Ripples of Becoming-With:
Co-creating a Postdisciplinary Module About Posthumanism

Catherine Bates
University of Leeds
c.v.bates@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract

This article provides a diffractive reading of the second-year undergraduate university module on posthumanism that I teach. The module is designed specifically for mature students. I consider the "postdisciplinary" nature of the module, and think through the ways in which the module "becomes" through co-creation with the students. This involves a discussion of Braidotti's (2019) notion of the posthuman university, Lykke's (2018) conception of the postdisciplinary, and Barad's (2007) and Haraway's (2016) imperatives to (1) think-with, and (2) be response-able within multispecies communities. Using these ideas, I consider the unexpected directions in which the students take the module. I attend to how it changes through their entangled discussions. I share how I designed the module and its assessment and discuss some of the texts and issues we bring into our learning community. Throughout, I advocate for an affirmative approach to social justice in higher education pedagogy that acknowledges the partiality and situatedness of knowledge, recognizes interdependence, and the need for affinity.

Keywords: Postdisciplinary, social justice, adult education

Introduction

Sara Ahmed (2017) describes feminist action as "ripples in water, a small wave…here, there, each movement making another possible, another ripple, outward, reaching" (p. 3). Her ripples—which only work when the hermetic notion of the individual human is challenged—involve the "more-than-human" and speak to the critical pedagogical approach I adopt when teaching. My view is that together, students and I, cause and respond to ripples in a process that continuously transforms us and later, ripples out into our communities. O'Shea (2015) enhances my view by suggesting that the relational capital first-in-family students build at university also cause "ripples of learning [to flow] from and between the institution and the home" (p. 153). In this article, I also consider activist learning as "ripplings" between students and tutor that bring new and critical knowledge into being.

The context for my discussion is a second year university module called, *Exploring Contemporary Issues*. The module was specifically designed for "mature students", that is, students over the age of 21 at the start of their studies. The aim of the module is to investigate answers to the question: What does it mean to be human in the 21st century? The module is taught at a Lifelong Learning Centre in England.[1] It is part of a program that aims to widen participation and make university education more accessible for people who have previously

---

[1] The location is part of a prestigious Russell Group university.

experienced structural exclusions from it. Students come to the program and the module with life and work experience but often without traditional qualifications, such as A-level graduation.

In the module, the students and I begin by considering+ Judith Butler's (2002) statement: "the category of the human is in the process of becoming" (n.p.). Considering the tension between the notion of "universal human rights" and the oppressive treatment of so many who are designated by nation-states as less-than-human, Butler (2002) suggests that being human is something "we have not yet achieved" (n.p.). In my class, considering humanity in this way, seems to dismantle fixed notions we hold about what being human is. This dismantling, then allows us to work together to assemble new possibilities for "human becomings". As a learning community, we listen to and develop dialogues with non-human voices such as Nim Chimsky, Kafka's (2005) ape, and *Bladerunner*'s (1982) cyborgs, as well as with companion animals, wildlife, family, tech-critters, and other beings in our lives. We specifically endeavour to learn from those designated as less-than-human by problematic epistemological and ontological histories that contribute to a definition of the human. We bring into our community, theorists who we figure as companions, rather than experts, so that student knowledge is not valued less than "academic" knowledge.

Gloria Anzaldúa (2018), one of our key companions throughout the module, argues it is

> not enough to stand on the opposite river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions. …At some point, on our way to a new consciousness, we will have to leave the opposite bank…so that we are on both shores at once. (p. 388)

My students often talk about the need to jump into the river together to enable new thinking about "human becomings" to move beyond the dualisms Anzaldúa discusses. This article is a posthuman discussion about how we, metaphorically spend time in that river, making ripples together to assemble new "becomings". By this I mean new ways of thinking and being, new realizations of who, what, and how we are, and of what beings, humans and non-humans, that constitute our community. In class, we probe new ways of "worlding", to use Haraway's (2016) term, while here, in this article, I present a diffractive reading of how the module works in practice and in theory. I suggest diffractive readings, rather than reflections, following Haraway's (1997) and Barad's (2007) view that diffraction suggests a "continuous production of difference" whereas reflection does not (Haraway, 1997, p. 268).

