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Gilbert Simondon, in his theory of individuation, brings forth new understandings of information and transduction. These concepts offer theoretical touchstones for the consideration of *Victimless Leather: A Prototype of Stitch-less Jacket Grown in a Technoscientific ‘Body,’* a sculpture by the Tissue Culture & Art project. This work operates on the coupling of the organic and inorganic, or the living and the machine. Thus, it has far-reaching implications about contemporary experience, not just in the techno-scientific practices of biotechnology, but also in the ways systems dominate human and nonhuman animal bodies. Yet, domination should not just be considered as subjugation. *Victimless Leather* also reveals a deep concern and practice of care. Linking Simondon’s philosophy with Deleuze’s concept of the monad offers a way to think through the implications of *Victimless Leather.* Together, these ideas enable an ethics of care focused on a greater actualization of the latent potentials inherent to processes of individuation.

**Individuation**

Individuation, in Gilbert Simondon’s work, is a principle of becoming. He distances his principle from that of hylomorphism and substantialism, or atomism, on the grounds that these modes of determining how a singular individual came to be begin their inquiry from an already existing individual (297). Instead, Simondon seeks to develop a principle of individuation that occurs before the formation of the individual. In the development of his theory of individuation, Simondon identifies the “pre-individual being,” a metastable condition ripe with tensions, potentials and energies that are resolved, actualized and used through processes of individuation (301). The sets of relations that make up the pre-individual give rise to individuation, from which both the individual and its associated milieu emerge. The milieu couples with the individual to form a dyad—neither preexists the other.

The resolutions of individuation are always partial; the pre-individual potential is never completely exhausted. The individual and its milieu carry forward leftover tensions, energies and potentials of the pre-individual where they combine with new tensions, potentials and energies to engender successive individuations (Simondon, 300). Simondon calls this ongoing, dynamic condition metastability.
Metastability is not stable; it is precipitous—on the edge of change. A metastable system is rich in “potential energy,” and from this potential emerge both individual and milieu. “Such an individuation is not to be thought of as the meeting of a previous form and matter existing as already constituted and separate terms, but a resolution taking place in the heart of a metastable system rich in potentials: *form, matter and energy preexist in the system*” (Simondon, 304, emphasis in original). Crystals serve as a physical example. “It is the organization of energy in a metastable system that leads to crystallization and subtends it, but the form of the crystals expresses certain molecular or atomic characteristics of the constituent chemical types” (304). Thus, we might say that each living being experiences processes of individuation, much like crystallization, throughout its life. This requires some flexibility in terms, for even as the pre-individual being transitions to individual and milieu, a new set of potentials are beginning to form, the newly emerged individual is immersed into a different pre-individual state. Thus, the (living) individual is also always in, or about to be in, some kind of pre-individual state, along with its pre-individual constituents. In short, the living being is always in a state of becoming; it is metastable.

**Information and Transduction**

For Simondon, information is a driver of individuation; it precedes individuation. “[Information] is the tension between two disparate realities, it is the signification that emerges when a process of individuation reveals the dimension through which two disparate realities together become a system. If this is the case, then the piece of information acts in fact as an instigation to individuation, a necessity to individuate; it is never something that is just given” (Simondon, Genesis, 311).

Simondon suggests his theory of information differs from those that quantify information into a formula, following Claude Shannon’s work, in that information precedes individuation, rather than occurring by way of individuation. “The information provides the formula that is followed by individuation, and so the formula could not possibly preexist this individuation. One could say that the information always exists in the present, that it is always contemporary, because it yields the meaning according to which a system is individuated” (311). Simondon clarifies in a note that he
does not wish to contest the validity of quantitative theories of information, but simply that information “precedes any duality of sender and receiver, thus any transmitted message” (n. 8, 318). As Adrian MacKenzie writes, “It is not so much the much-maligned divorce between signal and meaning that Simondon resists, but the confinement of the concept of information to a relatively late phase of its emergence, the advent of a particular form” (51).

