

# Move-ability

---

A philosophy of education study that develops an alternative understanding of inclusion through posthumanist theories using a diffractive reading

Shirit Tynell

---

Supervisor  
Bosse Bergstedt



# Abstract

Type of work: Master's thesis, 15 credits  
Number of pages: 50, excluding references and appendix  
Title: Move-ability. A philosophy of education study that develops an alternative understanding of inclusion through posthumanist theories using a diffractive reading  
Author: Shirit Tynell  
Supervisor: Bosse Bergstedt  
Date: 2016-06-01  
Summery: This is a study within the field of philosophy of education that seeks to develop an alternative understanding of inclusion within education in light of current changes in society. It discusses a shift within educational research from the field of diversity education towards the field of democratic education, and argues that an idea of separation between subjects implies a tension in the theory calling for this shift. Departing from a posthumanist theoretical framework, an interdisciplinary examination is performed, which suggests that humanist presumptions of separation of matter and meaning lie behind the idea mentioned above. It offers the concept of move-ment, which rather takes departure in the ongoing material-discursive entanglement of matter and meaning in the world's ongoing process of becoming.

The analysis method used in the study is the posthumanist methodology of diffractive reading, whose aim is reading texts through each other in order to develop alternative ideas. The analysis reads the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and the concept of move-ment, through each other.

The analysis results in the developed concept of move-ability, which understands inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon, in a way that more clearly emphasizes movability, transformation and relationality. Finally, the thesis performs a brief discussion of the concept of move-ability, in relation to educational practice. The discussion calls for further engagement within educational research, in order to develop educational approaches in which the concept can come to matter.

Key words: Democratic Education, Diffractive Reading, Inclusion, Move-ability, Posthumanism

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Already in Prologue</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>I. MOVED BEGINNINGS</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>The Notion of Inclusion within Education</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Towards a posthumanist notion of inclusion within education.....	4
Research aim.....	5
Delimitations.....	6
Previous research.....	7
Chapter overview.....	9
<b>Cutting Together-Apart the Move-able Theoretical Scene</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Re-turning humanist (social-natural) presumptions.....	11
Move-ment.....	14
Introducing agential realism and sym-poiesis.....	15
Always already entangled.....	15
Intra-actions.....	16
Agential cuts and agential separability.....	17
Sym-poiesis: becoming-together-with.....	17
Towards a move-able posthumanist concept.....	19
<b>A Move-able Reading: On Diffractive Reading as Methodology</b> .....	<b>21</b>
Towards posthumanist methodologies within educational research.....	21
A diffractive reading methodology.....	23
Move-able data selection.....	24
A move-able reading performance.....	26
Diffractive speculative fabulation as means of discussion.....	27
Urgent Matherings.....	28
<b>II. DIFFRACTIVE MOVES</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Towards Inclusion as an ongoing Sym-poietic Phenomenon</b> .....	<b>32</b>
Move-ing from Otherness towards im/possibilities.....	33
The Other that therefore I am: On human becomings.....	33
The other that (therefore) I am: On non/human co-becomings.....	37
Move-ability.....	40
<b>III. MOVE-ABLE ATT/ENDINGS</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>Towards a Move-able Educational Approach</b> .....	<b>45</b>
Wonderworlding.....	46
Educational move-able challenges.....	47
Implications for future research.....	49
<b>Not Yet Epilogue</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>a</b>
Ideas used for the diffractive speculative fabulation.....	a

## Acknowledgments

Paying gratitude with some modest words, engraved into a text, can hardly do justice to the numerous entanglements which have moved this journey, and yet. Firstly, I want to thank the many great scholars who have moved this study and me, although most of them did it unknowingly. Two of them have “followed” me during the whole process—Karen Barad, who helped me with her attentive and kind response to some of my thoughts via our email correspondence, and Donna Haraway. I am highly indebted to our seminars within Lund’s university’s department of Sociology’s research environment *Post Humanistic Education*, through which the ideas of this study further materialized. I want to give my thanks to Sara Ellis Nilsson for her helpful suggestions. I am thankful to Bo Isenberg for his valuable advices, and for sharing with us his dear friend Xavi, whose two-weeks-visit at our house touched this thesis, through vitally attentive walks, plays, noises and silences. I am extremely grateful to my supervisor Bosse Bergstedt whose careful and encouraging guidance during my year as a master’s student moved this thesis and me tremendously. I want to thank Tina Kindeberg and Barbara Schulte for their helpful recommendations at the final seminar. Dearest mom, dad, and siblings—how could I have ever believed in myself without your genuine belief in me, and your constant support? This one is definitely for you! Johan, älskling—thank you for your patience with me and with the children. And lastly, Alma and Jonathan. With your eager curiosity and enthusiastic thirst for tasting the world, your imaginative creation of pasts-presents-futures, your move-ability to and of your human and nonhuman companions, and your uncompromising desire for justice amongst them—you have been my daily reminder for the fact that *it matters what worlds world worlds*.

Lund, 2016

*Shirit Tynell*

## **Already in Prologue**

The following study is written as a master's thesis within the field of pedagogy. Pedagogy is an interdisciplinary research field, which for a long time has drawn inspiration from other disciplines. In this study I make use of ideas from scientific fields and perspectives that might seem new within a pedagogical context, but which I believe can help us look in new ways at pedagogical ideas. It is a philosophical study, which aims at further elaborating concepts in ways which can help us tell pedagogical stories about the phenomenon of inclusion in alternative ways, and as such, it doesn't aim at criticizing existing ideas, or setting ideas from different fields "against" each other, but rather trying to move ideas together, looking for patternings in this movement, which can open up for challenging ideas that we otherwise might take for granted. There are plenty of other productive studies that could have been done in order to approach the notion of inclusion within education, such as empirical studies, or genealogical investigations of the concept. I am certain that such studies could lead to further development of the concept and create new ways of thinking on the phenomenon of inclusion within education. In this study, I was inspired by posthumanist philosophical ideas and methods, which seemed to be helpful in such an attempt. Posthumanism is a rather new perspective within the field of pedagogical research, and it was a new perspective for me as well. As the study's research questions attend to theoretical as well as methodological aspects, not all questions are responded to within the forth chapter, which officially preforms the reading of this study. In order to make clear in which parts of the thesis the different questions are considered, I added this information directly after each question is presented in the introduction of this thesis. I attempt in this thesis to guide the readers through the posthumanist ideas, for example by the use of introducing passages in the beginning of each chapter, which aim to introduce the content that shall be discussed in the following chapter, as well as concluding passages in the end of each chapter, which aim at summarizing its main ideas and bridging towards the next chapter. In that, I hope the study can be more comprehensible. And now, it's time to start.

# I. MOVED BEGINNINGS

Which is not to say that emergence happens once and for all, as an event or as a process that takes place according to some external measure of space and of time, but rather that time and space, like matter and meaning, come into existence, are iteratively reconfigured through each intra-action, thereby making it impossible to differentiate in any absolute sense between creation and renewal, beginning and returning, continuity and discontinuity, here and there, past and future.

—Karen Barad

Meeting the Universe Halfway, ix

## The Notion of Inclusion within Education

A changing world, borders in movement, asylum seekers “knocking on Europe’s doors”, increasing social divergence, a “multicultural” society, a chaotic celebration of identities; these are only some of the names that could be given to what is generally being perceived and described as the rapid changes of the world as we know it, and to processes of globalisation and mobilization of the world’s inhabitants. Such developments imply seemingly new challenges for the European Union’s political debate. One such challenge is the question of *inclusion*. Educational policy does not get away with such challenges (e.g., Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2000). The concept of inclusion within education can be used with diverse meanings and within different fields, such as inclusive education, multicultural education, or education for gender equality, and the study—despite its multicultural sense—does not aim to reduce the discussion to any specific field. A *genuinely equal* education for everyone is in different ways believed to be a suitable answer for such challenges, and certainly for the question of inclusion (e.g., Tallberg Broman, Rubinstein Reich & Hägerström, 2002; Katalys, 2014; Säfström, 2010; Biesta, 2013). Timely solutions are examined hastily, not always able to keep up with the changes, prior to being exchanged with more fashionable ones. Contemporary educational policy has seriously engaged with such questions, thus bringing about the development of various educational programmes, within a field that can be named *diversity education*, aiming to set up the concept of diversity as an essential aspect of education (Prieto, 2015).

I find one central shift within contemporary educational theory, located within the field of *democratic education*, being particularly interesting and productive, and it will therefore be the focus for this study. With that shift I refer to a wave of educational theorists<sup>1</sup> who radically criticize the intentions of the diversity education programmes, arguing that such programmes are based on the idea of *integration* rather than *inclusion*. To put it simply, their main argue could be described as follows: the genuine incitement of such intentions is the *fear of otherness*, thus these are determined to fashion the *other* in the image of the *self*, and—in a very crucial sense—to create a kind of stable *homogenous subject* and *society*, by integrating the other into the existing structures and practices. Such intentions tend to entail a high level of segregation, inequality and exclusion of individuals/groups, who for different reasons either do not succeed in the process of the assimilation into the local society, or do not want to accept such demands. Such implicit exclusion should not be confused with an

---

<sup>1</sup> For some examples, see the section “Previous research” further in this chapter.

explicit exclusion, which, if we take the multicultural field as example, is commonly ascribed with extreme right-wing political ideologies, and which indeed distinguishes otherness, and is rather expressing a wish and a need for the total exclusion of such *otherness*, openly supporting the idea of a clear-cut *homogenous* society. However, even the integrative processes involve a great deal of normalization of the educational subjects<sup>2</sup>, something, from which even this thesis wishes to distance itself. These theorists assert that democratic education should rather imply *inclusion* of the Other<sup>3</sup>, focusing on the educational *relations between* the educational subjects, their *inter*-actions, based on an understanding of *differences* as something genuinely positive; in fact, as the very possibility—or talking with Hannah Arendt, the very condition—through which the Self can become, and trade into the world with his/her own *uniqueness*, a process to which Biesta (see for example 2011; 2013) refers to as *subjectification*. *Plurality*, thus, is seen as *the very condition of human action* (Biesta, 2013). The educational practices should therefore welcome the Other with its absolute “Otherness”, opening up for the possibilities of a more *heterogeneous subject and society*. In an important sense, the current efforts for re-defining the concept of *inclusion*, try to challenge norms within society. Some motivations for such attempts could be traced back to the aftermath of WW2, which brings diverse theorist and philosophers of that time, such as Emmanuel Levinas, to try to stop reducing the Other to the One/Self. A serious effort is made to try to open up for subjects’ transitive uniqueness, irreplaceability, irreducibility by/to any other being/non-being; a wish to get away from categorizing people into “boxes”, which is of course understandable at that time, and very much still in our time.

One theorist calling for the shift named above, whose theories are rather influential within the field of (democratic) education, and whose theorizing on the question of inclusion will be the point of departure for the reading in this study, is Gert Biesta. Biesta’s (2011; 2013) understanding of the question of inclusion (with departure in Jacques Rancière, and indirectly also Arendt and Levinas)—which appears intimately related to his notions of equality and plurality—appears to be interesting in many ways. Biesta’s (2011) attempt could be described as a post-colonial critique of *normalizing* (and thus exclusive) ideas of integration that are according to him circulating within educational theory and practice, in which it is the

---

<sup>2</sup> For further reading on the intimate power-relation between the concepts of educational inclusion/exclusion within practices of government, in what I in this study refer to as diversity education, I recommend the reading of Lindblad’s and Popkewitz’ (2010) discourse analysis “Educational Governance and Social Inclusion and Exclusion: some conceptual difficulties and problematics in policy and research1”.

<sup>3</sup> I make a deliberate use of Other with capital O, in order to be loyal to Biesta’s ideas’ entanglement with Emmanuel Levinas’ Other; “The Other is what I myself am not” (Levinas quoted in Todd, 2003, p. 29). *Other*, *Otherness*, *One* and *Self* are used throughout the study in the places when there is a wish to emphasize this idea.

marginalized ones who should assimilate to the norms of the centre, in order to be included, a kind of inclusion that happens *from within* the existing order. According to Biesta, that kind of idea regards inclusion as something that can become *absolute*, insofar as it is believed to have been reached once *all* others/members are included in the existing order. Biesta wishes to think inclusion as a rather relational (inter-subjective), performative, and sporadic process. The excluded individual is what Biesta calls an *incalculable* one; it doesn't exist prior to the process of inclusion, rather, it is created through it. In such way, inclusion becomes an ongoing phenomenon rather than one that can be "reached". Moreover, it is not normalizing, as it is motivated by a demand *from an unknown outside* of the order, which always means a transformation of the order, and is done—talking to Rancière—in the name of *equality*, that is, *all individuals* are as needed and as welcomed, they are political *agents* who are *acting* in the name of equality. In fact, one cannot become without the existence of the absolute Other. Now, it is precisely here, in the absolute, radical—and I will make a deliberate use in the word infinite—*separation* between individuals, that a tension is identified; a tension, which as will be argued in this study, is found productive for the developing of an alternative notion of inclusion within education, once in movement with the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study.

