

Possible themes for exploring curatorial affect

- affect theory as a mode of curatorial and exhibitionary analysis
- spatial intuitions, exhibition affects and artworld atmospheres
- transpersonal affect as feeling states that govern artmaking genres and curatorial subcultures
- generative affects in curatorial intervention and site-responsive infrastructural activism
- affects in relational aesthetics (registers of conviviality or mutually respectful agonistic struggle)
- configuring affect (mood, atmosphere and intensity) in museums, art, exhibitions and display cultures
- politics of affect in curatorial attitudes, habits, self-formation and art subcultures
- performance art affects as loci of sensations, connections and embodiments

- navigating exhibitions: eye level trajectories vs multisensorial immersions vs disembodied viewing of virtual exhibitions- accessing exhibitions: disability and neurodivergent curatorial modes
- codified affects, artistic style and attitude- spectral curating/haunted museums/intangible states
- experiential modalities: exhibitions as contact zones for art's affects
- case studies of the aesthetics of affect in art, exhibitions and display culture
- curating as the mediation of specific contexts, senses, interfaces, and cognitions



STREAM

S8. Dirt/y Affects: Against Clean Living

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Desirée Rowe

Towson University
drowe@towson.edu

Michael Tristano Jr.

Towson University
mtristano@towson.edu

Michael Frischherz

Towson University
mfrischherz@towson.edu

DESCRIPTION

Everything sucks. And we are all collectively being asked to clean it up. But what does it mean to sit in the mess? With the dirtiness? This isn't just a metaphor. This stream is invested in conversations that center the dirty atmospheres that we all share through performative representations of rubbish. In this stream, we revel in the contaminations between, through, and with each other. In a moment when purity logics dominate affective, material, and political movements across the global (e.g. eugenics, genocide, fascism), this stream invites authors to return to the dirt—both the literal and metaphorical—as a way of illuminating and imagining other worldings. As Leddy (1995) theorizes, some are primed to notice what is not dirty in ways others can not. The dichotomy between what is dirty and what is clean or neat is not simply a matter of aesthetics but rather a structure which reflects and refracts hierarchical forms of power. Those who are afforded the privilege of a clean existence move through the world with privilege many do not. Douglas' (1966) notion of dirt as “matter out of place” signals, “where there is dirt there is a system” (35). This stream asks submitters to engage in this systematic ordering of purity logics by (re)turning to the dirt. Shafiq (2025) offers us, “dirt is open-ended, there is an ambiguity of what can pollute, and what makes things dirty can be many: purity is singular but being dirty is quintessential plural: it is anything that is out of place” (p.3). We ask you to ponder where your work is with/in the dirt? Where does your work get messy? Building off the framework of palliative performance (Rowe 2024) advocates for a “palliative performance style that pushes back against the cult of wellness with a bare messiness that revels in its mistakes” (p.2) we ask to submitters to consider reveling in the mess and approach recent trans/inter/disciplinary work that centers negative affect within a specific frame - the dirtiness of it all. We invite collaborations that don't attempt repair. Rather, we/they push back against the neoliberal daydream of a futurity that is

rooted in some type of constructed purity ethic (Steulke 2021). We ask submitters to trouble the boundaries that demand our performance, our scholarship, our lifeworlds engage at the intersections of a white, nationalist ethic. The dirt/y is often disposable. Normative logics compel us to dispose of bodies, communities, excesses, waste, promiscuities, uninhabitable lands, and the shit that does not serve "us". Thus we seek proposals that dig through the trash to reclaim the disposable, that line their shelves with the treasures of refuse, that moan in pleasure at the sight of scum/SCUM.

Consider:

- What would it mean for us to desire dirt?
- To revel in/with the trash?
- What would it mean to MAKE something new out of dirt? (And really, actually, love it.)
- To contaminate the "public good?"
- To be a problem? (without looking for solutions) Without saying sorry?
- What would it mean to do dirty repair?

Dirt is the pejorative for soil. Though regimes conceptualize soil as a productive site of meaning making and growth, pejorative frames of dirtiness are rooted in our own epistemological frameworks. But we know dirt is also necessary for growth. Performative representations of dirtiness take many forms: methodological turns, death, architecture, aesthetics, religion, ecosystems.

Perhaps you can consider:

- Dust, excrement, rubbish, bacteria, soil
- Social outsiders as dirty
- Feeling dirty and normativities
- Dirty tactics and strategies
- Dirt and climate
- The politics of purity
- Contamination and pollution
- Disposability and compostability

We invite you to the dumpster. To the trash. To get dirty with us.



STREAM

S9. Elemental Affects and Atmospheric Wellbeing

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

David Rousell

RMIT University
david.rousell@rmit.edu.au

Deborah Lupton

University of New South Wales
dlupton@unsw.edu.au

Cher Hill And Carman McKay

Simon Fraser University
cher_hill@sfu.ca

DESCRIPTION

What would it mean to take the elements as organising contexts for affect studies? This stream proceeds from a series of emerging transdisciplinary fields—Critical Air Studies, Critical Forest Studies, Critical Ocean Studies, Critical Energy Studies, Critical Time Studies—assembling around shared elemental milieus: the air we breathe, the forests we walk through, the oceans we cross, the energy we metabolise, the historical time we are thrown into. In each case, it is an elemental milieu (with its particular thickness of bodily relationships and planetary forces) that draws researchers into unexpected collaborations across the humanities, arts, social sciences, and physical sciences.

The questions this stream poses to affect studies include: what role might affect play in drawing scholars into emerging elemental studies? Are there specific affects that circulate within and between elemental milieus? Does each milieu afford particular ways of registering and working with affect—different textures, tonalities, and affordances? What might an elemental approach to affect bring to place-based relationships, and what it means to live in good relations with land?

These questions emerge from the recognition that affect theory's primary conceptual vocabulary—intensity, capacitation, transmission, circulation—often begins with human social relations before moving outward. The convergence of new critical studies around forests, oceans, time, energy, and air invites a different starting point: the elemental milieu as protean condition for affective relationships from which sociality grows.

The concept of *atmospheric wellbeing* offers one worked example of what elemental affect studies looks like in practice (Rousell & Lupton, 2025). Understood as the affective and sensory dimensions of a body's entanglement with the air it breathes—its toxicities and breathabilities, political and climatic conditions, and intersectional angles of impact—atmospheric wellbeing names affects that exceed both individual health and planetary governance frameworks. Here the atmosphere is not background to affective life but its very medium of transmission: an elemental milieu that actively precipitates possibilities for sensing, feeling, and acting in the world.

An elemental turn in affect studies provides new critical tools for attuning to place-based histories of elemental milieus and how these are differentially impacted by colonial dispossession and toxification. Indigenous communities have long understood the elements as expressions of kinship, care, and sovereignty—not as passive media through which human social life unfolds, but as juridical, therapeutic, affective, and pedagogic forces (Bawaka Country et al., 2016; Kimmerer, 2013; Tynan, 2021). These perspectives vary significantly across distinct peoples, territories, and geopolitical contexts and cannot be collapsed into a general elemental framework. The stream invites work that critically attunes to affective configurations of the elemental and the situated complexities of atmospheric toxicity and wellbeing.