Information in this sense is a problematic. Simondon scholar Jean-Hughes Barthélémy writes, “With Simondon, indeed, every reality has its problematic to the extent that the potentials are not yet actualized and demand to be so; the problematic is the configuration starting from which something can ‘pose a problem’ and provoke a becoming, as a resolution of the problem” (223). For Simondon, living is problematic. “The living being is presented as a problematic being, at once greater and lesser than the unit. To say that the living being is problematic means considering its becoming as forming one of its dimensions, and thus that it is determined by its becoming, which affords the being mediation” (Simondon, 307). Information, as a disparity across realities, scales, or regions is a problem that needs resolving—resolutions, as we have seen, are individuations. This allows Simondon to fold information into the living being, such that living is informatic. “The living being can be considered to be a node of information that is being transmitted inside itself—it is a system within a system, containing within itself a mediation between two different orders of magnitude” (Genesis, 306). If information, as a problematic of relations, provokes individuation, it unfolds through processes of transduction.

What comes out of the pre-individual and manifests as individual and milieu does so based on the sets of relations that make up the pre-individual. Transduction is Simondon’s term for how these relations produce new states. “Transduction corresponds to the presence of those relations created when the pre-individual being becomes individuated. It expresses individuation and allows us to understand its workings, showing that it is at once a metaphysical and also a logical notion. While it may be applied to ontogenesis, it is also ontogenesis itself. Objectively, it allows us to comprehend the systematic preconditions of individuation, internal resonance and the psychic problematic” (314). As individuation occurs, the emergent forms, energies and structures come directly from the relations that comprise pre-individual being: these relations play out through
transductions. That is to say that what emerges by way of individuation is a cumulative effect of the pre-individual relations.

[T]ransduction represents a discovery of dimensions that are made to communicate by the system for each of the terms such that the total reality of each of the areas’ terms can find a place in the newly discovered structures without loss or reduction. The transduction that resolves things effects the reversal of the negative into the positive: meaning, that which makes the terms fail to be identical with each other, and that which makes them disparate (in the sense in which this expression is understood in the theory of vision), is integrated with the system that resolves things and becomes a condition of meaning (315).

Transduction describes systemic resonance across the pre-individual tensions, energies and potentials.

**Monadic Transduction**

Simondon explicitly distances his philosophy from monadology. “Unity (characteristic of the individuated being and of identity), which authorizes the use of the principle of the excluded middle, cannot be applied to the preindividual being—which explains why one cannot recreate the world out of monads after the fact, even if one introduces other principles, such as that of sufficient reason, to allow oneself to organize them into a universe” (301). In *The Fold*, however, Deleuze significantly revamps Leibniz’s philosophy, envisioning a dynamic interplay between relating bodies that actualize potentials. Deleuze extends the term monad to include chemical particles, molecules, atoms and photons; stating that any individual being, or thing, that is "endlessly "being formed"" is a monad (103). This is not the monad to which Simondon refers. This monad, endlessly forming, or unfolding in Deleuze’s parlance, fits Simondon’s ontology where becoming is being: “becoming is not a framework in which the being exists; it is one of the dimensions of the being, a mode of resolving an initial incompatibility that was rife with potentials” (301). Deleuze’s unfolding monad and Simondon’s theory of individuation connect: each describes processes of actualizing potential.

Like Simondon, Deleuze focuses on the relations that connect monads. Monads individuate through their relations with other monads, or by exerting forces on one another. "No matter what, genuine or absolute forms are primary forces, essentially individual and active primary unities,
that actualize a virtuality or a potential, and that are in harmony with each other without any one being determined by the other" (Deleuze, 103). One body does not determine the other's individuation, neither for Deleuze nor for Simondon, but the relations between them—potentials, tensions, energies, and forces—do result in individuation and transductive resonance.

Though singular, monads are made up from other monads. "Finally, a monad has as its property not an abstract attribute—movement, elasticity, plasticity—but other monads, such as a cell, other cells, or an atom, and other atoms. These are phenomena of subjugation, of domination, of appropriation that are filling up the domain of having, and this latter area is always located under a certain power" (Deleuze, 110). Our material, human form is a pre-individual state of individuating monads. The domination of monadic bodies can be considered as a kind of relation across divergent scales.