### ***Towards a posthumanist notion of inclusion within education***

Importantly, the theoretical shift from ideas of integration towards ideas of inclusion, seems—as described above—as an attempt to describe inclusion as an *ongoing, relational* and *performative* process without any "ends", where the ones to be included are iteratively co-created through the process, that is, flexible and heterogeneous kind of identities. Biesta (2004) himself argues for the need for a theory of educational relations to depart from the idea of the relationality of the relations rather than of its constituents; an idea, which is however challenged by its departure in ontologically separable subjects with boundaries separating between them, rather than in relationality. Whether it is *in subjects* or *in the meeting* with the Other, it is still active and separable individuals who are the point of departure. In order to do take departure in relationality, we need to radically abandon the individuals as any kind of starting point. It is therefore exactly here, in the effort to move towards a more *relational, ongoing* and *performative* understanding of inclusion, which I find the ideas of this theoretical shift productive, and from where I believe they can be developed.

In order to be able to understand inclusion as this kind of "free space" of radically queer and moveable entities, departing from relations rather than from separable subjects is crucial.

For taking such a point of departure, there is a need for new ways of thinking. The departure from separable educational subjects could be—as will be shown in this study—explained by presumptions of separation of matter and meaning, and thus also of the different individuals from each other. In order to depart from the entanglement of the subjects, rather than from their separation, this study suggests a departure in a posthumanist perspective, as this perspective offers a way of theoretically departing from the ongoing material-discursive *entanglement* of matter and meaning—and thus also of “individuals”—in the world’s iterative becoming. As will be argued in this study, such a theoretical departure helps in the development of inclusion as a “space” which is ontological, epistemological and ethical at the same time, an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon, rather than being understood as a meeting-place for ontologically separable subjects, to which ethics is later attached.

## **Research aim**

The intention of this study is to examine and further elaborate the philosophical and theoretical presumptions of separation behind the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and it is therefore situated in the field of philosophy of education. It seeks to seriously engage with the possibility of understanding inclusion as an *ongoing, relational and performative* phenomenon, thus challenging the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and developing a posthumanist alternative for the notion, which more clearly emphasizes movability, transformation and relationality. This elaboration is done by reading the contemporary notion of inclusion and ideas within posthumanist theory, namely the notion of move-ment, through each other. Accordingly, the following questions are considered:

1. What are the humanist presumptions behind the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and in what manner do such presumptions create a need for developing a posthumanist notion of inclusion? (Considered primarily in the first and second chapters)
2. Which re-configurations emerge of a diffractive reading of the contemporary notion of inclusion within education and posthumanist theory, through each other? How do these re-configurations contribute to an understanding of inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon? (Considered primarily in the forth chapter)
3. How can the developed posthumanist concept of *move-ability* be discussed, exemplified and further developed, in relation to educational practice, by means of diffractive speculative fabulation? (Considered primarily in the fifth chapter)

## ***Delimitations***

There is a rich field of research to be inspired by once engaging in developing new ways of understanding inclusion in relation to the contemporary challenges that were referred to in this introduction—research on inclusion, diversity, globalisation, and importantly—research on performativity and fluidity of identities, which does not take departure in stable nor essential categories, but rather on discursively constructed and flexible ones, such as the research done by Michel Foucault (see for example Foucault, 1989[1974]) and Judith Butler (see for example Butler, 1990). This is important and productive research, which *indirectly* affected this study, mainly through my own (Tynell, 2014) previous engagement with such theories in writing my bachelor’s thesis. Thus, the posthumanist theoretical inspiration delimitating this study, is not the only one that can help developing the notion of inclusion, most likely not either the only one that can help to more clearly emphasize movability, transformation and relationality. However, such inspiration suggests, as will be argued in this study, focusing processes of constructing identity as being material-discursive, rather than the discursive focus that is suggested by the extensive field of post-structuralist research, which is described above in this section. In that, it seems to be able to respond to the tension of separation, which challenges the relationality of the notion of inclusion. In like manner, neither inter-subjective theories and the field of democratic education, nor the specific example of Biesta’s theory, which is used in the reading of this study, are the only possibilities for re-reading the idea of inclusion within education in relation to the contemporary challenges, although they do manifest a rather central notion of inclusion within contemporary educational research. However, the movement of these theories through each other appeared to offer a productive reading, which generated creative patterns in which such an understanding is materialized. I started sensing the possibility of such a movement—which I described in this introduction as the tension of separation between the subjects, and the possibility of responding to it with the idea of entanglement of material and meaning—once being introduced to posthumanist theory during my master’s year in pedagogy, which made me start using it to think differently about the questions on inclusion which I was engaged with at that time. The delimitations made in this study were thus guided by an attempt to find a productive and practical way of—through this rather small study—developing alternative ways of thinking about inclusion, and do not claim to cover all research which might be relevant for the field. In the following section, a brief review of central previous research that is relevant for this study is performed.

## *Previous research*

This section do not aim at performing a comprehensive presentation of the previous research related to the notion of inclusion within education, as this study's intention is not to criticize existing theories, but to rather perform an alternative elaboration of the notion, by challenging a rather central understanding of it within contemporary educational research, to which the example of Biesta is used. For a more comprehensive research on inclusion within a Scandinavian context—Peder Haug, Niels Egelund and Bengt Persson's (2006) book "Inclusive pedagogy in a Scandinavian perspective" [my translation], and Claes Nilholm and Kerstin Göransson's (2013) rapport "Inclusive education: what can one learn from the research?" [my translation], issued by the National Agency for Special Needs Education and Schools (SPSM)—are recommended. Another fruitful reading is Inger Assarson's (2007) doctoral dissertation "The maxim of a school for all" [my translation], in which she studies the phenomenon of scientific discourses on inclusive education advocating "a school for all" through a post-structuralist perspective, and seeks to investigate how pedagogues construct meaning while confronting with political aims. Assarson's thesis initiates a critique, which my study continues engaging with through a posthumanist perspective. A few researches, which in different ways represent the shift from integration towards inclusion, and which will not be further discussed in the study, are briefly presented in the following paragraph.

Sharon Todd (2003) theorizes educational relations as ethical relations in which the roles of the subjects are seen as flexible. Ethics is nothing to be applied but it rather implied by such relations. It is indeed an important idea that even this study considers, through its discussion in the second chapter on the entanglement of ethics, ontology and epistemology. Miriam Prieto (2015) writes an inspiring article in which she—drawing on Biesta, Arendt, Todd and Levinas—criticizes the "diversity education" described in this introduction. She argues that we are always carrying all the others with whom we have encountered in our life's journey. The other can only be understood in terms of *alterity*, and can only be responded to with an ethical responsibility. The educational relationship is understood here as a meeting *between* individuals, a shared experience. Dependency rather than autonomy connects separated human beings in common places, through their relations. Those are important ideas that share many similarities with Biesta's theory on inclusion, which is used in the reading of this study. Reidun Carlsson and Claes Nilholm (2004) distinguish the idea of integration, in which children with special needs are integrated into already existing educational structures, from the idea of inclusion, which implies an education that *departs* from children's

differences. There are plenty of examples for the shift named above (for additional examples, see Säfström, 2011; Jonsson & Milani, 2009; Tornberg, 2004; and Krumm, 2004). In this study, it is mainly Biesta's theory, as will be motivated in the third chapter, that is chosen for the elaboration of the notion of inclusion within education.

There has been done some important posthumanist research within the fields of democratic education and of educational relations, which will be presented in the following paragraph.

Fikile Nxumalo (2012) develops a pedagogy of relational ethics instead of the existing multicultural pedagogical approach, which she argues, creates static representations of difference and diversity, produces and positions subjects, and thus reproduces inequalities. Nxumalo suggests moving towards relational attunements to relational grapplings with all kinds of materials, and to situated relational and transformative becomings. Although described as being entangled, different materials/discourses/bodies are described as *active* actors. This description seems to create separation. Instead, thinking *agency*, might be more productive for this relationalist understanding of the ongoing material-discursive-ethical<sup>4</sup> co-becoming of the world. Simon Ceder (2015) has written his doctoral thesis on the field of educational relations. Ceder develops a posthumanist alternative for the contemporary inter-subjective theories, which he calls Educational Relationality. Ceder's theory is relational and post-anthropocentric, departing in entanglements of impermanent human and nonhuman *relata*<sup>5</sup>, rather than in pre-existing human subjects who are entering relations. Ceder's work has inspired this study greatly, particularly the ethicality of concepts such as intra-relationality and proximity. Perhaps the closest work that has been done in relation to this study is Affrika Taylor and Miriam Giugni's (2012) study, in which they reconceptualise the notion of inclusion within Early Childhood Education. With their developed *Common World* concept, the authors show their commitment for a shift from social relations within exclusively human societies, towards heterogeneous relations within Common Worlds. Despite its departure in a generative relational ontology inspired by Haraway, it seems to deal with a critique against stability and normalization of subjects (the making of otherness to sameness), and an attempt to open up for flexible and heterogeneous subjects, where the meetings indeed change both parts, but they are still rather *different* parts, and thus separated. Put differently, even this study's main contribution seems to be a post-anthropocentric cross-species politically attuned reconfiguration of contemporary humanist ideas of inclusion in Early Childhood Education, its leading question being "*how might we live together in heterogeneous common worlds in a*

---

<sup>4</sup> The material-discursive-ethical is Barad's (2007) notion and is further discussed in the second chapter.

<sup>5</sup> Barad's concept *relata* is further discussed in the second chapter.

*way that allows difference to flourish?*”. In a very crucial way, the relationalist idea definitely seems to exist in their study, inclusion seen as a generative and collective act (in similarity with Biesta’s idea of inclusion of the “incalculable”). Nevertheless, it seems that their study’s departure from *radical* differences, from “*relations between ourselves [humans?] and others [more-than-humans?]*”, is challenging this shift. The ontological differences seem here to pre-exist the ethical call. In this *throwntogetherness* of this study, borrowed from Haraway, there is no consideration of the question of boundaries, no disruption of the idea of “exterior” otherness. However, as argued in this study, not only the *human*-centrism is a problem for the notion of inclusion, rather, it is the *entity*-centrism that is the problem. Crucially, ethics doesn’t come as a causal result of the move-ment—*after* the move-ment—it is rather *of* the move-ment. Signe Leth Gammelgaard (2014) reads Rancière (whom Biesta’s idea of inclusion departs from) through Barad. Gammelgaard recognizes Rancière’s departure from otherness being an exterior matter, as a challenge for the *transience* of identities, although without further challenging the separation itself and what it means for relationality.

It seems that there is more to be done when it comes to understanding the tension in the contemporary notion of inclusion within education, and to examining atomistic presumptions behind it. The preformed diffractive reading of presumptions behind the separation between subjects, and of posthumanist ideas on the entanglement of matter and meaning, through each other, contributes with a productive theoretical tool for a diffractive reading of the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, namely the concept of *move-ment*. The study takes a further step towards re-configuring otherness as existing *within* phenomena. According to this re-configuration, “entities” have no boundaries between them, but are rather always already threaded through “each other”. This re-configuration is plugged into the discussion on inclusion within education, in order to develop a posthumanist, post-atomistic, notion of inclusion within education.

Following is a brief chapter overview, after which the study will go over to setting the theoretical scene, starting with the humanist presumptions behind the contemporary notion of inclusion, followed by the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study.

## ***Chapter overview***

### **I. MOVED BEGINNINGS**

The first part of this thesis considers various “departing points” that moved the study. The first and current chapter locates a tension in the contemporary understanding of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and thus delimits the aim of the study. Further in this

chapter is a review of previous research relevant for the study. The second chapter aims at setting the theoretical scene of this study. Firstly, humanist presumptions behind the contemporary notion of inclusion are considered. It is suggested that a central problem behind the notion is its atomistic presumption. Secondly, the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study is being framed, inspired by Karen Barad's theory within quantum physics and Donna Haraway's theory within evolutionary biology, namely the concept of *move-ment*, which aims at responding to the atomistic presumption. The third chapter discusses and motivates different aspects of the diffractive reading methodology of the study, which is offered as a methodology that registers patterns of difference, which can generate a new understanding of inclusion.

## II. DIFFRACTIVE MOVES

The second part of this thesis performs the diffractive reading, which generates the posthumanist notion of inclusion within education as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon. The contemporary notion of inclusion within education, the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study, and nondualistic readings of symbolic structures in Jewish mysticism Kabbalah, are read diffractively through each other, paying careful attention to the diffractive patterns and what emerges of them. Hence, the fourth chapter deals with the (material-discursive) performativity of the concept of *move-ment*, in relation to the phenomenon of inclusion. Instead of an atomistic understanding of inclusion, as appearing between separable educational subjects, the posthumanist concept of *move-ability* is elaborated, understanding inclusion as an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon.