The stream is co-convened by visiting and local researchers and proceeds in collaboration with Coast Salish (máthxwi and x^wməθk^wəyəm) artist and facilitator Carman McKay, whose practice grounds our engagement with the specific elemental milieus of the conference's location on unceded lands.

We welcome work engaging with, but not limited to:

- Elemental affects and more-than-human wellbeing
- First Nations, Indigenous, and Global South elemental knowledges
- Critical Air, Forest, Ocean, Energy, and Time Studies
- Decolonial and extractive histories of elemental milieus
- Atmosphere as concept and method
- Affective, sensory, speculative, participatory, and creative methodologies
- Architectural, performative, and technological mediations of elemental milieus



STREAM

S10. Exercising Corpo-Realities

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Paul Bowman

Cardiff University
BowmanP@cardiff.ac.uk

DESCRIPTION

Why do we exercise, and how do physical practices shape our identity and ideology? Every physical practice creates distinct ways of experiencing the body—different 'corpo-realities'—which impact how we feel, what we believe, and how we relate to the world. According to Lauren Berlant, affect studies can be regarded as an extension of ideology studies, as it moves further into the realms of lived, embodied life.

We exercise to change. Exercise changes us. We change our exercises—depending. On what? Some approaches may see only ideological capture. We are certainly affected by the structuring forces of pre-personal discursive energies, tendencies and trajectories. But we form agency within structuring structures. We craft our activities on the basis of changes they themselves have produced. Things change, so we have to. We change, so things have to. New vistas open. We can now do different things, or the same things differently.

Across the disciplines, many methodologies are used to try to capture these complex dynamics. Meanwhile, untold numbers of people have agonising or delightful conversations with themselves about their identities, orientations, hopes, dreams, fantasies, and fears; move the pin up or down the stack; tighten their running shoes; ponder a kettlebell; or lightly touch a punchbag and take a barely conscious sniff. Countless reels tell us we must change our life. Some arrest us. Some irritate. Others excite. All are potentially powerful interventions.

This stream explores ways we might grasp the exercise/affect nexus. How can we comprehend and conceptualise affective atmospheres, felt and lived through media and movement? What can the relations hope to be between scholarly knowledges, practitioner knowledges, and dispersed and profuse discursive energies?

We invite contributions that explore:

- Methods to identify and analyse what Lauren Miller has called 'affective habitus';
- The retooling of discourse analysis to gauge atmospheres and structures of feeling at the interface of social media and embodied activities;
- The use of textual analysis to identify the ideological imperatives of embodied practices;

- Ways of disambiguating between inherent affective capacities and externally imposed ways of feeling and experiencing them. (Consider: might pranayama or qigong have inherently or immanently 'self-mystifying' trajectories, or are such dimensions imposed by an attending discourse that provides interpretive scaffolding? Or: does bodybuilding necessarily produce predictable forms of the simultaneous erosion and intensification of gender, or are the specific features of its 'capacity to affect' determined entirely by 'context'?)

The panel is open to papers that explore the affective dimensions of different corpo-realities from across the landscape of exercise practices. We anticipate papers on affective habitus (Lauren Miller), the interface of social media, ideological fantasy and affective exercise (Paul Bowman), and the use of textual analysis to examine embodied affective ideology (Peter Katz). The stream is open to contributions from any discipline that engage with exercise and corpo-realities in creative and insightful ways.



STREAM

S11. Feeling Beside Affect: (Un)Translatable & Ineffable

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Chufeng Meng

Western University
cmeng48@uwo.ca

Weifan Mo

New School for Social Research
weifanmo@gmail.com

Yilin Zhang

University of Georgia
yz37764@uga.edu

DESCRIPTION

In this stream, we invite attempts to refigure “affect” through unaccounted-for names, garments, or narrative formations, especially across cultural and linguistic contexts. With these attempts, a question begins to insist: To what extent is “affect” universal? What lies outside the frame of affect theory (or studies) in North American and European academies, yet might still disturb, inspire, or help us reimagine affect—or affect-like experiences?

This line of inquiry foregrounds the issue of translatability. Within the Chinese context, for instance, studies in the history of emotions often converge with “affect” in seeking to articulate, against the odds, modes of feeling and motility that resist habitual or institutional capture. Yet the term *qíng* (情)—with its wide range of connotations, from emotion in general to intense attachment, from private intention to the situation that invites response—eludes precise placement within the conceptual genealogy of English theory. Translatability, or rather the difficulty of translation, is not merely a linguistic problem. It inheres in cultural specificity and historically embodied structures of feeling shaped by social and political conditions.

By attending to (un)translatability, we make no claim to produce a coherent mapping or an autonomous genealogy that systematically stretches existing “affect” lexicons to other parts of the world, or to the fields and disciplines still at the periphery of our attention. Instead, we would like to lean towards the relationality of being Beside, following Eve Sedgwick’s proposal in *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (2002). To be beside connotes a non-dualistic, if at times conflictual,

spatial positionality that allows divergent or supplementary conceptualizations and worldings to remain in juxtaposition without coercing resonance—in mutual solicitation, in allusive query and dance.

Our stream aims to recall an ethical appeal to respect the integrity of those ineffable, irreducible, and untranslatable “affect(s)” (De Chavez, 2025). What ineffable Methods, Atmospheres, Knowledges, and Energies animate our endeavors? For non-Western individuals and their affective experiences, how do we preserve, search for, and invent new vocabularies to articulate those affects that English cannot address? And finally, how might we cultivate ways of moving together without moving in unison, resonating obliquely between our distinct tonalities?

Possible topics may include, but are not limited to:

- Non-Western & indigenous affective experiences
- Uneven forms and problems of subjectivity
- Unnamed affects and affective experiences/energies/methods
- Ineffable knowledge and ways of knowing
- Alternative vocabularies of affect
- Multilingual and monolingual approaches to feeling
- Affect in medical, healing, and ritual traditions
- Literary, cinematic, musical exemplifications of the (un)translatability of feeling
- Visual art and the ineffable
- Body, vibrations, and sensational experiences
- Emotions and feelings in diverse cosmologies
- Distinct socio-political needs that call for affect
- Non-Western affective pedagogies
- Cultural specificities in the body's capacity to affect and be affected
- The question of mobilization in postcolonial and decolonial practices
- Politics and social activism in different geopolitical contexts



STREAM

S12. Feeling Sick and Sickly Feelings

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Zoe Fuad

fuadzoe@gmail.com

DESCRIPTION

This stream will explore the overlaps between affect and disability studies, teasing out possibilities for mutual influence and intoxication. Experiences of disability, illness, and affect alike call attention to the bodymind's porousness. They foreground our ontological entanglements with the systems in which we're embedded (Marya & Patel 2021); how the body and world modulate, energize, and dis/able one another in turn. It's no surprise, then, that affect and disability are mutually constitutive on several levels: socially disruptive affects are often pathologized as mental illness (e.g. depression, anxiety, prolonged numbness), and disabled experiences entail a host of "bad crip feelings" (e.g. loneliness, abandonment, grief) (Smilges 2023). Panelists in this stream will enter extended conversation around how affect and disability studies intersect and challenge each other, as well as the potential risks and opportunities of blurring the distinctions in-between.