To facilitate the communication of my diffractive reading, the following are the key convergences I discuss: social justice pedagogy, postdisciplinarity, and posthumanism. Put another way, they are the intra-actions I attend to. These convergences or intra-actions constitute moments of new becoming in my ongoing teaching practice. In the first convergence, I discuss the way the module identifies and breaks down binary conceptions, and in doing so, moves beyond siloes and dualisms. The silos that exist, for example, between disciplines, tutors, students, and different more-than-humans. The second convergence involves the recognition of partiality and need for affinity. Finally, convergence three discusses the constitution of a becoming-community. It is brought into being through each iteration of the module. Through a collective pursuit of affirmative values and relations based on Braidotti's (2019) notion of affirmative ethics, we co-create a community. Affirmative ethics "allow us to say that 'we' are in *this* together, but we are not one and the same." (Braidotti, 2019, p. 136, italics added). The *this* is what happens when boundaries expand and the need for affinity is recognized. The

convergences and diffractive readings that follow contain input from two mature students who agreed to share their names, words, and experiences in the article.

Convergence 1. Breaking Down and Moving Beyond Boundaries

The *Exploring Contemporary Issues* module examines Lykke's (2018) postdisciplinarity in relation to the posthumanities. We discuss how she frames the phenomena of academic "studies," as in postcolonial studies, cultural studies, environmental studies, as ground shared among them. Furthermore, Lykke (2018) makes the following important distinctions:

> In multi and interdisciplinary knowledge production, the disciplines perform as prerequisites and taken-for-granted points of departure for the cross-disciplinary work. By contrast, the concept, postdisciplinarity, refers to more transgressive ways of producing academic knowledge which destabilize, deconstruct, and disrupt the hegemony of distinct disciplines and the classic academic divides between human, social, technical, medical and natural sciences. (p. 333)

My module investigates the question of what it means to be human in a "postdisciplinary" way. To do so, the module draws upon postdisciplinary theorists such as Haraway (2012), and we consider her philosophical, sociological, and cultural humanities approaches "together". Built into the module's design is the idea of a multistudent-tutor co-creation processes. The module design is structured deliberately as three connected strands: animal/human, human/technology, and borders. Each strand begins with reading key texts and examines examples set by me, which we consider in small-group seminar discussions. We also have two-hour interactive workshops in which the major theories and ideas are discussed together in a setting where students are encouraged to think-with their own examples, experiences, and affective responses. They might consider personal lived experiences of crossing borders and the bodily fear and excitement associated with it, or they might respond to the stories of other colleagues examining border theory. Student discussions are continued online in a discussion forum, which forms part of their assessment. In effect, an interactive and intra-active process in which students and tutor are accountable and response-able to each other is co-created. By response-able, I mean that the collective learning builds through a process of entanglement with each other's responses to the ideas presented. We use the workshop discussions and the discussion board to grapple with the notion of diffraction as patterns of difference that can potentially change how we think and become a community (Barad, 2007).

The module is collaboratively constituted through the work, insights, and affective responses students share. The assessment asks students to stay entangled with the details of the ongoing discussions, not necessarily to come to any conclusions. As Haraway (2012) says,

> The details link actual beings to actual response-abilities. Each time a story helps me remember what I thought I knew, or introduces me to new knowledge, a muscle critical for caring about flourishing gets some aerobic exercise. (p. 312)

Active caring is examined in more detail by Land (2019) who suggests that,

> how we are implicated in that complex relation in which not all lives are valued equally – we aren't just responsible for our relations but we must do something that responds well to how we are tangled in relations and with the others we are tangled with. (n.p.)

The discussion board highlights such issues as, animal rights, pets, animals in captivity and zoos in which we recognise our entangled relationships with pets, our closest companion animals. We often talk about what we have learned from our pets and about the emotional intelligence of non-human critters. We also discuss lines we would not cross with those companions, meaning we wouldn't use them for food or pure entertainment. There is a sense that pets have intrinsic value. In contrast, we consider critters in zoos. Do they have the same value as pets, and should they be in captivity? We probe whether or not we are complicit with dominant notions of animals that regard them as less-than-human, as curiosities, or entertainment. Considering Koko, the gorilla and Jane Goodall's research with the Gombe National Park chimpanzees, some of us notice that the apes are similar to us. They live in communities, feel pain, learn sign language, and speak their own language. Some of us ask shouldn't they have the right not to live in captivity? Others think about the differences between apes and humans. There is some conversation about whether these differences mark inferiority. For example, we ask the following question: Is their language as complex? What have the non-human apes designed? Are their emotions as complex? There is also discussion about the anthropocentric nature of such thinking. Furthermore, we question what we can learn from the apes? In this way, we challenge assumptions we have made as humans. We question species hierarchy. Grappling for an understanding of the complexity of our relationships with non-human critters involves bringing the critters in to a multispecies conversation. It makes the discussion board and workshops transformational spaces. Spaces in which boundaries are recognized, and perhaps in the very moments that they become blurred.