Deleuze uses the mathematical term vinculum to describe the connection between dominating and dominated monads. In mathematics, a vinculum is a horizontal line drawn over a group of terms indicating that they should be operated on as a single entity. Deleuze uses the term to describe an overarching identity belonging to a set of monads. “[A] partition, a supple and adherent membrane coextensive with everything inside. Such is the vinculum, the unlocalizable primary link that borders the interior” (111). The membrane is also an apt description for the internal relations of living beings to their exterior milieu in Simondon’s philosophy. Anne Sauvanargues explains, "[T]his interiority and exteriority are not absolute but metastable, dynamic, relative to each other, and their interfacing surface is itself in becoming, in relation. The membrane thus brings about this polarity of milieus, in which interiority and exteriority remain entirely relative, and even dephase themselves, since the living is characterized as that which engenders a proliferation of interior and exterior milieus in the organism without ever being content to oppose in a static way corporeal interior and an exterior world" (67). Modulating interior and exterior realities is one of the distinctions Simondon makes between living individuals and purely physical entities, such as crystals. Simondon states that we can then consider each living entity as a node of information. The “mediation” between external and internal act as disparate realities that the living being must negotiate (306). In Deleuze’s philosophy, the vinculum structures the dominated monads within particular bodies, providing a unifying, dominant identity. Thus, it modulates internal and external
realities. Responding to internal and external relations, one can imagine an undulating membrane in a constant state of flux; constantly enfolding and unfolding monadic bodies in response to internal and external forces. In such a way, the vinculum, the membrane, can also be described as informatic—it is the site of modulation between interior and exterior realities. Adhering internal and external relations systematically, the vinculum bind produces transductive qualities.

It is important to note that Deleuze uses the dominating properties of the vinculum to ensure a dynamic understanding of monads. “At all times aggregates of parts...are leaving my body, and thus crowds of monads that my monad was dominating enter under another vinculum, under a new monad” (Deleuze, 115). Simondon’s thought can be seen in Deleuze’s reworking of the monad: individuation unfolds across the backs of dominated monads.

In summary, individuation is a process by which an individual and its milieu emerge based on pre-existing sets of relations. These relations consist of potentials, tensions and energies that build over time in a metastable fashion. Information, or disparity, demands individuation. Thus the individual and milieu transductively erupt from the pre-individual. Latent tensions and potentials are carried forward, and the process continues. Deleuze’s reworking of Leibniz’s philosophy brings a dynamic understanding of monads: they are individuals open to change through the flux of dominated and dominating bodies—aligning processes of unfolding and enfolding with Simondon’s successive individuations. The concepts of information, its transductive productions and the domination of different bodies will help in considering the work _Victimless Leather._

**Victimless Leather**

Within a steel and glass cabinet, two glass flasks and a test tube sit on display (Fig. 1). At the back of the cabinet a small peristaltic pump moves liquid from one flask and the test tube through clear surgical tubing to the smaller, central flask. The liquids have a pinkish, bodily, color. They carry nutrients to the central flask. Spherical, the central flask sits in a special holder suspending it above a small light. Lit from below, a tiny, seamless jacket—an about the right size for a mouse to wear—grows inside the flask. It is recognizable as an article of clothing, but it could just as easily be considered as a shirt, sweater, or turtleneck, the word leather in the title is our clue that it
should be read as a jacket. The entire ensemble resembles something from B-movie—as if it were cobbled together by a mad scientist. The jacket, like Frankenstein, is a hybrid of multiple, cellular, bodies grown on a three-dimensional scaffold of biodegradable polymers. In its first manifestation it was grown from both human and mouse cells (Kramer). However this is not a science experiment; it is art.

Completed in 2004, *Victimless Leather: A Prototype of Stitch-less Jacket Grown in a Technoscientific ‘Body’* is by the Tissue Culture & Art project (TC&A), an art collective led by husband and wife team Oron Catts and Ionat Zurr. It belongs to a larger series of work titled *Technologically Mediated Victimless Utopia*. The entire series questions notions of living and nonliving, the relations between different living entities (especially humans and nonhumans), and contemporary technological mediations of life seen in medicine and biotechnology.

Catts and Zurr refer to their sculptures as “semi-living.” These semi-living sculptures are tissue cultures, where living cells are grown in vitro. TC&A has been using tissue culture in their work.
for over a decade. They use biodegradable polymers to direct the growth of the cells in three dimensions providing shape and form (Catts and Zurr, 365). As the cells have no living bodies, technological surrogates, called bioreactors, are used instead (Catts and Zurr, Towards a New Class of Being, 4). Bioreactors provide protection from the environment, supply nutrients to the cells, remove waste and maintain temperature, pH and gas levels. (Catts and Zurr, Growing 367). This is the minimum that the cells need to survive, though some bioreactors may be more technologically advanced, providing microgravity environments, for instance. Highlighting this technical mediation of life is at the heart of their work. "Our work is conceptually closer to cybernetics, machine/nature hybrids and the effect of technologies on complex biological systems, than to molecular biology–based art—although we often use genetically modified cells and utilize other aspects of molecular biology” (365).