Panelists might draw from disability studies to write with debilitating affects: chronic depression, melancholia, or numbness (Cvetkovich 2012; Chen 2000; Winters 2016; Bruce 2021; Langstaff 2016), for instance, all of which have been pathologized and medicalized in various ways (Khúc 2024). What resources does disability studies offer to reframe these states through a political/relational lens (Kafer 2013), or to realize the full political potential of embodiment? Conversely, submissions might uplift affective states specific to experiences of disability, such as the grief of k/crip time (Samuels 2017), the loneliness of ableist exile (Clare 1999), and the betrayal of care abuse (Kim 2025) – but also to the unique forms of pleasure that arise from access intimacy (Mingus 2011), disability intimacy (Wong 2024), cross-animate eroticism (Chen 2012; Chen & Luciano 2015), and disability-inflected kink (Hedva 2024; rhodes 2025).

Papers in this stream are invited to take up these provocations and the questions below:

- How are our atmospheric attunements changed, disrupted, or short-circuited by the entrance of neuroqueer and divergent receptivity? How might theorists of affect account for this invisible diversity in modes-of-being?
- How can we (re)design affect studies methods for disabled, mad, and neuroqueer bodyminds? How might their lived experiences open into new ways of knowing, feeling, and theorizing the world?
- What are the risks of pathologizing undesirable affects as disability? Conversely, what possibilities are opened up?

- How should affect studies be informed by the Psychiatric Survivors Movement, along with its k/crip and mad studies offshoots (e.g. Campbell 2022; Penney 2022; Shimrat 2022)?
- What are the affective implications of reclaiming terms like “crip” (McRuer, 2006; Kafer, 2013), “krip” (Moore Jr 2000) and “madness” (Bruce 2021; Lewis et. al 2025), both in and out of academia (or K/Crip Studies)? What charge do these terms carry? What is the affective force of our etymology more broadly?
- Similar to the “queer” in queer studies, “k/crip” also functions as a verb. To k/crip a system of knowledge means to disturb its relation (or lack thereof) to illness, to reimagine the presumed binary of dis/ability, and to trouble the boundedness of what such labels even mean (Cedillo & Yergeau 2019; Smilges 2023). What would it look like to k/crip affect studies, so as to refract, scatter, and complicate the knowledges produced?



STREAM

S13. Finding Form/Less/Ness

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Casey Boyle

casey.boyle@utexas.edu

DESCRIPTION

In the foreword to his essay collection *Every Force Evolves a Form*, Guy Davenport attributes its titular axiom to Shakers founder Mother Ann Lee's belief that *every force finds a form*. He illustrates it with a modest Shaker innovation, the broom. Earlier brooms were little more than bundles of twigs that forced the body to stoop, but Shaker designers flattened and angled the brush and lengthened the handle so that sweeping could be done upright. The change was small and also decisive. The broom's form answered the forces at work in sweeping, that is, the motion of the arm, the resistance of the floor, swatch of surface area, and the posture of the body. Form did not decorate the task; it found a configuration adequate to its motion.

This stream might begin with a broom, but it hopes to engage a much broader sweep of forms and forces. If forces find forms, then forms are not simply given. They emerge through pressure, constraint, and experiment. They also falter and fail. Long before contemporary debates about aesthetics or politics, biologist D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson proposed that form could be understood as the visible trace of forces acting upon living matter. More recently, form offers studies of the infrastructure of collectivity we find in a city or a state (Kornbluh), and arrangements like networks or hierarchies are understood as forms organizing patterns that structure both aesthetic works and social life (Levine). Yet affective experience often becomes most visible precisely where such patterns falter, such as "genre flailing" (Berlant). In each of these examples, it is not the form that is of interest but instead how force finds a shape that holds or fails to.

This stream invites work that attends to how affect moves through these conditions. How does form emerge from under pressure? What happens when it cannot? How do we sense, describe, or compose experiences that meet or exceed the forms available to them? What kinds of forms emerge when inherited genres thin or fray? What happens when affect encounters only insufficient forms? How are new forms constituted?

This stream welcomes proposals for finding form/less/ness through which affect becomes perceptible. We are especially interested in work that attends (implicitly or explicitly) to the relation between force and form in the presentation itself.

Possible directions include (but are not limited to):

- Processes of form-finding: emergence, adjustment, iteration, recombination
- Situations where affect settles into or reshapes existing forms
- Moments when forms become strained without collapsing
- Histories/theories that trace form finding or losing
- Occasions when affect finds only insufficient forms such as breakdown, exhaustion, impasse, attenuation, or failure
- Constraint, compression, subtraction, and sparseness as aesthetic or rhetorical strategies
- Diagrams of force as/in bodies, environments, materials, or infrastructures



STREAM

S14. Futures/Critical/Sense-Making

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Gillian Russell

Simon Fraser University
gillianr@sfu.ca

Frédéric Lesage

Simon Fraser University
flesage@sfu.ca

Samein Shamsheer

Simon Fraser University
sameinshamsheer@gmail.com

DESCRIPTION

This stream invites contributions that approach futures-making as critical sensemaking: a situated, ongoing, and affective practice through which people engage uncertainty and actively shape emerging possibilities through acts of making. We frame futures-making not as prediction, extrapolation, or risk management (futuring), nor as a purely cognitive or linguistic exercise (futures literacy [Miller 2018]), but as a material, embodied, and participatory process. It is a form of critical sensemaking, understood here as a creative, action-oriented practice through which people collectively render ambiguous, unfolding situations meaningful, attending to complexity, friction, and the margins where dominant narratives begin to unravel (Superflux; Weick 1995; Fuller & Weizman 2021). Used in this way, futures-making unsettles what is taken for granted, making visible the forces and assumptions that sustain the status quo, while opening space to perceive how the boundaries between the probable and the possible are flexible and negotiable.

By situating futures-making within critical sensemaking, we foreground the ways that making—whether through crafting artifacts, staging interventions, enacting situations, or designing materials—is not only a method for imagining futures, but also a means of sensing, negotiating, and reconfiguring meaning in the present. This approach emphasizes engagement with indeterminacy and multiplicity, highlighting the subtle disturbances, ambiguities, and edge conditions where established structures, assumptions, and narratives can be interrogated. Futures-making as critical sensemaking thus combines imagination with material practice, participation, and reflection, creating openings for collective exploration and intervention in the social, political, and material worlds we inhabit. We are interested in contributions that explore how futures-making enables broader civic participation,

redistributes agency in shaping the future, and cultivates capacities to question and unsettle what has been conditioned as immutable or inevitable. We welcome work that attends to the embodied, affective, and material dimensions of these practices, as well as their experimental, playful, or provocative potentials. Submissions might explore how futures-making generates tangible, evocative artifacts that function as sites for reflection, discussion, and negotiation; how different theoretical traditions of sensemaking explore futurity; or how critical approaches to method shift futures-making from attempts to maximise predictive reliability through the execution of research scripts, towards explorations of method's inventiveness (Lury & Wakeford 2012).