Our discussions about the animal/human binary involved a recognition of the anthropocentric thinking that led to a justification for human oppression. Human and non-human oppression, we came to appreciate, was linked to a process of categorization and labelling of beings as "not" human. Some beings were labelled "animal" or "property" and as such could and would be treated as less-than-human. Among the thinkers we used to think-with was Agamben (2004). His notion of the "anthropological machine" was helpful (p. 26). Bourke (2011) explains the anthropological machine as "the compulsive inclination to demarcate the territory of the human from that of the non-human" (p. 5). We also examined and found helpful, Kate Soper's (1995) work on the semiotic use of animals to shore up certain respectable ideas of the human (p. 83).

The examination of such concepts led to students in 2016, to focus a seminar discussion on the colonial phenomenon of the zoo. Instead of non-human animals, this zoo was a human zoo; a theatre installation by Brett Bailey that included live human subjects. Bailey recreated the voyeuristic historical practice of people of colour being displayed as specimens. Understandably, the seminar and the discussions that followed were transformative. This presentation is one of the many examples I could give, in which the module developed in a different, yet a necessary direction for the class than I had anticipated. It is significant to note that the students taking part in the discussion included people of colour. The students leading the seminar and discussions were a mixed group of people of colour and white students. Quite understandably, class members had different lived experiences that they brought to the discussion. Although by year two, most if not all, the students had experiences discussing topics such as racial oppression, the affective nature of this specific discussion needed to be carefully and sensitively managed. I discussed the matter with the session leaders and provided formative guidance. I encouraged them to be sensitive to the traumatic nature of the material and proactively consider that some students

might have difficulty dealing with it. I reflected with them on how to give students encountering difficulty with the material space and time to think. I suggested options that included a time-out, and/or if the student preferred**,** having individual discussions.

The discussions that followed included an examination of the horrific definitions of race that justified colonialism and led to people being treated like "caged animals". As students shared as a group, many examples of present-day structural and individual racism were identified. These examples led most students to realize that colonial thinking is still operating in their society. Some students also made the connection between human zoos to zoos in general. Those students started to question the ethics involved in non-human zoos and started to question their own complicity with them. Others made the connection to fascist thinking and more specifically, to events in Nazi Germany. Conversation on the discussion board about a theatre piece, not only raised awareness about the human and non-human zoos, it raised awareness of colonial practices that was unknown to many. For some students who saw the theatre piece as a representation of the concentration camp in Auschwitz, it reminded them of the need to keep the history of the holocaust within active living memory. The unfolding discussion was an entanglement of different material experiences and affective responses to critical issues. As a tutor, I was part of this entanglement and also acutely aware of how people of colour might be affected personally by engaging these critical issues. In my own contributions to the discussion board, I demonstrated my sensitivity to the issues and explained my own active listening and learning process.

As already mentioned, students participated in seminars from the beginning of the module, however, it was only in the third week of each strand, that students began running the seminars themselves. For their seminars, they identified their own materials and were inspired by the online discussions. Including student seminars was a significant part of the critical pedagogical approach I put in place, as I believed that it created a horizontal learning space that students were conscious of and sensitive to. As peer teachers, students co-created their curriculum and further blurred the boundary between tutor and student.

The inclusion of student seminars in the module was also inspired by social justice approaches to education. Specifically, I sought to break down boundaries in higher education for students who have not traditionally been/felt welcomed for classist, sexist, racist, ageist, or ableist reasons. Indeed, Enns and Sinacore (2005) explicate the characteristics of social justice education.