Technologically Mediated Victimless Utopia is a series of five artworks that pose questions around the subjugation of animal bodies. In addition to Victimless Leather the series includes: Semi-Living Steak, pre-natal sheep cells that were grown into steaks (these steaks were never eaten) (2000); Disembodied Cuisine, frog cells that were grown into steaks and then cooked and eaten in the gallery at the end of the show (2003); The Remains of Disembodied Cuisine, an installation featuring the remains of Disembodied Cuisine, or “the pieces people spat out” (2003); and DIY DVK 2006, a kit that allows individuals to create tissue cultures of animals they eat, or “or cause the accidental death of a living being” to deal with their guilt (2006) (Tissue Culture & Art website). Catts describes the initial idea of the series as a critique of contemporary views of the technology will alleviate animal suffering.

TC&A seeks to complicate technological positivism associated with vat-grown meat and leather. The title itself is a play on the idea, as tissue culture is not victimless. Growing animal cells in vitro requires fetal calf serum. For example Disembodied Cuisine required “about 500 milliliters of fetal calf serum which is pretty much equivalent to what you would grow from one calf so a baby calf had to be killed, the blood had to be drained, the serum had to be made for us to grow a tiny amount of meat, and that’s still the case. So the whole discussion about in vitro meat is very much a false discussion because it’s about distancing the victims of our consumption” (Catts,
quoted in Kramer). *Victimless Leather* also explores the victimhood of consumption, but through fashion.

The jacket is not victimless, it also uses fetal calf serum. The use of a coat references the economics of labor. In *Capital*, Marx uses the example of a coat to demonstrate the abstraction of human labor.\(^1\) Victimless Leather abstracts economies of production even further, where the roles non-human animal bodies (leather) and human bodies (labor) are shifted to the synthetic growth of animal cells in a bioreactor. However, TC&A seem more focused on the non-human animal bodies dominated through consumer networks than human labor:

“Leather is interesting because it’s unbelievable how many people wear leather and they’re not even aware of the fact that they’re having bits of dead animals on them. Leather is such an abstraction of the life form from which it originated that in the eyes of many people in modern, urban, western societies don’t make the link...It was really interesting to see how people were really offended and confronted by that work. Although we had works using traditional leather techniques, not so far from where we showed the Victimless Leather and no one questioned that, which is quite interesting” (Catts, quoted in Kramer).

This entangling of ethics and economics poses a number of disparities for the viewer to untangle. In some ways, the mediation of the cells through technological means can be more problematic than traditional leather-making practices. It demands an individuation of knowing—knowledge is a kind of individuation for Simondon. Individuation, for Simondon, occurs across all realms including ideas and knowledge. Knowledge results from the resolution of a “problematic” (309). Simondon describes the individuation of knowledge as unfolding between the individual and that which is outside of it. “A concept is neither a priori nor a posteriori but a praesenti, because it is an informative and interactive communication between that which is larger than the individual and that which is smaller” (310). The ethics of *Victimless Leather* refers both to the art object in front of the viewer and to wider systems of capitalist production, including: the fashion industry, various forms of food production, the biotechnology industry, and the art world.

\(^1\) My thanks to Laura Marks for bringing this connection to my attention.
However, the complex technologies used in *Victimless Leather* make untangling all of this difficult—we can assume that the majority of viewers are probably not well versed in tissue culturing. Therefore, the resolution of the work on their part is quite partial. This provides an ongoing openness to the work, a festering individuation around the hybridity of technological life. While we cannot ascertain to what extent viewers resolve this artwork for themselves, viewing it as a demand for individuation on the part of the viewer offers productive routes of inquiry.