We also encourage critical reflection on the conditions of making itself: how futures-making is socially and technologically assembled, whose voices it amplifies or silences, and how it may reproduce or challenge existing relations of power. Contributions may draw from research, design, experimental, or hybrid methods, but should focus on the ways futures-making enacts critical sensemaking through material, embodied, and collective engagement.



STREAM

S15. Hexegesis, Ofs and Ons

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Eldritch Priest

Simon Fraser University
epriest@sfu.ca

David Ceccetto

York University
dcecchet@yorku.ca

Ted Hiebert

Toronto Metropolitan University
ted.hiebert@torontomu.ca

DESCRIPTION

As questions of truth and correctness are increasingly cast aside in favor of the brute forces of action, it might behoove us to delve differently into how language and action relate by attending to casting itself. Theories of performativity still hold, but still: what changes when we treat words as a kind of summons rather than a declaration—a way of affecting knowing to effect a doing? How, that is, might we focus less on textual exegesis and its attendant questions of interpretation, and more on hexegesis: how a text glamours its circumstances to happenstance an emergence of what is idiosyncratically a materialization of affect as effect?

In this, hexegesis describes a mood swing in full swing, one textually enabled by the ways in which a text casts a spell rather than spelling things out. However, if a spell defies understanding in favor of simply enacting its point as the point, hexegesis works instead by listening for echoes, daydreams, nightmares, hallucinations, and the myriad other things that aren't there but effectively and affectively are. This stream welcomes papers that explore and experiment with writing as a matter not of explanation but of incantation. This is not a call for a panel on the occult and affect theory, so much as an encouragement for papers that emphasize their method(s) as a way to conjure effects and atmospheres that can't help but affect us in their casting. In this respect, we seek papers that take knowledge and understanding as things to be, like art, worked out—or, as Étienne Souriau put it, instaured.

Possible topics include but are not limited to:

- Sound, scent, touch, and the ambiances of living;

- Daydreams, naps, nightmares and other unlived experiences;
- Other artificials and intelligences than AI;
- Injunctions, conjunctions, and alibis of reason;
- Citation as a conjuring act and the footnote as a summoning circle;
- Viral media as contagion;
- Infrastructure as incantation;
- The technology of the self as a hexegesis;
- The weather as injunction;
- Spatial hexeges;es;
- Text as sigil
- Vibration, resonance, and the infra-sonic;
- Phantom limbs, ghost signs, and urban hauntings.



STREAM

S16. Insurgent Residues of Extraction

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Mathew Arthur

Capilano University
mathewarthur@capilano.ca

Claire Fitch

UT Austin
claire.fitch@utexas.edu

Sophia Jaworski

Capilano University
sophiajaworski@capilano.ca

DESCRIPTION

Under extractive conditions, matter is recalcitrant. It volatilizes, leaches, sediments, goes recombinatorial, persists even once discarded. Extraction tries to sort resource from waste, use from remainder. But the residual is charged with movements and timescales of geological life, like how dust murmurs and settles, rust spreads, the way a chemical plume follows water through rocky fissures for decades. These insurgent residues coalesce and thicken around distributions of livability, along infrastructures of settler-colonialism and slow violence, even as they seep, waft, and breach the enclosures through which life and nonlife are organized and theorized—or, worse, sacrificed. They accumulate as tailings, breakdown products, suspended particulate, plastic gyres, but also in concepts: toxic animacies, speculative geologies, and forms of alterlife.

Residues register before they are known, encountered as an off-feeling, a stickiness or fouling, maybe some other diffuse (usually toxic) apprehension. Contact zone before concept, they often stay invisible or unmapped, refusing coherent transit from local to global, micro to macro, oozing through itineraries of indeterminacy. We read grey literature packed with technoscientific jargon, parse massive energy regulator datasets, review cumulative effects studies. There is a feeling-residue to this work, yes. But what would it mean to know the way poisoned soil does? Through a microseismic event caused by fracking or the outflow of acid rock drainage from mining or other earthworks; as fluorescent orange flagging tape or oil and gas flocculants? Residues are naturecultures and medianatures that demand a muckpile of attention. Not tidy extraction. Murky absorption. These are energetic conditions—currents, accretions, reactions, frictions, leakages—that saturate webs of relation, altering capacities to affect and be affected. To follow residues is to enter a ruptured timescape that moves fast and very slow: the

reeling volatility of capitalist growth-fantasies held in aquifers and rocky bodies as a long, long monotony of damage and unrest.

This stream invites work that thinks with unruly matters of extraction: volatile, atmospheric, geological, chemical, and compositional forces that move through bio- and geontological registers and orders while fighting back, recomposing, upending damage-centered narratives, and creating new forms of non/life. We ask what attunements and ethics become possible when matter resists extractive capture—materially, compositionally, and in habits of thought:

- Extractive and toxic animacies, racialized or deviant matter, and queer inhumanisms (Chen 2012 Luciano & Chen 2019, Tompkins 2024)
- Economies of abandonment, sacrifice zones, and chemical colonialisms (Povinelli 2011, Nixon 2011, Gómez-Barris 2017, Liboiron 2021)
- The geontological, speculative geology, and geological feelings as forms of insurgence (Povinelli 2016, Luciano 2024, Raffles 2020, Yusoff 2024)
- Alterlife, speculative chemistry, and residues of affect in STS (Murphy 2017)
- Plastic matter, rusting matter, or compost as non-extractive, residual modes of theory-making (Davis 2022, Varga 2026, Arthur & Jentink 2018)
- Life at extremes, deep biospheres, subterranean non/life (eg. Kallmeyer & Wagner 2014)
- Confusions of non/life (eg. plastic-eating fungi or microbes)
- Compositional, speculative, and critical data studies methods for residues (eg. Dumit “Substance as Method” 2021)
- Cumulative regional effects studies and/as temporalities of insurgence
- Indigenous law and jurisdiction, “animisms,” situated knowledges of contamination and more-than-human relation (TallBear 2017, Todd 2017)



STREAM

S17. Made in/Visible: Threading Technologies and Affective Meaning MAKEing

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Meha Gupta

CUNY Graduate Center
mgupta@gradcenter.cuny.edu

Soham Sen

University of New Mexico
sen.soham.26@gmail.com

DESCRIPTION

For this stream, we use the word “technology” as an all-encompassing term for supply chains, computational methods, artificial intelligence, wearables, surveillance infrastructure, digital methods, and more. How do we define “technologies” today, and how does it shape our interrogation of affect? We invite discussions of technological infrastructure—the black-box invisibilities of its production, the procedural behaviors of its material units, and the ongoing aftermaths of socio-technical actualizations. We encourage playful and fateful reckonings with the embodied nature of tangible technologies through a human/post-human lens. How/when/where do we grow capacious (or turn obstinate) when enmeshed with the forces of affective production, movement, and connection in the depths of the digital, technological, and computational?