> Social justice in education includes (a) centralizing and affirming perspectives of those whose experience have been marginalized or ignored, (b) transforming the manner in which education occurs such that power differences are minimized and the empowerment of learners and educators is optimized, (c) working toward the full and equal participation of all learners, and (d) rethinking the institutional structures in which learning occurs. (p. vii)

The co-creation of the module includes the rethinking of institutional structures in which power differences and learning spaces/places are questioned. The module recognizes the significant barriers faced by students who have been marginalized and ignored by traditional university systems. Such systems, for example, charge fees, envision students as consumers, and measure effectiveness through quantitative surveys and graduate outcomes. While it is impossible

to completely remove these barriers, we acknowledged them, and continued to work to create liminal spaces where students and tutors could meet and work together.

One of our students, Sarah Hudson, for instance, explained her experience in the Lifelong Learning Centre (LLC) as being:

> In a world where boundaries within education maintain oppression as a result of a socially constructed linear system, the LLC, and sincerity of my tutors and of course Professional Studies were born to create a new one … I …call it Equilibrium in Education. (Hudson, 2018)

Sarah also described the experience of running her own seminar as a movement from "shackles to strengths". In a conference paper we gave together, we talked about the module as an example of an "us and us" curriculum. In a way, our co-creation work moves towards Braidotti's (2019) vision of the posthuman university. Her posthuman university is based on notions of becoming and co-creating a "we" which involves interdependent, transversal assemblages, rather than regarding the students as individual cogs in a capitalist wheel.

The vision of a posthuman university also entails a process of decolonization. A process which recognizes and acknowledges the violence of colonial thinking, practice, and history, and works to challenge it. The requirement for students to co-facilitate a seminar and select the learning materials has a decolonial element. Students are specifically asked to shift power structures and recognize the importance of voices and perspectives different from mine (the tutor), as well as different from each other, as individual students.

A student, Naoise Poku, shared her experience on the discussion board with a post which acknowledged the need to consider information in detail and to respect different responses when working with troubling critical issues. She stressed the need to move beyond comparisons of sameness and to recognize emotion:

> Suffering of this kind can never be compared…why use humans? [in the art piece]. I have been to Elmina's Castle in Ghana, which is where many Africans were taken from the land, they call this the point of no return. As I'm sure you will feel about your trip [to Auschwitz] this was also an event I will never forget. However … my point was there were no humans on display. Just the remains of the castle and the tour guide, which was harrowing enough. I think the main things is […] humans are emotional and we as a class were all affected by what we saw, which […] is what a good seminar should do. It got us all thinking and talking (Poku, Discussion Board post on Virtual Learning Environment, 2016).

Naoise's post brought another part of colonial history into the discussion and acknowledged the emotions that developed. She advocated thinking and talking, and recognized the effect of affect. She also broadened her thinking to include a consideration of the co-creation of the module, and the becoming-process of the student-led seminars. Such talk and thinking about talk are a key part of the module's constitution and process of becoming.

Convergence 2. Recognizing Partiality and the Need for Affinity

A becoming-process involves ever-changing assemblages and results from an acknowledgement that all knowledge productions are partial and need affinity (Lykke, 2018). Perhaps building on Haraway's (1988) understanding of situated, partial knowledge, Lykke (2018) explains that academic production of knowledge:

> …postdisciplinary collaborative spaces are needed, i.e. spaces where collaborative efforts between differently situated researchers can unfold without any discipline having an exclusive, taken-for-granted right to set the academic agenda and police the borders of the specific kinds of knowledge production to be set in motion. Collaboration is important in postdisciplinary work, since all knowledge production is considered partial, and no one therefore can have a full overview (p. 334).

The importance placed here on the acknowledgement of situated knowledge is key. No one can have a full overview. We need to keep reaching out through collaboration to generate further ever-changing but always necessary understandings. The students and I, with the co-creation of both in-person and online spaces, acknowledged our partiality and interdependence, and become something new together.

In this year two, undergraduate module, the central posthuman and postdisciplinary theories can present a significant challenge for students, even a barrier for some. It may seem out-of-tune for them with material everyday realities. For example, when reading Haraway's, *A Cyborg Manifesto*, I explain that engaging with this article might feel like you are walking into the middle of a complex conversation with someone who is not following conventional rules of sense-making.

