**Das Logic of Sinn** and **Das Logic of Angst** reveal themselves in the making of art. Suppose I am a film director who has successfully written, directed, edited, and importantly cinematographed mine own films and have accrued a standing ouvre: assume now that I hire someone intelligent to use only and I do mean only my previous work to create a fully realized filmographic art work that would best express my owvre ... What the intelligent person would find are what Deluze and Guattari call "lines of flight", what Plotinus calls "trace(s) of the soul", what some others call "strands of thought" (or "strands of the subterranean conscious"): these are, in this instance, all phrases for a full, discrete Arg of sense: for, to keep with the analogy, logic's conclusions are the premises of further conclusions, thus the art ouvre builds off of itself in a similar fashion: This does not imply that all arguments of sense are logically consistent, for perhaps some works create forks in the ouvre, some works being in different veins of sense: although possible to compare between, the flow of the sensible logic might be so disrupted that a pairing might itself express its discordance, and thus the existence of new kind (and sometimes culturally recognized new kind of new) ... nevertheless, the situation above asks us to recognize the a film metaouvre: This art which expresses the ouvre rather than the living artist is an expression of sense about sense: it is THE sense of anticipation and as such is made necessarily partly alienated from all arguments of sense of an ouvre. This is what I took Asteroid City to be a metaouvre film. The film metaouvre anticipates the ouvre in a way that a film ouvre intuitus -- the art made in a room lined with work is influenced but not beholden to: this is applicable to the direction of actors and their part of expression: how do you make the actor cry (here used again in my sense) which includes all pure expressions (and not only waterworks)? What exactly is to be expressed by the making of an Actor cry? When Scarlett Johannson cries in Asteroid City, Scarlett Johannson cries in character (in alternate version (?) of character(?)) in the film's scripted private pseudorehearsal of Johannson's character's character's reaction performance of her crying, which was then depicted in film as her in a tub, almost fully covered by porcelain but while supposedly still nude (yet in full makeup) and reclined, seen through a window of her building which was separated from another character character alternate character alternate stand-in (Jason Schwartzman) sitting in for his alternate character's alternate self -- not to be confused with Adrian Brody, who in the film is only the director of the PLAY Asteroid City which the film is a hypothetical film adaptation of (possibly what the playwright had been imagining he the screenwriter had been imagining while writing a play called Asteroid City which might have been different than the actual written play (because of the scene of Schwartzman's character's (?) character's (?) character's audition) which itself was a filmed as play scene sequence used as partly intermission a la Bergman's magic flute intermission ... so what was Johannson expressing? Does the convolution of anticipation act as lamination? This is what Stravinsky attempted with and within Apollon Musagete with his stated "Music without Affect", but as I mentioned previously, the French were working on a literal ontic of nihilation to hope toward a pure affect, which I also showed / proved (above) to be self-defeating. Does Anderson achieve a lamination of a quiet sadness through a confused sense: rather than follow a sensible logic to make Johannson cry, Johannson cries without affect -- the stillness of her tears prove alien (pun very much intended) to sense and thus express only the know-how, only and I do mean only the trick of the teardrop.

A thought while reading Campion:

If there be a harmony of the spheres and an agency in the human, then perhaps the astrology is the science of adaptation, akin to a weather and distinct from its report. In what ways can one move water?