What happens to, say, matters of method and academic methodologies, when a machine, created and credentialed by humans with the authority, audacity, and quasi-autonomy to contribute to disciplinary knowledge structures (see: the earliest anxieties of cybernetics in the mid-20th century), also starts contributing beyond the flows of human accessibility? We are thinking here, for example, of AI prompts that do not require language coherence, academic sophistication, or a well-curated reading list, yet have the power to disrupt, disorganize, and reorient the methods that help to determine the form and content of various systems of knowledge. How do we devise methods amidst the folding and unfolding in the ocean of AI prompts, constantly directing and redirecting the flows of the knowing and unknowing? In this atmosphere of the constant meaning-making process, territorializing and deterritorializing the intellectual legacy of knowledge making, prompts are the methods reshaping distinct disciplinary orientations. Even beyond prompts, what other elements of intellectual decay have come into being, and how do we imagine these atmospheres?

- What does *poesis*—the making of technology and what we do about it—look like in the present moment? What ethical, ontological, and epistemological approaches might guide how we interact and intra-act with technologies?
- How can we imagine otherwise through decolonial and indigenous knowledge systems?
- How do we feel affect in concepts such as hallucination, consciousness, and embodiment in relation to Artificial Intelligence (AI)?
- What would an affective interpretation of a technological knowledge system look like?
- What philosophical implications emerge as we reflect on thought in relation to these technological affective processes?



STREAM

S18. Minor Theory Amid Transactional Forms (Other People Have Become Incoherent to Me)

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Megan J Gette

University of Oslo
meganjg@uio.no

Alecia Beymer

University of Cincinnati
beymeraa@ucmail.uc.edu

Harshavardhan Bhat

University of Cincinnati
bhathn@ucmail.uc.edu

DESCRIPTION

If my writing makes a mess of things, it's not to flee understanding, but to map (mis-)understanding as a verb

—Douglas Kearney, *Mess and Mess and*

What is it about small lapping waves that makes them so intimate?

—Lyn Hejinian, *The Fatalist*

The minor persists amid transactional forms of relation, modes of exchange negotiated through institutional exigencies and embodied precarities, and logistical slowdown (Moten and Harney 2021). The transactional forecloses the potential for relation in a stable yet incoherent system. It urges legibility and clarity as a strategy for movement. To move, you become legible yourself, or attempt it. Meanwhile you attune to its performances: you sense out where someone's lack or overabundance of words, an eyeroll, a pause or hesitation marks misunderstandings and their timely fallout, a failed exchange. Just as we critique this space, someone else learns how to materialize or profit from it, making confusion a personal problem. Yet simplifying the form does not always yield clarity or understanding. The diagnostics or naming processes of theory are also part of the transactional machine.

Are our payments unconditionally tethered to this practice-of theory-making? Do we even know what is happening anymore? What modes of sensemaking and exchange take shape around incoherence, the mis-understanding? And how do we feel into the intimacies of being, proximity, and the personal in a contingent space of transactions?

Amid the institutionalization and disciplining of thought from the noise of lived experience, the minor might lurk or lag behind a worlding—"an imperial promise of a form barely roughed out..." (Berlant and Stewart 2019:22). It is shaped through power dynamics and political excesses but asks, "why do we care whether or not the master notices?" (Katz 1996). It might settle in opacity, out of view of the profitability of ambience and the illusion of 'free' thought which, is, at worst, extracted from personal lives, histories and practices that provide a backdrop for theory and its material circulations. We turn here to poets because they might be considered theorists of the minor gesture (Manning 2016), or the everyday, or the incoherent. Poets live in the messiness of making that reanimates the relational and resists the disciplining of thought within the institution. Form becomes possibility and play instead of formulaic ethos. But poets also need groceries, and cash. "Poetry is not a luxury" (Lorde). As poet Journey Streams writes, "They've added a laugh track to our love lives and sold us our old feelings and fed us the crumbs in the corners of our shoes" (2026). What modes of sharing, reading, citing, exchange might be modeled against the terms of legibility and transaction that instead re-value the poem, and life, in its "uselessness" (Manning 2023)?

This stream is interested in micropolitics and minor theorizing that shows up in what could be described as incoherence. We are especially interested in works that play against academic forms and contemplate the ideas below:

- a "dissociative poetics" (Berlant) that describes tactics of withdrawal, or not taking things personally
- mishearing, misunderstanding, wtf moments / micro-expressions that index the inadequacy of community
- the implications of clarity, form, legibility or consensus / theft and authorship / opacity, fugitivity, poetics
- the management of history in the everyday / the history of management in the everyday
- the exhaustion of representational thinking as "confrontations with stupidity" (Deleuze)
- illegible forms of thought; how thoughts come out before they are disciplined
- race, affect, and the genealogy of minor theory
- creating reciprocity, care, support, different forms of giving/taking, sharing
- humanity as institutional performance



STREAM

S19. Multispecies Affects: MAKEing Worlds in Precarious Times

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Ceall Quinn

UBC Geography
acquinn@student.ubc.ca

DESCRIPTION

Amidst planetary precarities, lives lived continue to make worlds. Faced with blooms disrupted by climate change, bumblebees maintain synchrony with floral partners by biting leaves to stimulate flowering (Pashalidou et al., 2020); itinerant mushroom pickers roam abandoned industrial forests in Oregon, gleaning livelihoods from ephemeral fungal partnerships (Tsing, 2015); elephants seeking states of intoxication raid distilleries in postcolonial Sundarpar, generating affective animus amongst local communities (Barua, 2024). Practitioners studying multispecies relations take these worlds seriously, expanding terrains of sociality and interpretation. Multispecies affects are concerned with severed, fragmented, durable, and novel associations between and across species; they comprise the energies, atmospheres, and forms of ecological attunement and discordance that inhere in the making and unmaking of more-than-human worlds.

On a planet terraformed by colonial capitalism, how might attending to multispecies affects give insight into the ways lives are lived, and, the conditions that impress upon these forms of life? This stream invites panelists whose work attends to this question by bringing affect theory and multispecies studies into conversation. Participants are encouraged to submit research, methodological explorations and/or creative and aesthetic engagements.

Questions to consider:

- What methods, tactics, practices make multispecies affects sensible?
- How do distributions of the sensible inform politics of inhabitation, coexistence, or animus?
- How might atmospheres inform relationships between humans and other than humans?
- In multispecies worlds, who knows?
- Can multispecies affects energize political transformations?