## III. MOVE-ABLE ATT/ENDINGS

The third and last part of this thesis serves as a brief example, discussion and further elaboration of the developed concept, in relation to educational practice and to possible pragmatic challenges. This is done by means of a diffractive speculative fabulation, inspired by Karen Barad and Donna Haraway. In the fifth and last chapter of this thesis, the stories of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass* and what Alice found there are thus re-told diffractively through the developed concept of *move-ability*, as well as through the posthumanist ideas inspiring this study. The diffractive speculative fabulation is helpful in opening up and calling for the theorizing of a *wonderworlding* educational approach, in which the concept of *move-ability* can come to matter within education. Crucially, this fabulation is a kind of attentive-ending—an att/ending, which enacts *move-able* beginnings for further engagement within educational research.

# Cutting Together-Apart the Move-able Theoretical Scene

Entanglements are not unities. They do not erase differences; on the contrary, entanglings entail differentiatings, differentiatings entail entanglings. One move – cutting together-apart.

—Barad, 2014, p. 176

The following chapter aims at setting up the theoretical scene of this study, and to respond to the first research question. In its first section, humanist (social-natural) presumptions behind the contemporary understanding of inclusion are considered. The second section establishes the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study, moved by Karen Barad’s work within quantum physics and by Donna Haraway’s work within evolutionary biology, namely the concept of *move-ment*. This posthumanist concept responds to the atomistic presumptions discussed in the first section of this chapter. Crucially, this chapter does not attempt to “represent” the theories, as if they were separable. Neither it claims to present or discuss the fields as such, or to make further conclusions within them. It rather aims at collecting inspiring posthumanist elaborations, which were made by those researchers within these fields, and which together, in their movement with the possible presumptions of separation within the humanist ideas that are inspiring this study, seems to be helpful in creating alternative theoretical ideas which can help to re-conceptualize inclusion within education. A sketching of the ideas moving this study seems therefore necessary, in order for it to become comprehensible as well as coherent. This theoretical discussion results with the elaboration of the concept of move-ment, which is offered as a productive theoretical tool for the further elaboration of the notion of inclusion, and is inspired by the ideas presented in the chapter.

## *Re-turning humanist (social-natural) presumptions*

Nothing exists except [a t o m s] and empty space.  
—Democritus

Haunting the presumption of *separation* between entities makes us re-turn<sup>6</sup> to a thicker “moment” of spacetimemattering (cf. Barad, 2014), or what I want to call a *move*<sup>7</sup>, when the idea of *atomism* is vitalized and emerges, as a kind of social-natural science phenomenon. Pre-Socratic cosmologists Leucippus and Democritus (5th cent. BCE) are regarded as the first atomists in the ancient Greek tradition (Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy, 2011; cf. Spencer, 2015). This atomistic account is based on an idea that the universe is constituted of physical “atoms”, which in Greek means “uncuttable, inseparable”, and in Latin “an

---

<sup>6</sup> Re-turning in the Baradian (2014) sense, not as going back to a specific past that was, but as “turning it over and over again” (p. 168), a kind of re-diffracting.

<sup>7</sup> *Move* is a key concept of this study and will be discussed in the second section of this chapter.

indivisible particle” (ibid.; Spencer, 2015). Similarly, the concept *individual* derives from the Latin noun *individuum*, which means “an atom, indivisible particle” (Online Etymology Dictionary, n.d.). The atomistic (social-natural) philosophy is thus based on an idea that the origins of everything are *material* inter-actions/relations of indivisible units—atoms/individuals—within an infinite void, which is nothingness, non-being (Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy, 2011). Separable atoms assemble collectives, thus producing infinite macroscopic transient bodies, in the world’s iterative process of becoming, growing, extinguishing and destructing. However, those aggregations are always divisible to their very last indivisible atoms/individuals (ibid.; cf. Leucippus, Democritus & Taylor, 1999). Although their individualistic sound, such ideas are not completely unrelated to collectivist humanist ideas, which are still circulating within contemporary educational research, as this study will argue. Barad (2003) is reminding us that according to metaphysical atomism, individual *relata*<sup>8</sup> always pre-exist any relations that may hold between them. This presumption according to her affects “[a]n entangled web of scientific, social, ethical, and political practices, and our understanding of them” (p. 813). Barad wonders why we think, “that the existence of relations requires *relata*?” and speculates a relational ontology<sup>9</sup>, which doesn’t haunt “geometries of absolute exteriority or interiority” (p. 812).

Crucially, the atomistic idea is based on atoms, aggregations, and inter-actions. As Haraway (2013) reminds us, Darwinism—with the individual as the basic unit of evolution, and even so Neo-Darwinism—with its synthetic understanding of evolutionary change on earth, having instead the population as the unit of evolution, have always worked with what she calls “a particular kind of choreography and a particular kind of ontological furniture, namely, units, collectives and relations” (35:07). It seems appropriate to briefly examine the auto-poietic ideas behind the evolutionary synthesis theories (theories that according to Haraway (2013) emerge in the 1920’s-1930’s), since such ideas not only help us to understand presumptions behind the contemporary notion of inclusion, but also can later serve as further ground for establishing this study’s sym-poietic<sup>10</sup> understanding of the phenomenon of inclusion. In the evolutionary synthesis theories, as Haraway (ibid.) tells us, anthropology, social sciences, biology, psychology and system sciences, are tied together, and lead to a radical development of Darwinist ideas. Haraway (ibid.) argues that the narratives of those

---

<sup>8</sup> *Relata*, which are “would-be antecedent components of relations” (Barad, 2003, p. 812, footnote 15), is used in this study as a placeholder for the all concepts signifying any “components” of educational relations, such as “entities”, “subjects”, “individuals”. The notion will be further discussed in the second section of this chapter.

<sup>9</sup> This relational ontology, Barad’s *agential realist* account, is discussed in the second section of this chapter.

<sup>10</sup> Sym-poiesis relates to relational and performative aspects of a becoming-together-with, and will be further discussed in the second section of this chapter.

theories—although understanding evolution synthetically, in so far as development is understood to occur through relations *between* organisms, rather than *within* organisms, which was the Darwinist understanding—are still based on an idea of species’ boundaries. Although it becomes harder to see what counts as one organism, the search after “the tiniest unit out of which worlds can be re-built” (36:58) continues. This implies according to her, that questions on development involve *auto-poietic* systems. Beth Dempster (2000), whose notion of sym-poietic systems Haraway later re-configured, describes *autopoietic* systems, that is, self-producing systems, being organizationally closed systems with self-defined boundaries, which are “homeostatic, development oriented, centrally controlled, predictable and efficient” (p. 1). That is, systems of re-production and selective competition, based on the logic of *separable* units/individuals, assembling *collectives* through *kinship*-based relations, which are not necessarily positive for the world’s becoming (Haraway, 2013).

And now back to Biesta’s account of inclusion, in which he draws on Jacques Rancière’s idea of democracy. Joseph M. Spencer (2015) argues that Rancière, in his democratic idea of community of equals, approves positively the atomistic idea of pre-cosmic continuous *parallel* “rain” of individual atoms in the infinite void, each in its separate and unique orbit of truth, before the atomic swerve. In “The Ignorant Schoolmaster”, Rancière argues, that: “One can say, if one likes, that truth brings together. But what brings *people* together, what unites them, is nonaggregation.... People are united because they are people, that is to say, *distant* beings” (quoted in Spencer, 2015, p.101, emphasis in original). Crucially, as Spencer points out, Rancière criticizes atomism for its idea which comes *after* the atomic swerve, which he calls “distraction”, since it leads to the constitution of the ordered cosmos, where the atoms aggregate to unities of sameness, and create what he calls the social order, which is according to him by definition the cancellation of the community and the situation of inequality and exclusion. Put differently, in the name of equality, and of what seems to me to be a kind of a flat-ontology, and thus a call for the ongoing disruption of normalising order, Rancière accounts for the existence of *distant* beings, and for *otherness*. Doing that, he seems to accept certain atomistic ideas, of the existence of infinite ontologically equal and *separable* subjects, who are *radically different* from each other, and who thus pre-exist their relations (cf. Spencer, 2015). Counterproductively, the idea of entirely separate subjects—in proximity though still at absolute distance from each other—challenges the sense of their interdependency, their co-construction through the ongoing and *relational* inclusive process; an interdependency that both Rancière and Biesta argue for. It is once again seen that the transiency of the incalculable subject is indeed helpful for the conceptualizing of inclusion as

an ongoing phenomenon, thus opening up for flexible and heterogeneous subjects, but that the separation, however, challenges the relationality of such a notion, and rather generates a kind of auto-poietic understanding of it.

The first research question of this study asks what the humanist presumptions behind the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education are, and how such presumptions create a need for developing a posthumanist alternative. In an important sense, this section argued for the possibility of atomistic and auto-poietic presumptions behind the notion, and showed how such ideas depart from geometry of separation, something that has been argued in this study to challenge the understanding of inclusion as a relational and co-creative phenomenon, and which therefore creates a tension in the theory. Can posthumanism help generating another answer to the urgent questions of inequality and exclusions that emerge through a normalizing colonialist regime, than the one of *absolute* Otherness, in a way that enables the understanding of inclusion as an *ongoing, relational* and *performative* phenomenon (thus opening up for queer and move-able human and nonhuman co-becomings)? This is the leading question for the next section of this chapter.

### ***Move-ment***

As introduced previously, this study aims at responding to the atomistic tension in the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education—namely, the separation between the educational subjects—as this tension generates an understanding of inclusion as an auto-poietic (atomistic and re-productive) phenomenon rather than a relational and performative one, an understanding which challenges the theory. For this matter, this study is theoretically inspired by posthumanism<sup>11</sup>, or more precisely, by the study's developed concept of *move-ment*. Considering the first research question of this study, the concept of move-ment seeks to shift away from atomistic and auto-poietic presumptions. It does so by departing from the ongoing entanglement of matter and meaning, in which no clear boundaries between *relata* can be drawn in any mattering sense, as well as from the intra-actions that emerge of such an entanglement, and of the performativity of such intra-actions. Move-ment is not an attempt to define posthumanism, but rather a concept that is found fruitful in responding to the separation of *relata*. The concept is diffractively developed<sup>12</sup> of the posthumanist ideas inspiring this study, drawing mainly on Barad's

---

<sup>11</sup> For a more comprehensive understanding of posthumanism, see for example the journal *Somplike*'s issue *Posthumanisms* (Di Leo, 2015), Ceder (2015), Snaza, et. al (2014), and Åsberg, Hultman & Lee (2012).

<sup>12</sup> The diffractive reading methodology will be presented and discussed in the third chapter of this study.

account of *agential realism*, and on Haraway's idea of *sym-poiesis*. Move-ment is thus offered as a productive concept for the developing of a posthumanist notion of inclusion, which understands inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon.

In the following subsection, the posthumanist theoretical ideas inspiring this study will be established, in order to in the next subsection introduce the developed concept of move-ment, which will serve for the reading of this study.

## **Introducing agential realism and sym-poiesis**

This subsection aims at presenting the posthumanist ideas that inspire the study's developed theoretical concept of move-ment, departing from Barad's *agential realist* account and Haraway's notion of *sym-poiesis*. Those are ideas whose fabric is about "calling into question the very nature of twoness, and ultimately of one-ness as well" (Barad, 2010, p. 251), that is, to challenge the nature of duality, unity and multiplicity (ibid.), in a way that "[b]etween' will never be the same" (ibid.), since "[o]ne is too few, two is too many" (ibid.).

### ***Always already entangled***

Posthumanism doesn't presume the separateness of any-"thing," let alone the alleged spatial, ontological, and epistemological distinction that sets humans apart (Barad, 2007, p. 136).

In her account of *agential realism*, Barad (2003; 2007) challenges what she calls the attitude of "thingification", that is, "the turning of relations into 'things,' 'entities,' 'relata'" (Barad, 2003, p. 812), which is according to her yet affecting our understanding of our relationship to the world. As Barad (2003; 2007) tells us, Niels Bohr's experiments within quantum physics<sup>13</sup> manifest how the properties of an electron, that is, its "meaning", are enacted through the experiment, and how they depend on which apparatus the experiment performs, and thus do not ontologically preexist the experiment. This, according to Barad (2003; 2007), illuminates the crucial entanglement of ontology and epistemology. Matter is not an ontologically given "thing", but rather "a doing, a congealing of agency" (Kleinman, 2012, p. 80). Departing from Bohr's experiments, Barad (2003; 2007; 2010; 2012b; 2014) elaborates a kind of relational ontology, an *agential realist ontology* (2003), which does not disentangle ontology, epistemology and ethics from "one another", but rather performs an ethico-onto-epistemology<sup>14</sup> (Barad, 2007). In Barad's agential realist account, "phenomena do not merely mark the epistemological inseparability of 'observer' and 'observed'; rather, *phenomena are the ontological inseparability of agentially intra-acting 'components'*" (Barad, 2003, p. 815).

---

<sup>13</sup> For more on Bohr's experiments, see for example, Barad (2003; 2007).