Robert Mitchell, writing about *Disembodied Cuisine*, claims that the work of TC&A reconfigures the systems of “energy, land and uses of long-distance transportation networks” of animal-based production within a milieu of biotechnology. He suggests that their work takes the distributed processes through which humans mediate animal bodies—meat and leather production, for instance—and offers biotechnological “frame on which to allow gallery-goers to begin to map more efficient realignments of the functions that are inherent in contemporary assemblages linking agricultural production, distribution, and consumption” (97).

Certainly, the work of TC&A should be considered within a broader milieu of biotechnology,
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which Mitchell does quite well. However, by reading the work in terms of efficiency—highlighting the potential of technology to realign these systems—disregards the ironic critique presented by the entire series. “[T]here’s a perception that by putting technology onto problems we can solve them, but in most cases we’re mostly just circumnavigating the problems and creating new problems” (Catts qtd. in Kramer). The work of TC&A seems to reveal more *inefficiencies* than efficiencies of biotechnological mediation. For instance, when Victimless Leather was shown at MoMA in 2008, the cells used for the jacket grew in such a way that the tubes supplying nutrients became clogged and the sculpture had to be ‘killed,’ that is the bioreactor was unplugged. We might also consider Catt’s admission that the steaks from *Disembodied Cuisine* tasted “quite disgusting” (qtd. in Kramer). The installation *The Remains of Disembodied Cuisine*, by exhibiting the bits of meat spit out by those who tried it, highlights their critique.
At an obvious level, *Victimless Leather* poses questions about the technologies used in manipulating living bodies. The cells making up the jacket stand in for the leather clothing we wear, implicating the viewer in a global system that uses animal bodies as resources, both in current use, but also in a foreboding future sense. The artwork actualizes a future potential of industry and science. That is to say that it confronts the viewer with a technology that has not been fully subsumed into culture. As such, the work is problematic. It poses not only the future potential of hybrid flesh-technologies, normally safely contained by the science fictions that think them up, but also the imbrications of life and technology seen modern, contemporary society. It requires an individuation, a resolution. The viewer must decide what to make of this...thing.

The artists also take direct aim at the viewer’s skin, the membrane. When I view the slightly pebbled flesh of Victimless Leather, I cannot help but imagine what it would feel like next to my skin. What would it be like to wear? Is it soft or rough? Will it yield to the contours of my body? Is there a break-in period? Looking at the tiny jacket, I feel my skin tingle with anticipation and discomfort. That it is locked behind the cabinet only seems to defer and heighten my curiosity.

Fig. 3 *Victimless Leather* with fungal infection, source: [http://tcaproject.org/thumbs_cache/images--img-1538-389c-800x600.jpg](http://tcaproject.org/thumbs_cache/images--img-1538-389c-800x600.jpg)
The *Victimless Utopia* series suggests that TC&A takes great delight in such provocation, exploring imaginative sensory overload in the feel and taste of such flesh. Overload seems the right word for semi-living flesh participants could not bear to eat.

We must also keep in mind that the sculpture is living; therefore, it should have its own transductive response to information. The growth of cells in response to nutrients is one obvious form of individuation. The biodegradable polymer that directs the growth may be considered as a vinculum, providing both a dominant identity and marshaling the growth of skin cells into a particular formation. The vinculum, as modulating between different realities can also be considered as informatic.

However, the inefficiencies mentioned above seem to reveal some of the most interesting, emergent qualities of individuation in the jacket. When shown at MoMA, the jacket cells traveled along the tubes delivering nutrients, eventually clogging them. The curator turned the installation off, killing the sculpture (Kramer). Nutrients and the structural integrity of tubing provided a vector of potentiality actualized by the growing cells in emergent ways that the artists had not anticipated. Even though this sounds bad, it should be obvious that killing the sculptures is technically always part of TC&A’s work. The cells will not survive travel, and will probably not pass biosafety regulations. However, sometimes TC&A holds ritualized killings for their sculptures. Other times the artists take them out of the bioreactors so that audience members may touch them, essentially prodding them to death (Naked Matter).

The ritual killing of the work highlights, in some ways, the overall domination of the sculpture. As a whole, the work of art also functions as vinculum, binding together technology and living cells. The bioreactor, “surrogate” body, sustains the cells of the jacket. The pump, enlisted to circulate nutrients, is dominated by the jacket, as are the nutrients and the vessels containing them. Domination here should not be seen simply as subjugation. Domination also implies care.