Potential topics include:

- Lively capital (Haraway, 2008; Barua, 2023; Collard, 2020)
- Attunement, listening, and sensorial methods (Durand and Sundberg, 2026)

- Affective approaches to wild life politics and abundant futures (Collard, 2020; Collard, Dempsey, and Sundberg, 2015)
- Affect, biopolitics, animality (Rutherford, 2022)
- Multispecies rhythms (Despret, 2021; Van Patter, 2023)
- Animals' geographies, mobilities, and atmospheres (Hodgetts and Lorimer, 2020; Lorimer, Hodgetts, and Barua, 2019)
- Affect, ethologies, and geography (Barua and Sinha, 2019; Lorimer 2011)
- Affective ecologies and multispecies encounters (Myers and Hustak 2012)
- Vegetal affects (Subramaniam 2024)
- More-than-human contact zones (Isaacs and Otruba, 2019)
- Postcolonial fauna and flora (Barua 2024)
- Disabled ecologies (Taylor, 2024)
- More-than-human making practices (Andreyev, 2021)



STREAM

S20. Occluded Atmospheres: Esoteric Aesthetics, Night Knowledges, and Sensory Shifts

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Sandra Huber

Concordia University
sandra.huber@concordia.ca

Victoria Papa

Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
victoria.papa@mcla.edu

DESCRIPTION

Affect theory has long emphasized atmospheres as diffuse yet palpable conditions that shape how bodies feel, move, and relate. Yet not all atmospheres register equally. Some saturate experience so completely that they appear as the background of life itself, while others remain partly hidden—sensed only in the minor registries of experience. Specifically, this stream turns to *esoteric aesthetics* and *night knowledges*—modes of perception oriented toward the subtle, the nocturnal, and the partially hidden in order to register these sensory shifts.

Whereas occulted knowledges are studied and learned, however unconventionally, occluded atmospheres are sensed into and immersive, calling in not only practices and methods such as divination and ritual but also affects and states such as grief, illness, opacity, dreams, confinements, and the boundary lines where proficiency or literacy shift into intuition or illegibility.

To think atmospherically about occlusion is also to ask how certain forces remain difficult to perceive within dominant regimes of knowledge. Atmospheric conditions may be normalized through habit, concealed by infrastructures of power, or rendered unintelligible by epistemologies that privilege clarity, visibility, and measurement. Yet many aesthetic, cultural, and intellectual traditions cultivate ways of sensing atmospheres that exceed these frameworks. *Esoteric aesthetics* and *night knowledges* become salient as expanded calibrations.

Esoteric aesthetics names artistic and cultural practices that register forces often considered intangible, diffuse, or atmospheric: energies, presences, vibrations, tonalities, and other subtleties that move through environments. Across literature, visual art, performance, ritual practice, and speculative

thought, such aesthetics develop forms of attention capable of rendering occluded atmospheres perceptible.

Night knowledges, meanwhile, gesture toward epistemologies that emerge through intuition, sleep, scent, ritual, divination, embodied attunement, and other practices that register worlds beyond the limits of daylight rationality. Rather than treating these themes solely as objects of analysis, this stream approaches them as modes of atmospheric sensing—ways of perceiving and navigating environments saturated with diffuse affective forces.

This stream invites contributions that explore how occluded atmospheres emerge across aesthetic, social, ecological, technological, and political contexts as well as through different methods, including performative, speculative, or practice-based approaches that engage atmospheres sensorially rather than only analytically. What forms of perception arise when attention turns toward what is ambient, partially hidden, or atmospherically diffuse?

Possible lines of inquiry include:

- How do esoteric aesthetics register or render perceptible occluded atmospheres?
- What are night knowledges, and how do they cultivate sensitivity to subtle atmospheric forces?
- How do artists, writers, and cultural practitioners develop forms or methods capable of sensing or transmitting atmospheric intensities?
- What atmospheres become perceptible through experiences of illness, vulnerability, grief, disability, or altered sensory awareness?
- How do ecological, technological, or political conditions produce atmospheres that remain partially hidden or unevenly sensed?
- How might practices such as divination, dreamwork, ritual, or altered perception create atmospheric shifts, and to what end/s?
- What practices of intention, attention, or attunement allow occluded atmospheres to become momentarily legible?
- What forms of nocturnal, cyclical, or non-linear time emerge in practices of atmospheric sensing?

By foregrounding atmospheres that remain subtle, obscured, or difficult to articulate, this stream asks how affect studies might expand its vocabulary for sensing the opaque conditions that shape collective life.



STREAM

S21. Sensational Affects, Strange Aesthetics, and (Counter)Pedagogies

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Nandita Baxi Sheth

Institute for Doctoral Studies in the Visual Arts, Independent Scholar
nbaxisheth@idsva.edu

Kristopher Holland

University of Cincinnati College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning
hollankp@ucmail.uc.edu

Scott Jarvie

San Jose State University, College of Humanities and the Arts
scott.jarvie@sjsu.edu

DESCRIPTION

While an aesthetics of affect encompasses all the elements of the conference theme “Methods, Atmospheres, Knowledges, and Energies”, this stream is interested in exploring the varieties of methods employed by affect theorists, educators, and artists and the ways in which these methods stitch up or unravel communal atmospheres, distribute knowledges, and circulate energies. We wonder, how might thinking with theories of affect help contribute to reshaping notions of aesthetics as sensual pedagogies? “In the midst of so much worldly unmaking”, what can varieties of artmaking produce? Deleuze and Guattari suggest that art is “a bloc of sensations” or even “a pure being of sensation” (1994). This repositions the capacity of art to generate sensation that is beyond the visual, inclusive of a range of human and even other-than-human sensoriums. Furthermore, expanding the binary relation of subject/object or artwork/viewer, the aesthetic impacts of activities of making engage assemblages of materials, spaces, architectures, and bodies that craft sensorial vibrations. This stream seeks papers, presentations, and projects that involve themselves with sense-sational affects, (counter)pedagogies, and strange aesthetics. How do art, art making, and art experiencing make the familiar strange, the everyday uncanny? The late David Graeber wrote, “the ultimate hidden truth of the world is that it is something that we make, and could just as easily make differently” (2024). Making affect, then, is worldmaking. It is to be involved with the materials and entities of the planet, in cycles of formation, destruction, revision, transformation, and remaking (think of the scrappiness of collage and composting). In this way, the affective power of art is always already pedagogical. We seek to assemble panels that bring work at the intersection of affective and aesthetic activity into

conversation with pedagogical practices. "What can a body do?" Seigworth (2020) reminds, "is fundamentally a pedagogic matter." (p. 87) What methods of artistic practice find places within and alongside affective pedagogies? If "places called schools are precarious and provocative affective atmospheres" (Anderson, 2014), how might art provide counter-spaces of sensational alternative, even refuge? And since "teaching is generally considered to be about relations of knowledge transmission, primarily through language" (Dernikos et al., 2020, p. 16), what opportunities might more capacious expressions informed by artmaking offer educators? What "mobile energies" (ibid) does art generate, and what do such affective flows do pedagogically?

While we invite paper proposals that fit normative frames of academic conference presentations, we also encourage presentations that subvert expectations while still working within space-time constraints. This challenge could allow for instances of making to occur within the parenthetical framework of the event of the panel. Write to us with any questions.