<sup>14</sup> The ethical aspects of this account are discussed mainly in the forth and fifth chapters of this study.

Phenomena/relations, not ontologically separable “relata”, are the primary ontological “unit” of such an account (Barad, 2003). Relationality, rather than relations, is the name of the game.

According to such an account, it is not discourses that create exclusions through words/meanings, thus making boundaries between ontologically natural “things”. Matter and meaning—material phenomena and discursive practices—are not separated but rather threaded through each other; they are co-created/creative, none being “ontologically or epistemologically prior” (Barad, 2003, p. 822). Matter is iteratively materialized, so that *boundaries and meanings* are iteratively enacted, through vital *material-discursive* practices. “[T]he material-discursive field of possibilities” (p. 823) is constantly re-configured. As Barad reminds us, “[m]aterial conditions matter, not because they ‘support’ particular discourses /.../ but rather because matter comes to matter through the iterative intra-activity of the world in its becoming” (p. 823). This understanding is generating a new posthumanist account of *performativity*<sup>15</sup>. Whereas traditional accounts of performativity<sup>16</sup> solely take into consideration the productive nature of *social* practices and *human* actors, that is, discursive—boundary-making—practices, agential realism is acknowledging that the productive forces involved in the materialization of phenomena and of the world are not only human (Barad, 2007). Crucially, it is the entanglement of matter and meaning, matter and discourse, which is the matter of matter. That is, “we know because ‘we’ are of the world” (Barad, 2003, p. 829). This material-discursive doing-knowing involves—as will be shown later in this study—serious ethicality, or maybe it should rather be called *ethic-ology*; we move and are being moved because ‘we’ are *of* the move-ment. It is herein, in the ongoing *entanglement* of matter and meaning, that Barad’s agential realist account seems helpful for attending to the tension of separation between the educational subjects, which was illuminated in the contemporary notion of inclusion within education. The entanglement of matter and meaning is however not the only notion which inspires the theoretical concept of *move-ment*, which is developed in this section for the diffractive reading of the notion of inclusion. An additional agential realist concept, *intra-action* (Barad, 2003; 2007), as well as Haraway’s (2013; 2015a; 2015b) notion of *sym-poiesis*, further helps in the elaboration of the concept of move-ment. In the following subsection, we continue talking to Barad in order to touch the concept of intra-action.

### ***Intra-actions***

An *intra-action*, rather than an *inter-action* between preexisting separable relata, is Barad’s performance of such ideas of inseparability, relationality, entanglement; an understanding

---

<sup>15</sup> For more on Barad’s posthuman performativity see for example, Barad, 2003.

<sup>16</sup> See for example, Judith Butler, 1990.

according to which transient boundaries of “relata” materializes and come to matter, that is, become meaningful, *of* and solely *within* intra-actions (2003, p. 815; 2007, p. 139). Phenomena, rather than relata, are iteratively co-produced and re-configured *of* agential intra-actions<sup>17</sup>, “that may or may not involve ‘humans’” (2003, p. 817). As Barad (2003) reminds us, “[r]eality is not composed of things-in-themselves or things-behind-phenomena but ‘things’-in-phenomena” (p. 817).

### ***Agential cuts and agential separability***

The separation between relata, that is, the derivation of relata from the ongoing entanglement/relationality—which also means their emergence—is what Barad calls an *agential cut*. An agential cut is enacted within a specific intra-action, which involves specific apparatuses. Those are not causal *Cartesian cuts* between ontologically separable relata (Barad, 2003; 2007), but rather a transient “cutting together-apart” (that is entangling-differentiating), as one move (not sequential acts)” (Kleinman, 2012, p. 80). With that said, intra-actions with their agential cuts enact what Barad (2003; 2007) calls *agential separability*, that is, a transient and relational kind of separation (and crucially also of otherness, as will be diffracted in the reading of this study), an exteriority-within-phenomena (Barad, 2003; 2007). Accordingly, relata do not preexist relations, rather, relata-within-phenomena, or what I will in this study call *move-able relata*, emerge of intra-actions, “their” separability being merely agential, relational, appearing solely within and of intra-actions (Barad, 2007). This is certainly a shift away from an atomistic understanding according to which relata—having clear-cut boundaries separating between them, and which are pre-existing their inter-actions—are the basic ontological units. Crucially, the *attending to* a relation, that is, *the specific apparatus* that makes the agential cut, literally *matters*; it materializes certain worlds and co-becomings, at the same time as making other ones impossible (cf. Barad, 2003).

### ***Sym-poiesis: becoming-together-with***

As relata do not *act* separately, and in fact do not *exist* separately, the idea of ascribing them characters of agency as *separable agents* (even if such agency is seen as a relational act, that is, one which is happening inter-actively), is challenged. Barad (2003; 2007) rather talks on agency as an intra-relational doing. Now, this idea fits nicely with Haraway’s (2013; 2015a; 2015b) re-configuration of the notion of *sym-poiesis*, a notion that seems helpful in further developing the conceptual inspiration for the reading of the notion of inclusion as an ongoing,

---

<sup>17</sup> Or as what can be described as *sym-poietic* intra-actions, that is, performative and relational, co-creative, intra-actions, as will be shown later on in this section.

relational and performative phenomenon. Rather than the Darwinist and Neo-Darwinist narratives of auto-poietic evolutionary systems of re-production and natural selective competition, which are emerging from the logic of collectives that are established by kinship-based relations between ontologically separable units, Haraway (2013; 2015a; 2015b) purposes the idea of sym-poietic becoming, a becoming-together-with. Dempster (2000) argues that sym-poietic systems are evolutionary systems that do not have clearly defined boundaries, and which “have the potential for making dramatic and surprising changes” (p. 11). Haraway further elaborated the notion of sym-poiesis departing from diverse theories within the field of “ecological-evolutionary-developmental biology” (Haraway, 2015a, p. 261), such as Lynn Margulis’ theory of *Sym-bio-genesis* (Guerrero, Margulis & Berlanga, 2013), and Hustak and Myers’ (2012) theory of *Involuntary Momentum*, which are questioning species’ boundaries, and which no longer use “the apparatuses of units, collectives and relations, that works through re-production and descent” (Haraway, 2013, 38:38). In-volution, intra-relations, intra-actions, crucially involve critters’ *mutual* indigestions and infection (rather than re-production) (ibid.), a multi-species co-making, a sym-poietic becoming, “that kind of coming together but not fully assimilating, whereby two become less than two but more than one” (Haraway, 2015a, p. 262). It is a becoming which is ongoing, relational and performative, and which is based on what Haraway (2013; 2015a) calls for *kind*-ships, which are affinities that are positive for the world’s becoming. Haraway (ibid.) tells us about the biologist Scott Gilbert and his colleagues (Gilbert, Sapp & Tauber, 2012), who rather than the term “organism”, which according to Haraway (2015a) “has the appearance of being closed off at the boundaries” (p. 261) and the term “environment”, started using the terms “holobiont” and “holobiome”, in order “to single the webbed multiplicities that make up any ‘one’ in time and space” (p. 262). Haraway (2008) suggests talking about *companion species*, “a permanently undecidable category, a category-in-question that insists on the relation as the smallest unit of being and of analysis ” (p. 165), as “[s]pecies, like the body, are internally oxymoronic, full of their own others, full of messmates, of companions” (ibid.). Pressingly, boundaries between *relata* do not preexist their relations; they are iteratively co-created through material-semiotic interactions<sup>18</sup> (Haraway, 1988). Barad’s *relata* are thus what Haraway (1988) calls “boundary projects” (p. 595).

Although in intimate proximity with Barad’s notions, sym-poiesis is found productive in so

---

<sup>18</sup> Haraway (2015b) mentions that she uses *inter-action* too “in order to remain legible to audiences who do not yet understand the radical change Barad’s analysis demands” (p. 162, footnote 1).

far as it stresses the *co-performative* character of the intra-actions, the collective doing of identity, something that appears to be important for the developing of inclusion as not only relational and ongoing but also a (co-)performative phenomenon. It seems that when Barad's and Haraway's notions are moved together, a productive pattern is co-created, from which the concept of move-ment can emerge, a concept which can help in the diffractive reading of inclusion. Crucially, Barad's (2003; 2007) account of agential realism and Haraway's (2013; 2015a; 2015b) notion of sym-poiesis, once moved through each other, queers any atomistic relations/inter-actions between seemingly "separable" relata, in ways, which indeed matter. It is a shift from humanist boundary-making accounts "by which the 'human' and its others are differentially delineated and defined," (Barad, 2007, p. 136) and by which body is seen as the natural boundary between interiority and exteriority. "Relata" are sym-poietically re-configured within material-discursive performative entanglements, thus not existing as individual elements or as "things", but rather as dynamic and sym-poietic phenomena.

In the following subsection, the elaboration of the concept of move-ment, which emerges of a diffraction of Barad's and Haraway's notions, will be presented and motivated, in relation to the aim of the study, which is to read the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon.

### **Towards a move-able posthumanist concept**

Ceder (2015) is developing the concept of *intra-relationality*, with which he aims to emphasize the movement rather than the transient relata, which are co-produced within intra-actions. This study was moved by a similar attempt to shift away the focus from the specific intra-actions themselves, as such focus seemed insufficient for the aim of this study, which is the elaboration of the notion of inclusion as an *ongoing*, relational and sym-poietic phenomenon. However, the emphasize on the relationality per se still seemed insufficient for this study's development of inclusion as a sym-poietic phenomenon, inasmuch as specific intra-actions, and cuts which are enacted of them, are as well of importance, in relation to transient educational "identities" which are iteratively co-created of the ongoing material-discursive entanglement.

I want to therefore further elaborate these ideas and suggest the concept of *move-ment*, which is found helpful for the aim of this study. Move-ment is a concept, which offers a way of simultaneously thinking *ongoing* entanglements—*movement*, *relational* intra-actions—*moves*, and (co-)performative sym-poiesis—the iterative re-configuration, becoming-together-with, of transient human and nonhuman "relata", who are both *moving* and *being moved by*

each “other”, *of* the moves; touching and being touched. The idea of *move* primarily emerged of the overall understanding of the concept of move-ment. It seems to however manifest the entanglement with Barad’s (2014) understanding of intra-action as being “[o]ne move – cutting together-apart” (p. 176), which further motivates the developed concept, in relation to the study’s theoretical inspiration. Barad’s (2012a) idea of *touch* further helped in coming to think of the term *move*, which similarly to touch, is moving, touching, re-configuring; an idea which will be prominent in the reading of this study. Crucially, the concept’s performativity is threefold, as it diffracts the ideas of entanglements, intra-actions and sym-poiesis, which in their diffractive move-ment attend to the tension of separation within the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and to the auto-poiesis implied by such separation. Put differently, it is a concept that is productive for shifting the focus from separable *relata* as constituters of entanglements in favour of *move-able* phenomena—moveable as in transient, but crucially also attentive and response-able—moving and being moved—to/of im/possibilities which dis/appear of the moves<sup>19</sup>. Separability between phenomena is merely agential, and here I believe *move-ability* can serve as a productive alternative in understanding inclusion, as will be argued in the reading of this study.

This chapter aimed at responding to the first research question of this study. The question sought to examine possible presumptions behind the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, and to investigate in what manner do such presumptions create a need for developing a posthumanist alternative. As showed in the first section of this chapter, atomistic and auto-poietic ideas seem to circulate in the contemporary notion of inclusion. As such ideas depart from separation, it is argued that they need to be re-thought, as they challenge the understanding of inclusion as a sym-poietic phenomenon, which creates a tension in a theory that argues for inclusion being a sporadic, relational and performative process. As argued in the second section of this chapter, posthumanist ideas—in their departure from the entanglement of matter and meaning, and from sym-poietic intra-actions, *of* which move-able “*relata*” iteratively are co-created—help solving this tension, and move from the idea of separation towards the idea of move-ment. This move is argued to be productive in the further elaboration of the contemporary notion of inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon, which will be performed in the forth chapter of this study. But first, next chapter will discuss the diffractive reading methodology of this study; a methodology which is inspired by the theoretical ideas that were presented in this chapter.

---

<sup>19</sup> This idea is the logic of *move-ability*, and will be further developed and discussed in the forth chapter of this study, the diffractive reading of the notion of inclusion.

## **A Move-able Reading: On Diffractive Reading as Methodology**

The following chapter aims at discussing different methodological aspects of this study. In the first section, the methodology of *diffractive reading* is presented and motivated in relation to contemporary methodologies within educational research, and to the study's aim and its research questions. The second section motivates the selection of texts, which are used for the reading. The intention of the third section is to describe the performance of the reading. The fourth section seeks to discuss the contribution of the diffractive speculative fabulation used in the discussion of this study, in relation to the study's third research question. The fifth and last section touches on some critical considerations concerning the methodology.