The artists are, of course, aware of such care. “We always spoke of the necessity of having to care for our sculptures...We are quite aware of our responsibility toward the creations we make” (qtd. in Gluzman). The bioreactor is one form of care. It provides protection and nutrients for the semi-
living sculpture. The artists also have more active care-taking roles. When showing *Victimless Leather* in Japan, this time in the shape of a kimono, the sculpture contracted a fungal infection (Fig. 3). Catts applied medicine daily to the sculpture but to no avail, the fungal infection remained in the work, culminating in the production of a fungal bloom that Catts describes as a “flower” (*Naked Matter*)\(^2\). This, of course, can also be understood as a form of transduction on the part of the fungi infecting the cells of the sculpture.

Care complicates ethical critiques of bioethics in ways that distinctions of good vs. bad do not capture. It extends our relations and dominations beyond any ability to simply accept or reject the technological abstractions of biotechnology industries and practices. Care must attend to the singularity of the individual, the specific sets of relations that make it what it is and mold its needs. The sculptures of TC&A represent technological mediations that are unfolding in the world now—specific manifestations of technology and life in laboratories around the world. Instead of simply vilifying such practices, they ask us to consider what care these new, semi-living beings require. An ethics of care reinserts us, the viewer of the work, as culpable participants in systems like food and clothing production as well as biotech industries, preventing the dislocation of such ethical conundrums onto some unidentifiable ‘other’ of corporate industry. It can refocus our attention, and our individuation, to the bodies we dominate.

In this way, we can consider the disparities involved in care, both in terms of power and subjugation, but also in the specific needs of a dominated monad. Providing care necessitates an attention to the specific needs of an entity. In the case of semi-living sculptures, this means providing shelter and nutrients through the bioreactor, or, in some cases, the application of medicine. To provide a specific shape, the use of biodegradable polymers means that the cells grow upon the scaffold, which then degrades away as the cells grow and replace it. In this sense, an ethics of care is similar to what Elizabeth Grosz describes as an “ethics of actualization...it aims eventually, through the opening up of the future, to aspire to the maximization of actualization, the maximum incorporation of pre-individual potentials, disparations, into the individuals and supraindividuals [and semi-living individuals] that emerge” (50-51). Yet, not all potentials within

---

\(^2\) Presumably a great deal of care also occurs in creating a work: figuring out how to grow a specific shape, the fabrication of custom bioreactors, developing their own tissue culture techniques, and so on.
a given assemblage of monads are purely physical. By attending to the ethics of the semi-living sculptures, and by drawing shared, ethical connections between the sculptures and larger systems of domination of other entities (biotechnology, food production, fashion, etc), the artists set the stage for further actualization of latent potentials within their work through audience response. Encouraging the actualization of potentials within a regime of domination also means allowing for different paths of individuation. Care, in its response to the singularity of a given monad (or monads) is inherently dynamic—care must individuate along with both the dominated and dominating monads. Care must be as metastable as the entities involved in such a relationship.

As we have seen, the semi-living sculptures of TC&A do not always produce the results one might expect. Potentials are actualized in ways that can be characterized as failures. Cells grow in new directions causing the installation to be turned off, or fungi invade and bloom in unplanned ways, diverting the artists’ intent. This does not seem to bother Oron Catts: “I celebrate those types of failures, I think those type of failures are the most important part of the work because we are never going to engage with life and have full control over it. The rhetoric that is surrounding contemporary engineering and that attempts to deal with life is extremely problematic and really dangerous. If there’s any contribution I’d like to make, it’s that one of bringing into perspective that when you engage with life, you should never assume that you’re going to have full control over the consequences” (qtd in Kramer).

Such an approach of care to our own dominated monads is performed through processes of modulation. Much like Sauvanargues’ idea of the membrane, care is a permeable interaction between dominant and dominated monads. Care is yet another node of information: it requires the navigation between different realities. Care that engenders the maximum actualization of potential means that certain aspects extend beyond the means of domination. Recognizing the care inherent to domination, in its metastable interchange of bodies—both technological and organic—and the deep, convoluted problems it brings to the fore engenders vectors of transduction around monad bodies. An ethics of care means modulating between a the specific needs of dominated monads and a recognition that dominated monads may trasnductively individuate in directions away from the systems that dominate them. Perhaps it is through a transductive understanding of care and individuation that these systems may individuate in ways that actualize more potential.
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