Potential presentation themes might explore the following and more:

- Pedagogical and curricular practices that thread affective aesthetics through sites of learning or knowledge production
- Methods and techniques that evoke affect through cycles of formation, destruction, revision, transformation, and remaking. For example, collage as affective method, among many possible others
- Arts-based research and boundary objects that cross disciplinary margins (Loveless 2019)
- Transhistorical and/or transcultural redefinitions, redeployments, subversions, and/or re-implementations of art historical movements such as surrealism, fluxus, propaganda art, etc. into contemporary times
- Exploration of art without objects, such as social justice practices or relational aesthetics
- Post human or planetary aesthetic practices that consider multispecies sensoriums and vital materialist affects (Bennett 2010)
- Making strange or enactivist paradigms for linking affordances with affect
- Counter)pedagogical tactics that emerge from the desire lines that are carved through curricula by excessive, scrappy, resistant or alternative practices. Show us!



STREAM

S22. Storying Wisely: Speculative Fictionings, Affect, and the Politics of the 'What If?'

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Sarah E. Truman

University of Melbourne

sarahe.truman@unimelb.edu.au

DESCRIPTION

This stream focuses on the overlap between affect theory and speculative fictioning. Speculative fictioning, or speculative fiction as method, gathers practices under the provocation “what if?”, taken up in research, teaching, critique, pedagogy, and creation. It often works by making scenes, prompts, and narrative experiments that people can think with, feel with, and act with, using stories and other texts as tools for inquiry. Affect can be understood as a capacity that both builds and leaks: intensities that gather, circulate, and drain across bodies, texts, technologies, and environments. How might affect theory and speculative fictioning work together to open possibilities, or to foreclose them?

This stream understands speculative fictioning as both situated and material: shaped by where and how it is made, by embodied and more-than-human conditions, and by feminist materialist commitments to partial perspective, relationality, and consequence. Storying wisely is a reminder that stories and speculative fictionings are never neutral. In the name of progress, or innovation, speculation is often treated as inherently good, but the question remains, progress for whom? Alongside speculation’s capacity to open futures, there are sinister speculations, forms of future-oriented practice that regulate behaviour, consolidate power, and foreclose possibility through anticipatory governance, racial capitalism, finance, eugenics, and settler colonialism. Storying wisely means staying with this double bind, and staying alert to how genres, methods, and media carry force in the world, including how speculative futures decide who is rendered possible, realistic, curable, and disposable, or written out of the future.

Work in this stream might pursue the meeting of affect and speculative method through forms such as SF, horror, climate fiction, fabulation, counter-myth, speculative non-fiction, research-creation, and speculative pedagogy. When speculative work circulates in academic and policy settings, it is often flattened into metaphor, allegory, or a creativity add-on. This stream keeps speculation in play as practice, taking seriously what speculative methods do to feeling, relation, and the uneven politics of the “what if?”

Papers might take up questions such as:

- In which ways does speculative fictioning operate as an affective method, in research, pedagogy, activism, or artmaking, and what ethical obligations follow from storying wisely?
- In which ways does “what if?” open onto liveable otherwise-worlds, and in which ways does it operate as anticipatory capture that sorts, targets, and forecloses futures?
- In which ways do Indigenous futurisms rework speculative fictioning as method, as relation, and as world-making practice?
- How do Black studies and Black futurity rework speculative method as a practice of possibility, critique, and otherwise-worlding?
- How do Queer and Trans theories rework the futures speculation reaches for, including its norms of the family and the human?
- How does crip theory rework speculative futures, especially the promise of cure, the fantasy of independence, and the demand to be made “normal”?
- What affects, including hope, dread, grief, rage, numbness, desire, and care, organize speculative scenes of world-ending and world-beginning, and how are these affects unevenly distributed?
- How do corporate, state, and institutional counter-speculations mobilize affect to commodify imagination, secure extractive futures, and make harm feel inevitable?
- In which ways do speculative texts and methods make infrastructures of feeling and control visible, and what do they reveal about who is made possible, curable, or disposable?



STREAM

S23. Taxonomy, Psychology, and Beyond: Affect in the History of the Sciences

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Jason Emmett Collins

Brown University
jason_collins@brown.edu

Rebekah Rosenfeld

University of Chicago
rosenfeld@uchicago.edu

DESCRIPTION

How, and when, did affect come to be understood as antithetical to the kind of cognitive discipline that defines scientific inquiry? As the “Knowledges” theme for this MAKE conference points out, capital-K Knowledge is associated with a cluster of concepts that are “[s]ubtractive of feeling” and “[e]liminative of affect”—a state of affairs in which the understanding of science as the ultimate bearer of instrumental rationality has played an important role. And yet, as scholars from Lorraine Daston (1995) to Donovan Schaefer (2022) have pointed out, affects are and always have been inextricably entangled with the theory and practice of scientific investigation. The posture of aloofness with which affects are taxonomized, as these scholars have revealed, is itself also affectively determined.

This stream asks: what is the history of affect’s entanglement with knowledge practices and its subsequent disavowal? How does this historical narrative map onto contemporary politics—where it is possible for Ben Shapiro to argue that “facts don’t care about your feelings” in defense of religious fundamentalism, while professional scientific associations like the American Psychological Association come under fire for their empirically-derived support for gender-affirming care of minors?

We invite submissions from a broad range of disciplinary, geographic, and historically-framed points of focus that explore and complicate this long-held problematic. From late scholastic “sciences of the soul,” to the emergence of early modern psychology and taxonomies of affect in the 17th century, to the 18th- and 19th-century development of political and population sciences of the mob, to the 20th-century advent of psychoanalysis and its theory of drives, intellectual history is rich with examples of the imbrication of science and affect (even if often holding them as mutually exclusive of each other).

We welcome papers on how affect has been marginalized, discounted, or disavowed in the sciences, but also how it has been incorporated, mobilized to advance Knowledge (singular) or knowledges

(plural), and turned into an object of science in its own right. What is gained or lost by the objectification of affect, and what epistemological premises allow affect to become an object of science specifically as opposed to, or alongside, other fields, such as poetics, visual art, ethics, or religion, to name a few?

Possible topics for this stream include but are not limited to:

- How do modern notions of science and its epistemologies produce or determine our ideas of what “affect” is (if at all)?
- How does the inclusion or exclusion of affect in the history of the sciences affect the orders and hierarchies that science generates?
- How do gendered perceptions of science and affect respectively inflect their mutual imbrication in our understanding?
- What affects are implicated in the scientific or biopolitical discourses and practices of colonial or neo-colonial management?
- How do artistic or literary ways of knowing, themselves “arts” rather than “sciences,” generate or critique affect in manners not possible within the bounds of science, however defined? How do they mediate our knowledge of science and themselves in relation to science?
- Religion, like affect, has a complicated history as one of the “others” of modern science. How have religious and/or Christian concepts, both metaphysical and social-political, determined the structures of science (e.g., reason as “transcendent and all-seeing”) or provided alternatives?