There are two approaches we take to address this challenge. First, we bring other texts and companions into the conversation and in doing so acknowledge the partiality of each text and begin looking for affinity. Second, we work on the theory together without looking for a unified and singular interpretation. These acts enable us all to think creatively within the limits of our knowledge. For example, I use the first approach when we engage with Lykke (2018). She discusses the need to consider gender issues from an interdisciplinary and a bottom-up perspective. By "bottom-up" she means an "activist point of view" (p. 228). She presents an activist point of view as an alternative to "activism" saying "that societal problems are reduced if they are solely treated within the horizon of one discipline – they cannot really be contained and treated to the benefit of those who are hit by them from a single discipline" (pp. 228-229).

In taking an inherently discursive approach to the workshops, students have the opportunity to include their own examples and problems, thus building up knowledge from what they already know. Further, when we consider issues together in this way, we move beyond a siloed disciplinary approach. For the seminars, we focus on specific case studies and ask, what does it mean to be human in the 21st century? The first two case studies, Franz Kafka's (2005) *A Report to an Academy* and James Marsh et al.'s (2012) *Project Nim*, both introduce non-human animals into our conversations. The texts urge us to look beyond the binary distinctions Western, Eurocentric philosophy has traditionally made between "human" and "animal." Both address the partiality of the human perspectives and knowledge, both succeed in defamiliarizing the idea of

the human, thus setting the conditions for a postdisciplinary discussion that moves between experience, theory, and imagination.

In Kafka's story, Red Peter, the captured ape, is forced to imitate humans to survive a life in captivity. In our discussions, students tend to focus on the violence of the capture, wanting to disassociate from that type of human behaviour, but soon start thinking about what the performance of the human reveals. Within these conversations, Red Peter, an imaginary ape in one sense, becomes something real and part of our learning community. Adding Haraway's (2016) work to the conversation brings in concepts of hybridity. She suggests that to solve problems, one has to "stay with the trouble" long enough to find solutions and that those solutions may require us to make odd kinships or "oddkin" as she calls it (p. 4). That is, we may "require each other in unexpected collaborations and combinations" (Haraway, 2016, p. 4).

Red Peter, for example, in showing us his partiality, reveals our own. We realise that in trying to answer the questions he raises about what freedom and human civilisation are, we need him, each other, and other texts. We begin to realise that the "human" he has become is just a collection or an assemblage of performances (the handshake, the pipe-smoking, the spitting). This leads us to wonder if being human can be reduced to a set of performances. We ask, well, what is human? Red Peter is part ape and part human; he is a hybrid being. He became part human in response to his problem/trouble/capitivity through collaborations with humans that he combined with his ape-ness, and suggests what we have to do. He is the product of a sympoeisis, a making-with (Haraway, 2016, p. 4). In similar ways, students were remaking themselves too with Red Peter and with Haraway.

In acknowledging Red Peter's and their own partiality and how we all think-with others, students begin to recognize the need to build affinities with others in the room and in our communities, as well as with textual companions. In our class, we consider the entangled connection between thinking-with and affinity as "response-ability". Haraway (2016), drawing on Arendt's (1963) work, notes that response-ability is linked to "matters of care" (p. 36). Respecting this, we conduct our thinking-with an openness to the matterings of the world. Our ability to care and be responsible to/for others generates affinities in processes of becoming-with.

As a counterpoint, we also consider Deleuze and Guattari's (2004) work called *Becoming-Animal* as a response to Kafka's (2005) *Response to an Academy*. They consider Red Peter's discussion about imitating human beings, and use it to suggest that imitation is not what should, can, or does happen between man or animal. Students think-with Deleuze and Guattari's (2004) thinking about Red Peter's statement: "[T]here was no attraction for me in imitating human beings; I imitated them because I needed a way out, and for no other reason" (p. 99). The thinkers suggest that it is not "a question of a resemblance between the comportment of an animal and that of a man" but rather it is "a question of a becoming" (Deleuze & Guatarri, 2004, p. 99).

Grappling with the theory together, students and I are encouraged to stay with the trouble as Haraway (2016) suggests, and work with partial knowledge to keep the conversation going and to continue our becoming. We also do some creative work with Haraway's (1985/1991) *Cyborg Manifesto*. I bring Lego and plasticine (pre-COVID-19) into the workshop. The students work in groups to envision a cyborg as they investigate the concept with each other. Creating the cyborg becomes a challenge to the human, in the way Red Peter is. Once again, there is no room

for imitation. It is a matter of care. The students want their cyborgs to be sensitive to human/tech entanglements and to damaging origin stories that violently exclude many (Haraway, 1991). In a real sense, these cyborgs, along with Red Peter, and Haraway herself, become part of our naturalcultural multispecies community.