### ***Towards posthumanist methodologies within educational research***

There is always something ghostly about living constantly in a well-ordered state. You cannot step into the street or drink a glass of water or get on a streetcar without touching the balanced lever of gigantic apparatus of laws and interrelations, setting them in motion or letting them maintain you in your peaceful existence; one knows hardly any of these levers, which reach deep into the inner workings and, coming out of the other side, lose themselves in a network whose structure has never yet been unravelled by anyone. So one denies their existence /.../ all these things that one denied /.../ turn out in truth to be the most important things of all, and this gives life a certain spooky quality /.../ For him morality was neither conformism nor philosophic wisdom, but living the infinite fullness of possibilities /.../ He believed in morality without believing in any specific moral system /.../ Morality is imagination /.../ Imagination is not arbitrary /.../ It is reality that awakens possibilities, and nothing would be more perverse than to deny it. Even so, it will always be the same possibilities, in sum or on the average, that go on repeating themselves until a man comes along who does not value the actuality above the idea. It is he who first gives the new possibilities their meaning, their direction, and he awakens them.

—Robert Musil, *The Man Without Qualities*, p. 12

Bo Isenberg (2011) tells us, while talking to Robert Musil and his *Man without qualities*, that what matters when it comes to critique is to let the realizing of “possible realities”, rather than the revealing of “real possibilities”. However “possibilist” Musil’s *man* is, the “risk”, according to the posthumanist inspiration of this study, is if he shall be understood as an agent who *actively* creates realities, which are thus seen as objects, albeit those are created with the discursive power of his imagination. On an ontological level, the possibilities could be in that sense understood to exist *before* their creation, before they are revealed and thus realized epistemologically *by* the man. If we think ongoing intra-actions, as risky and playful material-discursive co-creations of im/possibilities and in/determinacies, then we can understand the diffractive reading methodology as the scholarly engagement with readings which are attentive, response-able, *move-able* to/of im/possible co-creations of ideas/concepts/theories, rather than other kinds of engagements, such as with *reflective* readings, which could under certain circumstances aim at *identifying* “real” possibilities, or with critical readings, which

*might* aim at *actively*, epistemologically, realizing alternative possible ontological realities (cf. Barad, 2010). Clearly, there are many kinds of methodological engagements and ways of understanding them, and this description does no justice with any of them. It doesn't aim at "defining" any methodology, what they do/not do, but is rather seeking to identify what it is that the diffractive reading methodology aims at doing. As Hillevi Lenz Taguchi (2012) reminds us, a diffractive reading is about "an uncovering of *a* reality that already exists among the multiple realities being enacted in an event, but which has not been previously 'disclosed'" (pp. 274-275), it is material-discursive entanglement of texts/theories, of which ideas co-become im/possible. In such an understanding, contemporary critical analysis methodologies—here described through a possible understanding of Musil's longing for life's *spooky quality*, his call for *attentive creativity*, and his understanding of the *proximity of responsible moral and creation*—are moved, in ways that really matter. This is the logic of the diffractive reading methodology of this study.

The posthumanist theories inspiring this study involve new challenges when it comes to doing educational research. What is it that we actually are doing when we do research? What are our aims with the research and its analysis? These kinds of questions are intimately intra-related with this study's consideration of the traditional ontology-epistemology divide (as discussed in the second chapter). The notion of move-ment creates a need for alternative educational methodologies, which seriously engage with such challenges; it calls for a methodology that understands the researcher and the data, and also the "different" theories/ideas, as onto-epistemologically intra-related, and thus is move-able to/of the patterns of their move-ment (cf. Ceder, 2015). Informed by the aim of this study, its methodology is committed to developing a posthumanist notion of inclusion within education. Where can inspiration for a reading, which can respond to this aim, be found?

Within educational research, posthumanist methodologies that depart from onto-epistemological entanglements have been mainly used in analysis of *empirical* data<sup>20</sup>, as argued by Ceder (2015). However, such methodologies have been recently established in readings of philosophical texts within educational research<sup>21</sup>. Ceder's (2015) development of

---

<sup>20</sup> Some examples: Palmer (2011) performs a diffractive analysis of teacher students' narrative stories; Lenz Taguchi (2012) performs a diffractive analysis of an interview with a nursery-class student; Lenz Taguchi & Palmer (2013) read diffractively stories produced by school students, reports, articles, media clips, and memories which emerged through the readings; Juelskjær (2013) reads students' interviews and agential realism diffractively; Davies (2014) performs a diffractive analysis of observations made in a Reggio Emilia preschool.

<sup>21</sup> Inspiring examples for diffractive readings of philosophical texts within *other* research fields are Barad's (2014) diffractive reading of diffraction, and Iris van der Tuin's (2011) reading of the philosophy of Henri Bergson through the work of Barad.

diffraction as educational methodology has inspired this study remarkably. In similar ways, the following study performs a diffractive reading of educational philosophical texts and posthumanist ideas, through each other. Although not being the only posthumanist methodology that responds to the theoretical call of this study<sup>22</sup>, the methodology of diffractive reading was found helpful, as it theoretically departs from the two scholars who developed it, Barad and Haraway. In that sense, the methodology and theory of this study use the same terminology and ideas, which hopefully helps the reading of this study (cf. Ceder, 2015). Additionally, this methodology has already been established within educational research in readings of philosophical texts (see Ceder, 2015), which facilitates its use in this study. In the following subsection the diffractive reading methodology is introduced.

### **A diffractive reading methodology**

Haraway (1992) distinguishes diffraction from reflection, which according to her only reproduces the same. Diffraction is rather “a mapping of interference” (p.300), of where “the effects of difference appear” (ibid.). Barad (2007) develops Haraway’s idea to a methodology of diffractive reading. Unlike representationalism of linear causality, in which a theory provides a stable “frame” against which other texts/ideas are studied as “objects”, “diffraction involves reading insights through one another in ways that help illuminate differences as they emerge: how different differences get made, what gets excluded, and how these exclusions matter” (p. 30). It is not about a critic of *separated* texts/ideas/fields, or their geometrical unification to one holistic piece, but rather about “making connections and commitments” (Barad, 2010, p. 266) between *seemingly* different ideas, being move-able to ideas that always already are (re)threaded through the texts (cf. Barad, 2014); it is a cutting-together-apart in which “one is too few, two is too many” (Barad, 2010, p.251; cf. Haraway Cyborg, 313). Such reading is “a ghostly causality, of a very different order” (Barad, 2010, note 10, p.268). Musil’s ghosts are yet-already in move-ment with Barad’s ghostly spacetimematterings.

The diffractive reading methodology responds to this study’s theoretical inspiration, as no meanings are argued to exist separately or outside moves; the posthumanist theory is not understood as more genuine than the ideas, which are being read; it is rather *of* the diffractive reading that new concepts are onto-epistemologically materialized, thus “effecting” all the involved theories. The diffractive reading methodology is committed to paying close

---

<sup>22</sup> To name a few others, as specified in Ceder (2015): *transposition* (Braidotti, 2006), *transversality* (Yuval-Davis, 1997, 2012; Dolphijn & van der Tuin, 2012; Guattari, 2984), and numerous methodologies inspired by Deleuze and Guattari, such as *line of flight*, *cartography* and *plugging in* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997; 2004).

attention—a kind of move-ability—to/of possible creative openings, which can help in generating new concepts, and in that, it responds to the aim of this study. The reading of this study seeks to be move-able to ideas, which can help developing the posthumanist perspective *and* the field of democratic education, in relation to the notion of inclusion.

In the following section, a motivation for the selection of texts, which are used for the reading, is offered.

### ***Move-able data selection***

One of the ideas that informed the reading of this study, is that reading texts from *seemingly* separate disciplines can open up for the appearance of new concepts (Barad, 2007; Ceder, 2015). The reading is thus moved by philosophical-theoretical texts from the scientific disciplines of (democratic) education, biology, quantum physics, theology/theosophy, but also of non-scientific texts within Jewish mysticism, as well as blog posts. At times the selection was as a result of seemingly conscious decisions. However, the texts were not selected at a specific point of time *before* the reading, the selection was rather continuously enacted *of* the reading, in response to ideas that emerged through it, of moves with different texts/ideas.

Within the field of educational research, primarily Biesta's theorizing on inclusion is used in the reading. To a certain extent, the choice is based on Biesta's great influence in the field of (democratic) education, and on his careful work on the shift from integration towards inclusion. The choice is however mainly a response to the possibility of creativeness that appeared in the move-ment of his theorizing on inclusion with the posthumanist ideas inspiring this study—a fascinating creativity that seemed to generate an alternative way for understanding the phenomenon of inclusion within education<sup>23</sup>. Two of Biesta's texts were chosen for the reading. The first text is a chapter named "Education, democracy and the question of inclusion" [my translation], in Biesta's book "Good education in an age of measurement. Ethics, politics, democracy" [my translation] (2011, pp. 112-128), in which Biesta performs his reading of inclusion within education. This text serves for the second part of the diffractive reading, where the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education (here as appears in Biesta's theory) is further elaborated to the posthumanist notion of move-ability. The second text is a chapter named "Democracy", from another book of Biesta, called "The Beautiful Risk of Education" (2013, pp. 101-118), in which he writes about the idea of plurality, and which has appeared to be constructive for the

---

<sup>23</sup> This refers to the productivity of Biesta's attempt to move towards a sporadic, relational and performative understanding of inclusion. For a further discussion, see the first and the forth chapters of this study.

reading. It is Biesta's idea of plurality of separable subjects, which motivates his idea of the inter-active transient human becomings, and which lays the ground for his understanding of inclusion of equal but absolute different subjects, as will be shown in the reading. It is this text, which is productive for an elaboration of otherness, as infinite im/possibilities for move-able non/human co-becoming, rather than absolute exterior differences being the condition for transient human becomings. In relation to the idea of otherness being exterior and the educational subjects being absolute separable, and thus their "becoming" being an inter-active act, Carl Anders Säfström's (2011) text "What I Talk About When I Talk About Teaching and Learning" was as well used in the first part of the diffraction, as it seemed to help manifesting the idea even clearer, and thus made the argument in the reading more thorough.

The fact that Barad and Haraway are the other main scholars who moved the reading (and the study) can be traced to their contribution for understanding inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon, rather than one that is based on absolute differences<sup>24</sup>. Barad's (2003; 2007) *agential realist* account and Haraway's (2013; 2015a; 2015b) notion of *sym-poiesis* are both threaded through the concept of move-ment, and move the first part of the diffractive reading, which performs the elaboration of the idea of otherness being a move-able and agential rather than exterior matter. Additionally, their theories appeared fruitful for the second part of the diffractive reading, in which the notion of inclusion within education is further elaborated as *move-ability*—an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon. Importantly, their theories were found valuable when it comes to understanding ethicality as an intra-active "part" of the phenomenon of inclusion rather than its causal effect (more specifically, the idea of *response-ability*—in Barad, 2012a, 2014, and in Haraway, 2011, 2015a, and Barad's idea of *touch*, 2012a)—an understanding that seems urgent once developing a field that is intimately touched by questions of ethics. Thus, Barad's (2007) ethico-onto-epistemology became a vital part of the fabric that materialized the posthumanist concept of *move-ability*, which was elaborated of the reading.

Informed by the tension within the contemporary theorizing of inclusion, a need for re-configuring the idea of absolute otherness of the radical Other, that is, of otherness being an exterior matter, appeared necessary for the elaboration of a posthumanist notion which is ongoing, relational and performative. The reading was thus further moved of three theological/theosophical texts, which perform nondualistic readings of symbolic structures in Jewish mysticism Kabbalah—two texts of Rabbi Rami Shapiro (2003; 2014) and one text of

---

<sup>24</sup> Since this understanding created a tension in the theory, as discussed in the first two chapters of this study.

Sandra Valabregue-Perry (2012). A particular word-play, which is discussed in those texts, is diffracted in the reading. The idea of involving this nondualistic Kabbalistic word-play in the diffractive reading was inspired by Barad and her partner Rabbi Fern Feldman’s joint course taught at *Kallah* (a program within *Aleph*—The Alliance for Jewish Renewal), in which they together performed a “queer” reading of the Kabbalah, by a diffraction of nondualistic readings of Kabbalah, and of posthumanist ideas from the field of quantum physics, through each other. A word-play from their diffraction—which I read about in Rabbi Rachel Barenblat’s (2013) blog post, in which she tells about her attending to their course “Infinity, nothingness, and being: Running and Returning, An exploration in Quantum Physics and Kabbalah”—is used in my development of the understanding of otherness as existing solely within intra-actions, of the world’s iterative move-ment, rather than as an exterior matter. The word-play is further diffracted through Barad’s (2012b) article “What is the measure of nothingness? Infinity, virtuality, justice”, in which she writes on vacuum fluctuations and discusses the constant flickering of self and nothingness, and in that also the notion of *im/possibilities*, which serves as the main idea for the diffraction of *otherness*. The movement of those texts was found creative and enlivening, strengthened the ethical aspects of the reading, and intra-acted with me as the “writer” of this thesis.

The following section describes the performance of the diffractive reading.