STREAM

S24. The Making of an Affective Cosmos: Between Art, Science, and Philosophy

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Janae Sholtz

Alvernia University, Professor of Philosophy
janae.sholtz@alvernia.edu

Alain Beaulieu

Laurentian University, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy
abeaulieu@laurentian.ca

DESCRIPTION

A combination of knowledge and atmosphere, this stream is oriented to the very literal manner in which the cosmos, the cosmic, and cosmology have infused our conceptions of knowledge and reality and how these themes have enjoyed a resurgence of sorts in multiple fields (for instance, affect studies, new materialism, Deleuze Studies, process philosophies, environmental studies) which seek to re-potentialize and rethink the relation of affect to bodies, earth, and universe. How can cosmological thinking expand our understanding of, and sensitivity to, affect? What new affects are unleashed when we turn our theoretical attention to the cosmos, allowing perhaps that we must traverse the boundaries between philosophy, art, and the sciences to do so? Cosmological questioning is also a resource for great imaginings, from different worlds, to the reconfiguration of space and time, when we challenge ourselves to think beyond the human, beyond even the earth, to the outward bounds of reality, we open possibilities for rethinking our ethics, our politics, and our very modes of existence. This is where the creative spirit of affect studies takes hold, producing a new and fecund atmosphere for thinking and being anew. We challenge contributors to this stream to use the powers of the cosmos, the open-ended questioning that has always infused thought and philosophy as pertaining to the ineffability and expansiveness of this topic, to think differently and create new concepts which challenge the boundaries between the sensible, the intelligible, and the affective.

One may find an authentic cosmological sensibility in much recent continental philosophy, namely for thinkers like Nietzsche, Whitehead, Bergson, Husserl, Heidegger, Axelos, as well as Deleuze and Guattari, yet the tradition of looking to the stars, contemplating the atmosphere, and imagining brightly the ineffability and possible significance of the cosmos is baked into the deepest deposits of human thought. This stream invites participants to address this history through any variety of the compendium of thinkers whose work addresses the cosmic, but to do so with fresh eyes, through the lessons and interventions of affect theories which have expanded our understanding of the vitality

and variety of materialities and challenged the priorities of the purely human. This stream also provides the opportunity to entertain the confluence between the sciences and philosophy of cosmology. Our scientific knowledge of the strange phenomena of the cosmos, from the molecular to the macro, has yet to find home in our conceptual frameworks. Creating bridges between these areas of conceptuality, philosophy, and science is crucially needed in our quest to reimagine the world and our place in it. Finally, it is important to acknowledge that some of the most fecund and productive spaces in which a cosmological sensibility has been engendered is in the artworld itself. How can art inspire thought and offer tools for helping us understand the affective nature of the cosmos? Papers in this stream might include topics such as:

- The ways by which contemporary artworks strive to grasp non-terrestrial forces that are affecting the world's materiality
- Abstraction in art as an expression of natural entities being affected by c(ha)osmic forces
- The challenges in expressing artistically invisible, cosmic forces that are affecting materiality
- The affects involved in recent theories in scientific cosmology (chaotic universe, fractal universe, relativity, string theory, loop quantum gravity, etc.)
- The status of affects in speculative cosmology
- The (in)compatibility of human experience with scientific cosmology
- Cosmic affects as connectors between the human experience and vast, impersonal structures
- How might philosophy contribute to newer cosmological questionings at the crossroads of art and science
- The reassessment of the relation with the Earth in light of the affective turn



STREAM

S25. Theory (for Now)

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Walter Lucken Iv

Queens College CUNY
walterluckeniv@gmail.com

Chad Shomura

University of Colorado-Denver
chadjshomura@gmail.com

DESCRIPTION

Treasured intellectual and cultural resources prove themselves increasingly toothless in the face of state terror, ecological collapse, genocide, labor abuse, and a hard reactionary lurch in political landscapes. The atmospheres of social and political life are thick, foreboding, full of dread and anguish, posing hard questions to theorizing, teaching, and study itself. Are these practices still possible? If so, how? Might contemporary atmospheres shift what theory entails? This stream asks participants to consider how atmospheres shape intellectual work and how rapidly shifting, increasingly complex, and often terrifying affective terrains—scholarly, political, social, economic, and ecological—threaten theory, demand theory, and rewrite assumptions about what theory is/can be. In short, this stream flows through the mucky, fraught, and potentially promising connections of atmosphere and theory.

At the same time, atmospheres can easily be registered unevenly when dominant sense regimes, which govern the blurs of corporeal and intellectual labor, filter out a range of affects to consolidate a dominant mood. And a range of conflictual and messy affective states can be the byproduct of clashing movements and forces, or the predictable if not intended result of algorithmic design. A steady stream of terror and violence in ordinary life, the news, and social media feeds is interspersed with other events and aesthetics that generate other feelings, provide escape, and/or amplify the horrors of the now. In the face of systemic violence and immiseration, people have always fashioned joy, beauty, love, and other so called “positive” affects that are never replacements for, lose sight of, and are always intimate with grief, terror, and loss. Atmospheres can make fugitive potentialities sensible. What new possibilities emerge, are created, and are experimented with alongside terrors and threats that are new and unprecedented or extensions and evolutions of longstanding systems of power? How might the minor affects shaping dominant atmospheres be sensed, registered, inflect theorizing? What can silenced, co-opted, and incarcerated knowledges teach us about how we theorize the effects and affects of atmospheres?

What can theory do in a scenario where a mass audience doesn't need convincing that things are very, very, dire? For decades, tools like (to name just a few) cruel optimism, queer negativity, Afropessimism, crip theory, and Indigenous thought have brought to light the systemic violences underpinning the world. As it becomes increasingly hard to deny that the world is being consumed by violence—just as it is increasingly hard to deny that bodies of all sorts resist violence, act creatively, push for other worlds—what can theory do? In this stream we invite you to report back from your atmospheric location—which may be narrow, broad, or dispersed—and let us know how the weather is. What's theory for now?



STREAM

S26. Make-Break-Flows

STREAM ORGANIZER(S)

Gregory J. Seigworth

Millersville University

gregory.seigworth@millersville.edu

DESCRIPTION

Does your paper abstract seem to not find a ready fit into any of our other conference streams? Does your proposal's affective terrain somehow manage to fall outside of their content areas? If so, then you are welcome to submit your paper abstract here. We (the #MAKE team) will serve as evaluators of this catch-all stream. A couple of quick details:

- We will likely still try to see if your paper proposal might find a home in one of the already accepted streams (sometimes an angle of entry emerges as stream organizers shape their submissions into panels)
- Because of the vastness of affective territories, the papers/panels that compose this stream will likely MAKE for some very interesting break-flows. As we have learned from past conferences, this can open up truly brilliant cross-illuminations and conversations.
- All this is to say, don't choose 'Make-Break-Flows' as your immediate default-position but only take this route if there is absolutely no way that you see your ideas fitting within any of the other streams. Feel free though to reach out to any stream organizer or to the core committee to discuss the fit that comes closest to matching your own work, and see what they recommend.