Convergence 3. Constituting a Becoming-Community Together

I end this article with three examples of intra-actions that have caused ripples in the ever-changing communities this module produces. The examples are titled "Unknowability: Robots Returning the Gaze", "Quoting Each Other: Students Transgressing Academic Conventions of Hierarchy", and "Squirrels and Gardening" are invitations to jump into the river with my students and I; to join us as readers and beings-that-matter.

Unknowability: Robots Returning the Gaze

In one student-led seminar, the student session leaders brought in robots who watched us all as the discussion progressed. The uncanniness of feeling watched by these robots affected everyone. It became impossible not to acknowledge their impact and consider how they became part of our world; they were world-making with us. The group thanked the robots at the end of the seminar. Had they become part of our community? This question led to discussions about Roy Batty's last speech in Scott's (1982) *Blade Runner*. In it he asks humans to look at themselves and to consider if what he has experienced/seen is any less valid because he is not human. In his moving soliloquy, he points out:

> I've seen things you people wouldn't believe. Attack ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched C-beams glitter in the dark near the Tannhäuser gate. All those moments will be lost in time, like tears in rain. (Scott, 1982, adaptation by Hauer)

Within his speech is a reminder of the unknowability of other beings. We can't know what Roy has seen or the impact it has had on him. It does suggest that we respect these unknown and perhaps unknowable things in other beings, human or not, and listen for them. We need to hear what others say and acknowledge the richness of their perspectives. Also, we must consider that our impact on others forms part of what we cannot know and as such must be handled carefully.

Quoting Each Other: Students Transgressing Academic Conventions of Hierarchy

In another student-led seminar, the leaders quoted one of their fellow students on a presentation slide and cited her contribution to the discussion board. Her perspective was affirmed in this moment. The cited student felt a validation of her becoming-an-academic identity and an acknowledgement of the difficult experience she had had in sharing. The student has become a theorist. Her confidence rippled out and had an impact on her community. As tutor, I was caught up in the reverberations.

Squirrels and Gardening

A group of students talked to me about their plan to build their seminar around squirrels. We talk about our relationship to squirrels. For example, we identified grey squirrels as the maligned, non-native UK pests and red squirrels as the Squirrel Nutkins heroes, but we also

discussed the history of hunting for squirrel pelts. This conversation took place online. As we talked, I looked outside, and saw a squirrel taking the bulbs out of the pots I had just planted and bury them in another part of the garden. For a moment, a wave of individualized control inundated me. Should the students focus on squirrels? Should I stop the squirrel replanting the bulbs? Then I relinquish control, happily. I saw the beauty in the way these two events converged and appreciated how multispecies communities are entangled, come together, and become together.

Conclusion

Braidotti's (2019) posthuman university is an imaginary that arose from the need to engage with, and rethink limited, bordered conceptions of education. My students knew first-hand the effects of a commodified model of higher education. More than this though, other forms of such traditional thinking have led to a continuous increase in global inequalities and injustices. It has resulted in global climate breakdown and the onset of the sixth mass extinction. As Haraway (2016) says,

> these times called the Anthropocene are times of multispecies, including human, urgency: of great mass death and extinction; of onrushing disasters, whose unpredictable specificities are foolishly taken as unknowability itself; of refusing to know and to cultivate the capacity of response-ability; of refusing to be present in and to onrushing catastrophe in time; of unprecedented looking away. (p. 35)

Using the discussion board, student-led seminars, co-creating inter/intra-active workshops, and being open to the student's information, like Naoise's insights, the students and I try to stay with the trouble without moving to despair. It is not always easy. Haraway (2016) articulates this difficulty too, saying,

> How can we think in times of urgencies without the self-indulgent and self-fulfilling myths of apocalypse, when every fibre of our being is interlaced, even complicit, in the webs of processes that must somehow be engaged and repatterned? (p. 36)

The module I teach, which encourages a collaborative building of "response-ability", and which I think of as a breaking down or a blurring of boundaries between student/tutor, self/other, knowledge/feeling, real/imagining, academy/real world, theory/life, is my activist response to Haraway's (2016) question. It is also, I hope, a teaching which creates Braidotti's (2019) "we" that necessarily involves the "mix of humans to non-humans, zoe/geo/techno-bound computational networks and earthlings" (p. 145).