### ***A move-able reading performance***

Informed by the aim of the study, and by the diffractive reading methodology, the reading of texts is committed to mapping effects of difference in the move-ment of the texts. The reading doesn’t focus on the differences themselves, thus separating the texts and presenting lifeless remainders, but rather on the effectuality-materiality of their dynamic entanglement. Put differently, ideas from the different texts are read through each other, and in this movement, while I am attempting to be attentive to its patternings, some connections are enacted, connections which are found productive for the development of other ideas. Not just any effectuality is registered. The mapping is engaged with being attentive to such effects that can respond to the atomistic tension in the contemporary notion of inclusion within education, and which thus can help in the elaboration of a posthumanist notion of inclusion within education, in ways which clearly emphasize movability, transformation and relationality. In that, the reading implies the development of the posthumanist perspective as well as of the field of democratic education. Crucially, a good-quality diffractive reading moves and is moved by all the perspectives/fields that are read of it.

The tension in Biesta's theory is not the focus for a critical investigation in its traditional way. Possible atomistic presumptions of the contemporary notion are discussed (in the first section of the second chapter), in order for the study to be carefully conducted. However, what's of interest for the reading is where this notion and posthumanism can in their dynamic move-ment, mutually develop an alternative understanding of inclusion as an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon, thus responding to the separation of the educational subjects, which is materialized of the notion. Accordingly, as well differences as similarities are attended to.

The next section considers the use of diffractive speculative fabulation in the discussion.

### ***Diffractive speculative fabulation as means of discussion***

The third research question of this study aims at briefly exemplifying, discussing and further elaborating the developed posthumanist concept of *move-ability*, in relation to educational practice. Clearly, a further development of the concept through its discussion is understood as inevitable considering the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this thesis. Thinking otherwise would mean that the concept is considered being a objective matter for a reflective discussion. How can this question be engaged with, considering the methodological approach of this study? Inspired by Haraway's idea of *speculative fabulation*, further touched by Haraway's and Barad's idea of diffractive reading, the last chapter of this thesis is experimenting the discussion of move-ability by means of *diffractive speculative fabulation*.

In Charles Lutwidge Dodgson's (Book chapters and script., n.d.) novels *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass and what Alice found there* (which are written under the pen name "Lewis Carroll"), Alice's meeting with wonderland's risky knots, in which she meets many queer and move-bale "identities", happened solely within the "dream world", and she wakes up in relief to the "real world", in which more clear-cut boundaries exist between seemingly different, even if seen as fluid, positions. As the question that informs the discussion is how it is possible to deal with the notion of move-ability within educational practice, finding suitable approaches and responding to possible pragmatic challenges of falling back to separable positions is crucial. Re-telling those stories from a *wonderworlding* approach—diffracted through posthumanist ideas inspiring this study<sup>25</sup>, through Biesta's (2011) idea of "doing" democracy instead of teaching it, and through the developed concept of *move-ability*—was found helpful for the consideration of possible challenges of engaging with the notion of move-ability within educational practice, and thus

---

<sup>25</sup> Barad's notions of *touch*, *response-ability* (2012a) and *im/possibilities* (2010), Haraway's notion of *worlding* (2008; 2011; 2015a; 2015b) and *sym-poietic storytelling* (2010).

responding to Haraway's (2013) call for "staying with the trouble", going on adventures with ideas, and doing "worlding" (cf. Haraway, 2011, 4). A *wonderworlding* educational approach towards inclusion, in which the developed concept can come to matter, is thus being offered. Further, the possibility of pragmatic challenges implied by such an approach is specified. Such a discussion can be understood as an attentive-ending, an att/ending, which doesn't aim at performing a comprehensive discussion of the notion of move-ability and its educational challenges, but rather opens up and calls for further engagement within educational research; the discussion itself is a move, which co-generates new creations and move-ment.

I offer the methodology of speculative fabulation as a "scholarly multispecies story telling" (Haraway, 2011, p. 8) for "passing patterns back and forth, giving and receiving, patterning, holding the unasked-for pattern in one's hands," (ibid., p. 5) being move-able, and thus creating new ideas, new stories, which disrupt the narratives that are circulating in society, in the case of this study—the narrative of absolute separation between the educational subjects; ideas with which educational theory can think new ideas and new stories, that can make a positive change for educational research and practice (ibid; Haraway, 2000). Since as Haraway (2011) reminds us, "[i]t matters what stories make worlds, what worlds make stories" (p. 4). Those move-able fabulations are at the same time the makings of knowledge; they *are* pedagogical practices *of* the world (cf. Haraway, 2011, p. 14-15; cf. Edwards, 2012), pedagogical practices of wonderworlding. Crucially, the discussion doesn't aim at "representing" an educational practice and its "existing" challenges for the developed concept, but rather to speculate and suggest an approach responding to the concept's call, by re-telling the exhausted narratives, which are told in Alice's story, in which educators can always fall back to the old comfort-zone, not needing to ever deal with how wonderworlding matters. The result of this experimentation is twofold—briefly exemplifying, discussing and developing the concept of move-ability, and it is also suggested for the use within educational practices as means of adapting the notion of move-ability, and the approach of wonderworlding. It is herein that the discussion serves as what I call, an att/ending, a move-able attentive ending, which calls for further engagement within educational practice as well as research. Finally, the argument of this study is discussed in relation to the previous posthuman educational research, which is mentioned in the introduction of this study

In the next section, critical considerations concerning the methodology are discussed.

### ***Urgent Matterings***

Urgency is energizing, but it's not about apocalypse or crisis. It's about inhabiting; it's about cultivating response-ability (Haraway, 2015a, p. 260).

In the following section I seek to touch what is usually within research called critical reflections, and thus discuss the methodology of this study. Probably the most urgent matter to consider with this thesis is its ethicality. If to talk to Barad (2007), knowledge production always means, “making worlds” (p.91). The agential cuts moved by the study matter. My response-ability as a researcher is to be attentive to those materialisations and their ethicality. As Haraway (2011) reminds us, our stories “are not containers; they are patterings, risky co-makings, speculative fabulations” (s.15). We *are* our stories with all its liveliness. I am informed by this call, and do the greatest attempt to consider throughout the study, how the different patterns that are registered in the readings of this study move the study, but also how they can come to matter within educational practice.

When it comes to the re-telling of Lutwidge Dodgson’s novels, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass and what Alice found there*, the novels’ copyright ceased 1907 and 1948 respectively (see, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ), n.d.).

As the use of posthumanist methodologies within qualitative social science research is rather new, once considering the methodology of this study, I turned to chapters in central method books within social science research, which deal with the use of qualitative methods that focus different ways to analyse texts (Bergström & Boréus, 2012a, 2012b; Alvehus, 2013). Since the focus of those chapters is on the power of language—a discursive rather than material-discursive focus, it seems hard to relate to its guidelines. However. I find that the consideration of such guidelines offers a fruitful methodological discussion, wherefore the following discussion departs from central aspects that are dealt with within those chapters.

It seems hard to show where the differences between texts appear, so to say, find the place where they differ and where the concept that is developed in the reading is thus “originated”. Such an attempt challenges the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study. Rather, the places where the *effects* of differences appear are being registered, which makes “transparency”, “validity”, and “authenticity” hard measures to follow. As Stefan Heidenreich (2016) reminds us, the lack of transparency is a crucial feature of the process of meaning-making-together. I attempted to enclose original text-parts that are used in the reading, before their “diffraction” is done, or in the appendix of this study. Additionally, all the texts used throughout the thesis, are carefully referred to within the study, and in the list of references, so that if needed could be returned to. I believe that this attempt, together with a comprehensive use of quotes from the texts and theories used in this study, is helpful for making the study “transparent”, or rather “accessible”.

As explained previously in this chapter, the aim and the questions of the study weren't chosen before the diffractive reading methodology was chosen, or after an exterior text/object was read, in which a tension to be solved simply appeared—in a manner that could “solve” the “problem” of the study's results' predictability. I can't claim that the results were “found in the data” and were later reflected on with an “appropriate” exterior theory/apparatus, as if the results simply existed “out there”. Similarly to post-structuralist analysis, even in posthumanist readings, assessing a “real” meaning is understood as impossible. “Reality” is understood as materialized *of* the intra-active research (cf. Heidenreich, 2016), in a non-linear process. We are always already threaded through the ideas “we” create. The diffractive readings of this study are my move-ment as a “researcher”, with manifested, as well as ghostly “parts” of the study. It is hard to describe the messy “analytical” process without reducing it. It could be argued that the study was co-created *of* timely discursive-political-educational challenges, personal materialized experiences, aims, theories, methods, data, results, conclusions, and other inspirations, such as attendings to seminar-meetings, readings of theoretical and fictional texts, watching of videos—all diffracted *through* each other, co-enacting, co-enlivening, discovering-materializing each “other” as move-able phenomena, in an ongoing move-ment (cf. Barad, 2007). A clear motivation of different choices and stages is thus striven for throughout the study, in order to allow the reader to “follow” it.

And what about the study's “validity”? Can I claim that the methodology and the data used in the study are the most “appropriate” ones for considering the research questions? I can't, and it would have meant that a certain apparatus would result in certain epistemological results, and that data entails essential ontology, which challenges the idea of this study; however, the different methodological choices done in the study are carefully chosen and motivated throughout the study, and seem to be productive in responding to its questions.

To conclude this methodological discussion, I hope that the study is performed carefully and with close attention to the details emerging of it. And now it's time to move for the second part of this thesis, which performs the diffractive moves of the study, thus attending to the second research question, which asks which re-configurations emerge of a diffractive reading of the contemporary notion of inclusion within education and posthumanist theory, through each other. Accordingly, the following chapter in-vites the readers to “follow” the further elaboration of the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education, as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon.

## II. DIFFRACTIVE MOVES

Theorizing, a form of experimenting, is about being in touch. What keeps theories alive and lively is being responsible and responsive to the world's patternings and murmurings. Doing theory requires being open to the world's aliveness, allowing oneself to be lured by curiosity, surprise, and wonder. Theories are not mere metaphysical pronouncements on the world from some presumed position of exteriority. Theories are living and breathing reconfigurings of the world. The world theorizes as well as experiments with itself. Figuring, reconfiguring.

—Karen Barad

On Touching—The Inhuman That Therefore I Am, p. 207

## Towards Inclusion as an ongoing Sym-poietic Phenomenon

If the serious challenge, the really hard work, seemed to be taking account of constitutive exclusions, perhaps this awakening to the infinity of constitutive inclusions—the in/determinacy, the virtuality that is a constitutive part of all finitude—calls us to a new sensibility.

—Karen Barad, *On Touching—The Inhuman That Therefore I Am*, pp. 215-216

The introduction of this study describes a move within educational research from what is named *diversity education* towards *democratic education*. The move is discussed in relation to the question of inclusion, and is described as being regarded by its advocates to be a shift from ideas of integration—whose incitement is assimilation and normalization of the other in the image of the self, towards ideas of inclusion—which are relational/inter-subjective, and in which plurality of absolute otherness is considered being the condition for the subject's becoming, thus understanding the other as an absolute radical Other. Moreover, the inclusion is sporadic, and the excluded ones are incalculable, and are iteratively re-configured through the relational process, thus the inclusion process is claimed to be performative, and inclusion and exclusion are seen as intertwined. Accordingly, inclusion is claimed to be *ongoing*, *relational* and *performative*. However, the study located a tension in the inter-subjective theory, in so far as its point of departure in absolute separable subjects (which has been argued in this study's second chapter to possibly be enacted by atomistic presumptions) challenges the relationality as well as the *co-creativity* of such a notion (as it opens up for creativeness which is auto-poietic, that is re-productive, rather than sym-poietic, that is co-creative). Departing from the notion of move-ment—which is based on the posthumanist inspiration of this study, namely, the ideas of ongoing entanglement of matter and meaning, intra-actions rather than inter-actions, and sym-poiesis rather than auto-poiesis—this study considers not only the ongoingness, but also the *relatioanlity* and *co-creativity* of the phenomenon of inclusion. The study's aim is thus to further elaborate the contemporary notion of inclusion within education as an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon.

Accordingly, the second part of this thesis performs a diffractive reading of the notion of inclusion within education, wherefore the forth chapter attends to the effects of the diffractive patterns of the reading—a reading of the posthumanist notion of move-ment (which is developed in this study of the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study), and of the idea of absolute separation, which is being materialised in the contemporary notion of inclusion, through each other. In doing so, this chapter attempts to respond to the second research question of this study, which asks *which re-configurations emerge of a diffractive reading of the contemporary notion of inclusion within education and posthumanist theory, through each other, and how do these re-configurations contribute to an understanding of*

*inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon.* The performance of the reading starts with re-visiting the idea of plurality—as the enabling of, and the acting together, of radically different subjects, that is, the enabling of absolute Otherness—being the condition for (human) becoming. This is an idea, which is central for the contemporary notion of inclusion within democratic education, and whose diffractive move-ment with the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study was found productive for the reading, as it enacted a re-configuration of the idea “otherness” as being a sym-poietic, intra-active matter, rather than an exterior one, a re-configuration, which indeed contributed to the elaboration of inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon. In that, this re-visiting that is performed in the first section of this chapter, responds to the first part of the second research questions—*which re-configurations emerge of the diffractive reading.* This re-configuration is followed in the second section of this chapter, by the further elaboration of the notion of inclusion within education as *move-ability*, which is an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon, thus responding to the second part of the second research question—*how do these re-configurations contribute to an understanding of inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon.*

### ***Move-ing from Otherness towards im/possibilities***

The following section performs an urgent move, namely the re-configuring of the idea of plurality as absolute “Otherness”, as this idea challenges the understanding of inclusion as relational and co-performative. Drawing on Barad (2012b), and on nondualistic readings of symbolic structures within Jewish mysticism Kabbalah, otherness as manifested in Biesta’s notion of human becoming, is read through the notion of move-ment, and is re-moved<sup>26</sup> as the *infinite im/possibilities for move-able human and nonhuman co-becomings*, thus the “exteriority” of the “other” is understood as exteriority-within-phenomena. In such way, becoming is understood as a sym-poietic phenomenon, rather than auto-poietic. The performance of this move is helpful for the elaboration of the posthumanist notion of inclusion, as will be shown in the second section of this chapter.

### **The Other that therefore I am: On human becomings**

Biesta (2013), in a comprehensive argument in which he draws on Hannah Arendt, elaborates

---

<sup>26</sup> *Re-move* is understood not as a removal, an elimination, of an idea, but rather a kind of move-ing it over and over again, re-transforming, re-configuring, re-diffracting, which is enacted of the diffractive reading (cf. Barad’s idea of re-turning, 2014).

his idea according to which plurality, as in the *absolute* differences between *unique* subjects, is the condition for the subject's becoming, in an ongoing creation of the self. That is, One's becoming depends on the *radical Other*. In a very crucial sense, one's freedom to become one's "uniqueness" is thus understood as inter-related to the existence of exterior Otherness. The colonializing regime's old narratives of integration, which are departing from a wish for creating unity based on sameness, are according to such an understanding simply unjustified. How does Biesta motivate the dependence of the process of becoming on the existence of plurality—how does he explain his shift in understanding becoming as an inter-subjective (relational) process, rather than an intra-subjective one (of subjects who develop on their own), which according to him opens up for heterogeneity, rather than sameness?

[I]t is crucial to see that "beginning" is only half of what action is about. Although it is true that we reveal our distinct uniqueness through what we do and say, we should not think of this as a process through which we disclose some kind of preexisting identity /.../ Everything here depends on how others will respond to our initiatives. (Biesta, 2013, p. 105)

Biesta continues by explaining why Arendt's understanding of action implies that becoming is never possible in isolation:

[W]e cannot act in isolation. If I were to begin something but no one would respond /.../ I would not appear in the world. But if I begin something and others do take up my beginnings, I *do* come into the world, and in precisely this moment I *am* free. (Biesta, 2013, p. 106)

The identity is transient and doesn't preexist the relation; it is rather iteratively constructed through it, thus being dependent on the relation. However, here is a subject who *begins* an action, that is, although the action is relational—the subject begins an action but is at the same time also *subjected* to its consequences—it is clearly inter-active; the relation comes thus as a *result* of the subject's active beginning. It is a *causal* process, separating matter from meaning, ontology from epistemology. Moreover, the actors are necessarily separable, as one starts an action whereas the other responds/doesn't respond to it. So the subject is changeable, and is iteratively created *through* relations with other subjects. However, it is an *auto-poietic* inter-action between *separable* subjects, which, as stated before, is challenging the relationality and co-creativity of the process (cf. Haraway, 2013). Let us stay with Biesta for a while and examine his idea that otherness is an exterior matter.

Biesta reminds us that since "Others" as well are capable of their "own" actions, their responses to "one's" beginnings are "unpredictable" (Biesta 2013, p. 106), and that this can lead to a situation where the subject is trying to control the other's response, and in that—to the erasure of plurality (herein lies Biesta's critique against attempts to reduce otherness to sameness). Biesta explains that since it is precisely otherness which *enables* one's becoming, that kind of action would mean depriving one's own possibility for action, and tells us that it

is therefore that Arendt argues that “plurality is the condition of human action” (Arendt, 1958, p. 8, in Biesta 2013, p. 106).

Crucially, Arendt and Biesta’s call for plurality is not simply in the meaning “plural”, that is, a need for *any* collective whatsoever, which can consist of subjects who are normalized to be the same. They rather argue for a *specific* kind of plurality, based on *radical* otherness. Biesta (2013) explains that the “place” where the becoming of subjects can occur shall be reduced in neither space nor time; its true space rather “denotes a particular quality human interaction” (p. 107) per se, and which doesn’t start nor end somewhere, but is rather sporadic, in so far as it iteratively appears and disappears, meaning that action is thus “entirely dependent upon the constant presence of others” (Arendt 1958, p. 23, in Biesta, 2013, p.107). Biesta (2013) continues and stresses the importance of “the question of how *we* can *bring about* a space in which freedom can appear” [my emphasis] (p. 113), a public realm which *enables plurality* (ibid.), and which is searching “a way of existing together in which *we* bear with *strangers* and *they* bear with *us*” [my emphasis] (Biesta, 2013, p. 114), a way of existing “together-in-plurality” (Biesta, 2013, p. 114). Once again, otherness shall not be reduced to sameness. Becoming is only possible as “connection-in-difference” (ibid.).

In that, Biesta (2013) argues that democratic education, as the place where plurality of absolute Otherness exists and is made possible, can enable the becoming of its educational subjects (p. 113). For further stressing the importance of this vision, he tells us that according to Arendt, if this space to act and become together-in-plurality (that is, the inter-actions between absolute different subjects) doesn’t exist, we “slip back into an existence that is no longer about our *distinct* uniqueness, but only about the maintenance and preservation of life /.../ We slip back into an existence that in this respect is *no longer human*” [my emphasis] (p. 113). What Biesta seems to say here, is that without the existence of the *absolute* Other, one can solely re-produce oneself—that is, re-produce sameness—in a very mechanical sense, never re-configure oneself.

In order to tell us how one can exist together-in-plurality, Biesta is taking us on an Arendtian journey, in which we learn on the differences between narratives of *tourism*—regimes of explicit homogeneity where the other is a stranger and shall stay that (otherness is explicitly excluded); narratives of *empathy*, which can be described as seemingly inclusive, although those are implicit exclusive and normalizing colonial attempts to integrate the Other and reduce her in the image of the Self, that is, to assimilate the other, and according to which One is assumed to fully understand the Other’s perspective; and lastly, narratives of *visiting*, that is, “being and thinking in my own identity where actually I am not” (Arendt, 1977, p.

241, in Biesta, 2013, p. 116). According to Biesta, the narratives of visiting are inclusive narratives of existing together-in-plurality (of absolute Otherness). When it comes to the idea of tourism, it is according to him clearly erasing plurality, as it doesn't wish to engage itself with otherness. Biesta's creative critique is thus mainly against the empathy narratives (which could be described as the integration attempts of the diversity education, as described in the introduction of this study), that by assuming that One can *really* understand the Other, one denies "both the situatedness of one's own seeing and thinking and that of the other's" (Biesta, 2013, p. 116), thus implicitly erasing plurality. The idea of visiting is *understanding* that the world looks different to someone *else* (ibid.), that is, not understanding *how* the Other sees the world, but rather understanding *that* she sees it very differently.

Carl Anders Säfström (2011) discusses similarly his understanding of teaching and learning as the equality between *different* subjects, through a story of meeting with Otherness:

In the speech that unmistakably came from that girl and no one else, she touched something that was unmistakably in me and in no one else. In the moment of the speech there was equality in the sense that it reached beyond the social/historical/geographical positions from where the speaking bodies originated /.../ *Teaching is a particular way of speaking, a confirmation of a certain kind of equality through which noise is turned into discourse by connecting different worlds.* [emphasis in original] (Säfström, 2011, p. 60)

Visiting, according to such ideas, is about understanding the very "fact" of difference; it is to not erase the Otherness of the absolute Other, but to rather act and let the Other act as well. It is precisely through this acting together-in-plurality—in the place where "separate worlds [are] connected" (Säfström, 2011, p. 60)—that "radically new meaning [is brought] to the world" (ibid.), and that "One" can be *moved* "out of place" (ibid.). It is certainly a narrative of a *heterogeneous* society with *flexible* subjects (rather than a *homogenous* society with *stable* subjects). The idea of visiting is crucial in Biesta's understanding of inclusion, by regarding the existence of absolute differences as the very condition for (human) subjects' ongoing process of becoming. The Other is not the same as the Self, but is rather an absolute Other, in her very unique way, which is precisely that which makes the Self be in *Her* very unique way, in a kind of inter-active becoming (Biesta, 2013, p. 114); it is *the Other that therefore I am*.

Informed by the notion of move-ment, these subjects might be heterogeneous and transient, but they are not relational, in so far as by departing from *radically different* subjects, between which there are clear boundaries, the subjects are separated. In that, their becoming together-in-plurality is inter-active, not intra-active, and—as argued in the second chapter of this thesis—it is a becoming that is auto-poietic rather than sym-poietic, which means that ideas of re-production rather than co-creation can continue circulating (cf. Haraway, 2013). What happens if we try to re-move those ideas and the posthumanist

theoretical ideas inspiring this study, through each other? Thinking sym-poietic agency rather than auto-poietic action, move-ment rather than separation, moves—intra-actions, rather than inter-actions, material-discursive practices rather than discursive ones, and crucially, the re-configuration, which will be performed of the move in the following subsection—infinite im/possibilities emerging of the move-ment (rather than otherness being an exterior matter), which enact move-able human and nonhuman co-becomings (rather than transient human becomings)? The next section will attend to the idea of such a move.

### **The other that (therefore) I am<sup>27</sup>: On non/human co-becomings**

When two hands touch /.../ a proximity of otherness that brings the other nearly as close as oneself. /.../ if the two hands belong to one person, might this not enliven an uncanny sense of the otherness of the self /.../ the greeting of the stranger within? So much happens in a touch: an infinity of others—other beings, other spaces, other times—are aroused.

—Karen Barad “On Touching – The Inhuman That Therefore I Am”, p. 206

Considering the theoretical inspiration of this study, namely, the notion of move-ment, although utterly important, the idea of shifting away from an education that aims at normalizing its subjects and creating sameness and re-production, is insufficient, and implies a theoretical tension, once what is suggested is moving towards an opposite idea, namely, absolute Otherness, as an exterior matter. Admitting to otherness as opposed to sameness does not once and for all solve the problem of exclusion and inequality. Opening up for flexible and heterogenic becomings doesn't dissolve taxonomic and differentiating categories of difference. What is at stake is finding a way to reach what seems to be the “goal” of the contemporary theory within the field of democratic education, which is an ongoing, relational and performative kind of becoming, which enacts the dis/appearance of move-able and queer co-becomings, while leaving the narrative of active and separable “subjects” behind, a narrative which enacts auto-poietic and atomistic becoming.

The idea that change cannot come out of sameness seems reasonable. But does that necessarily mean that the solution shall be the finding of otherness radically *outside* the “self”? What happens with Biesta's and Säfström's call that we read about in the former section, if we speculate that *move-ment is the “condition”, that is, the enactment, the im/possibility, of move-able co-becomings?* That it is *of the move-ment with its moves, that move-able “relata” are iteratively moving and being moved.* What if we always already exist together, in fact, we never existed separably? What if we are rather entangled and the stranger is therefore never radically “outside”, and in fact, is never really a “stranger”? What if we always already are in move-ment, and do not need to—and can't possibly—*actively* bring

---

<sup>27</sup> This title expresses my move-ment with Karen Barad's (2012a) work and through her even with Derrida's.

about a realm in which “we” can become? In order to examine those questions, the reading will turn to nondualistic readings of symbolic structures within Jewish mysticism *Kabbalah*.