As Carol Taylor (2018) suggests, "the affect and emotions that emerge in the phenomenon of teaching are also moments of becoming-with and constitute an important site of accountable intra-action in a responsible pedagogy" (p. 108). I hope that I have shown how the module I teach is full of these becoming-with moments. The moments of mutual becoming which ripple out in ways none of us can fully know, but, none-the-less for which we are responsible. These moments are enabled by a recognition of the power differentials in higher education and involve an intentional crossing of these power borders and silos. They are enabled by a thinking-with Red Peter, Roy Batty, Nim, and our vast multispecies world, all of whom create ripples of mattering.

References

Agamben, G. (2004). *The Open: Man and Animal* (Kevin Attell, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a Feminist Life*. Duke University Press.

Anzaldúa, G. (2018). La conciencia de la mestiza: Towards a New Consciousness. In G. Columbo, R. Cullen & B. Lisle (Eds.), *Rereading America*. Duran Books.

Arendt, H. (1964). Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil (Rev. and enl. Ed). New York: Viking Press.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press.

Bourke, J. (2011). *What it Means to be Human*. Virago.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Polity.

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman Knowledge*. Polity.

Butler, J., & Taylor, S. (2010, October 6). *Examined Life* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k0HZaPkF6qE

Chance, K. (2002, February 26). Freepress Interview with Judith Butler. http://mailman.lbo-talk.org/2002/2002-December/028577.html

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2004). Becoming-Animal. In P. Atterton & M. Calarco (Eds.), *Animal philosophy: Ethics and identity.* Continuum.

Enns, C. Z., & Sinacore, A. L. (Eds.). (2005). *Teaching and Social Justice: Integrating Multicultural and Feminist Theories in the Classroom.* American Psychological Association.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison* (Alan Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575-599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1997). *Modest_Witness@Second_Millenium. FemaleMan_Meets_OncoMouse: Feminist and Technoscience*. Routledge.

Haraway, D. (2012). Awash in urine: DES and Premarin® in multispecies response-ability. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, *40*(1/2), 301-316.

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Hudson, S., & Bates, C. (2018, July 3-4). Co-creating an us-and-us curriculum. At *Borders and Boundaries Conference: Debating the Limits and Possibilities of Education.* Lancaster University.

Kafka, F. (2005). A Report to an Academy (Willa & Edwin Muir, Trans.). In N. Glatzer (Ed.), *The Complete Short Stories* (pp. 250-259). Vintage.

Land, N. (2019). How do we move well together with/in the yard? Response-ability and sticking with paper borders. *Movement Pedagogies*. https://movingpedagogies.blog.ryerson.ca/

Lykke, N. (2018). Postdisciplinarity. In R. Braidotti & M. Hlavajova (Eds.), *Posthuman Glossary* (pp. 332-335). Bloomsbury.

Lykke, N., & Last, A. (2018). A Conversation Between Angela Last and Nina Lykke. In Fensham et al. (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Interdisciplinary Research Methods* (pp. 228-238). Routledge.

Marsh, J., Chinn, S., Terrace, H. S., LaFarge, S., Lee, J., Hinchliffe, D., & Hess, E. (2012). *Project Nim.* Santa Monica, CA: Lionsgate.

O'Shea, S. (2015). Filling up silences—first in family students, capital and university talk at home. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 34*(2), 139-155.

Scott, R. (Director), & Michael, D. (Producer). (1982). *Blade Runner* [Film]. Warner Brothers; The Ladd Company; Shaw Brothers; Blade Runner Partnership.

Soper, K. (1995). *What is Nature*. Blackwell.

Taylor, C. (2018). Each intra-Action matters: Towards a posthuman ethics for enlarging response-ability in Higher Education pedagogic practice-ings. In V. Bozalek, R. Braidotti, T. Shefer & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Socially Just Pedagogies: Posthumanist, Feminist and Materialist Perspectives in Higher Education* (pp. 81-96). Bloomsbury.