Rabbi Rami Shapiro tells us about how word-play is counted within Judaism being a spiritual practice for an ongoing de-construction of thought (Shapiro, 2014). Such risky and creative word-plays seem to me to manifest how matter and meaning are deeply entangled through “one another”, and why it’s impossible to determine in any mattering sense, whether it is the letters which materialize the meaning, or whether it is the meaning which is manifested in the letters, as none preexist the other; material letters and discursive meanings rather iteratively co-create “themselves” of such word-play performances (cf. Barad, 2003; 2007). One example for such a word-play, which seems helpful for the reading of *otherness*, is the game of the Hebrew words *ain* (אין) and *ani* (אני). Rabbi Rachel Barenblat (2013) writes in her blog about a course<sup>28</sup> she attended, in which Barad and Rabbi Fern Feldman diffracted this word-play of *ain/ani* in relation to Rabbi Itamar Schwarz’ text about cycles of being and nothingness, and to quantum physics ideas on vacuum fluctuations. Barad and Feldman’s “queer” reading of Kabbalah, and particularly the nondualistic reading of *ani/ain*, seemed to me to enact a productive re-configuration in the reading of otherness in Biesta’s theory, wherefore this word-play was chosen for the reading. Shapiro (2014) tells us that whereas both words consist of the same Hebrew letters—*aleph* (א), *yod* (י), *nun* (נ), albeit in different order, they “have” *seemingly* different meanings, *ain* meaning “nothingness”, and *ani* meaning the “self”. Shapiro (2003; 2014) tells us that according to the Kabbalah, the letter *yod* (in the English version of the words it is the letter *i*) stands for *yadah*, “knowing”, and that the entanglement of self and nothingness can thus be manifested as following:

When your knowing is externally focused you perceive a world “out there,” and an *Ani* “in here,” in your head. When your knowing is internally focused both the perceived and the perceiver (out there and in here) disappear, and *Ain*, no-thing, is present /.../ Reality is the dance of off and on, *Ain* and *Ani*. You yourself are this dance. You are constantly spinning from *Ain* to *Ani* to *Ain* again over and over and over (Shapiro, 2014).

Interestingly, *ain-sof* (אינסוף), which literally means “infinity”, is used within Kabbalah<sup>29</sup> as the infinite and performative entanglement of God, the world and humanity, all co-evolving (cf. The New Kabbalah, n.d.; cf. Shapiro, 2014), an idea that manifests the interconnectedness of epistemological inquiry and cosmological expansion (cf. Valabregue-Perry, 2012). *Ain-sof* is nothing and everything, hidden and revealed, reality and illusion, creator and created, *ani*

---

<sup>28</sup> According to Barad (personal communication, October 20, 2015), she and Feldman taught this course multiple times at *Kallah* (a program within *Aleph*—The Alliance for Jewish Renewal).

<sup>29</sup> *Ain-sof* is not understood with a singular meaning within Kabbalah. I apply *one* way to describe the notion’s use within Kabbalah, which is responding to the theoretical inspiration of this study. For a more complex discussion on the meanings within Kabbalah, see for example, Wolfson (2012) and Valabregue-Perry (2012).

and *ain*—the nondual, entangled and dynamic unity of the infinite im/possibilities, which are iteratively “reconfigured and reconfiguring with each intra-action” (Barad, 2010, p. 268, footnote 12); a unity which doesn’t imply the erasure of differences—of otherness—but rather their entanglement, thus being threaded through each other rather than separated (cf. Valabregue-Perry, 2012; The New Kabbalah, n.d.), as infinite im/possibilities. In a very crucial sense, *ain-sof* is iteratively re-moved, in an ongoing co-creation; it is the infinite play of *ain/ani*, the “integrative multiplicity” (Valabregue-Perry, 2012, p. 429)—the “plurality”—of otherness that is threaded through the world (cf. The New Kabbalah, n.d.; Valabregue-Perry, 2012). And maybe the *ain-sof* is the *void*, which is “not a financial wheeler-dealer, an ethically questionable, shadowy character” (Barad, 2012b, p. 12), but rather “a spectral realm with a ghostly existence” (ibid.). And what happens to “the noise” or “the speech” in Säfström’s (2011) meeting, once being moved through the idea of *ain-sof*?

Virtual particles do not traffic in a metaphysics of presence. They do not exist in space and time. They are ghostly non/existences that teeter on the edge of the infinitely thin blade between being and nonbeing. They speak of indeterminacy. Or rather, no determinate words are spoken by the vacuum, only a speaking silence that is neither silence nor speech, but *the conditions of im/possibility for non/existence*. [my emphasis] (Barad, 2012b, p. 12)

Rather than an inter-action, in which the Other’s *noise* turns into an inter-active *discourse* by connecting two *different* worlds (as understood in Säfström’s passage), otherness is here understood to be materialized *within* moves, *of* the move-ment, so that move-able “relata” are iteratively co-created, some impossibilities for move-able non/human co-becomings are enacted, while others remain yet hidden, always already threaded through “each other”. Noise is not an “outside matter”; it is rather always already threaded through the silence. And does that not mean that we neither are tourists nor visitors, in an *outside* place? That we are rather always in-visitors, even in “our own identity”? What if instead of visiting, we talk about move-ing, which we always already do, and which doesn’t have any “direction” *from*, *towards* or *between* subjects? Where “one” is always already “on the move”, always move-ing *of* the infinite im/possible old-new landscapes/spacetimematterings/becomings, which are neither totally “exterior” nor totally “interior”?

”Unique identities” of absolute ”Others” do not merely furnish our world as material ”things”; ”they” do not preexist their relations, their moves, their ”thingification”, their materialization, but are rather *of* the world, always already threaded through “each other”, and through the entanglement of matter and meaning (cf. Joshua Simon, 2010), always “made up of all possible histories of virtual intra-actions with all Others” (Barad, 2012b, p.15). Even the smallest bits of atoms, including the virtual ones, “are an enormous multitude” (ibid.). Otherness is not an “exterior matter”, but rather comes to matter solely within moves, not as

absolute radical separateness, but rather as infinite im/possibilities (cf. Barad, 2014); the infinite play of *ani/ain* is not a dualistic inside-outside play, but rather an un/doing of any kind of “identity”, even a fluid one, an entangled and dynamic play of non/being, of in/determinacy of the infinite “plurality” of im/possibilities that emerge *of the ain-sof*, of the *move-ment* with its moves; a move-ment which is “a lively tension, a desiring orientation toward being/becoming” (Barad, 2012b, p. 13), towards sym-poietic creations. Crucially, the *ain*, that is—the ”other”, and *ani*, that is—the ”self”, are always already threaded through “each other”, through the iterative dance of self/other, inside/outside, matter/meaning, no/thingness, non/being, in/determinacies, and of im/possibilities. “We” are *of* this flickering dance, *of* this infinite move-ment; *ani/ain* are inseparable, always already entangled *of the ain-sof*; always already threaded through the infinite im/possibilities for move-able human and nonhuman co-becomings; through *the other that (therefore) I am*.

Now that that idea of plurality, as absolute Otherness, being the condition of all (human) becoming (as manifested in the contemporary theory within the field of democratic education), has been re-moved by *of* the idea of infinite im/possibilities for move-able non/human co-becomings, in a way that becoming is understood as a sym-poietic rather than auto-poietic phenomenon, we can continue and respond to the second part of the second research question, which asks how this re-configuration, which emerged of the diffractive reading, contributes to an understanding of inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon. In order to do that, the reading will now perform the further elaboration of the contemporary notion of inclusion towards a posthumanist one, in a way that materializes inclusion as an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon. The elaboration emerges of a reading of the re-configured understanding of im/possibilities, which was developed in this section, and of the concept of move-ment, through each other.

### ***Move-ability***

What happens if the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education is moved by the study’s developed concept of *move-ment*, and of the re-configuration that emerged of the first section of this reading, namely the infinite *im/possibilities* for move-able non/human co-becomings, rather than the idea of plurality (of radically different subjects) being the condition for (human) becomings? How can such a re-configuration respond to the second research question, and contribute to an understanding of inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon? It is this question that informs the second part of the diffractive reading. We start this part of the reading by looking

at the conclusive passage from Biesta's (2011) chapter "Education, democracy and the question of inclusion" [my translation], in which the central ideas regarding his notion of inclusion within education are being outlined:

Moreover, Rancière doesn't see democratization as something that is done *for* others; it is something that people can only do themselves /.../ Thirdly, Rancière helps us understanding that we shouldn't think of democratic inclusion as allowing additional people to form a part of the existing order, but rather as a process, which necessarily implies that this order is being transformed. As long as we limit our efforts to include the ones who are recognized as being excluded, we merely move within the existing order /.../ what Rancière provides with is an understanding of the need for another kind of inclusion: the inclusion of that which one cannot know is excluded from the existing order; the inclusion of that which I in another context have called for the "incalculable" (see Biesta 2001) [my translation] (Biesta, 2011, p.127).

Biesta's (2011) central idea in his notion of inclusion is threefold. Firstly, inclusion is not a *normal* condition in which the ones who do not yet meet the entry standards are integrated into the existing order through a process of assimilation, but rather a *sporadic* process, where the inclusion appears precisely in those "places" where the order is dissolved in the name of equality. In that, it is an *ongoing* process. Secondly, it is a process based on the idea of *active agents* emancipating themselves from being a minority, that is, it is not about a passive minority being integrated by others into *their* existing "space". Lastly, inclusion is *performative*, in so far as the ones to be included emerge through the process itself, and are thus incalculable. Once again, it seems to matter that the excluded ones are incalculable, since they cannot be known in advance, as that would be based on an idea of what is "normal" and thus, how one "should be". Although not explicitly noted, Biesta's idea of inclusion is clearly of a *relational* process, as it happens according to him through human inter-actions with other humans (something that is intimately related to his idea of the subjects' becoming, as discussed in the previous section of the analysis). All those points sum up to a critique of colonial idea of inclusion, which probably rather be named *integration*, based on a wish to fashion the other in the shape of the self.

The incitement for those ideas seems to be based on Biesta's idea of plurality and equality, as discussed in the previous section, according to which subjects' have the right to—and can solely—iteratively become "their" uniqueness through their inter-actions with absolute Others. Such an idea necessarily implies that the excluded ones are incalculable, and that inclusion is an ongoing process, which takes place whenever certain "Others" are excluded, which is also precisely the places where they are "created", through those occasions/inter-actions in which they are excluded. It is a thorough argument, which indeed matters. However, the departure in *separable* and *active* subjects, as argued in this study, counteract

the idea of relationality, and also of co-creativity (sym-poiesis) rather than re-production (auto-poiesis)—both crucially being ideas which Biesta’s theory seems to call for.

The diffractive reading that is performed in the next paragraph, of the above quoted passage (in which a central contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education is manifested), the study’s developed concept of *move-ment*, and the idea of *im/possibilities* rather than otherness, which was re-configured in the reading performed in the previous section, together with Barad’s (2012a; 2014) and Haraway’s (2011; 2015a) idea of *response-ability*, and Barad’s (2012a) idea of *touch*, through each other, re-moves the idea of the separation of individuals (which is probably most clearly manifested in the idea of the active agents), and thus of auto-poiesis, which is materialized of the contemporary notion of inclusion, while re-giving the notion its desired non-normalizing (post-colonial), ongoing, relational and performative move-ment. The diffractive patterns enact a posthumanist notion of inclusion as an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon.

**Inclusion** is not something one does *for* others, but it is neither something, which other “active agents” can do “themselves”, that is, *auto-poietically*. It is rather an agential phenomenon, which always already happens *of* the move-ment of non/human move-able co-becomings. In that way, inclusion shall not be understood as the condition of integrating additional *human*-beings into the existing order, based on a wish to maintain sameness and homogeneity. *Neither* can it be understood as an auto-poietic sporadic process of mobilizing fluid positions in society, and thus as the *inter-ruption* of the existing order, in the name of equality between *separable* (human) “individuals”, based on a wish to maintain heterogeneity, fantasizing otherness as an absolute “exterior matter”. Inclusion shall rather be understood as an ongoing and sym-poietic phenomenon, that is, ongoing, relational and performative, *of* which *moves* iteratively emerge; moves wherein move-able agential-cuts, or *intra-ruptions*, are enacted; cuts of which *move-able* human and nonhuman “relata” iteratively and sym-poietically dis/appear (in the in/determinate play of inclusion/exclusion). Crucially, separability is merely agential, that is, it exists solely *within* such moves. As long as we limit our efforts to include the ones who are recognized as being excluded, we merely move within the existing order. However, we can neither limit our efforts to allow the separability of individuals in the name of “their” right for “their” “absolute otherness”, for their “unique” and flexible (human) becomings; we need to be able to imagine and speculate another kind of inclusion, which “is not something you have toward some kind of demand made on you by the world or by an ethical system or by a political commitment /.../ not something you just respond to, as if it’s there already” (Haraway, 2015a, p. 257): a *move-ability* (which is agentially response-able) to, or rather *of* the infinite im/possibilities for move-able non/human co-becomings (which are always already threaded through the move-ment), which pays careful attention to affinities that can make a positive change for the world’s iterative becoming. Move-ability is thus the sym-poietic performance of moving and being moved by “the stranger threaded through oneself and through all being and non/being” (Barad, 2012a, p. 217); it is the “cultivation through which we render each other capable, that cultivation of the capacity to respond” (Haraway, 2015a, pp. 256-257); it is an ongoing and sym-poietic, to-be-re-made creating-knowing-move-ing activity, a worlding activity (cf. Haraway 2015a). Inclusion in its

posthumanist account shall be understood as *move-ability*, which is an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon, a *material-discursive-ethical* phenomenon (cf. Barad, 2007).

In an very important sense, inclusion cannot depart from a "thingification", from "[t]he same ancient logic from which the family originates" (Simon, 2010, section "Their World, Not Ours"), according to which family is a collective based on separation and re-production. The fact that the collective becomes the unit rather than the individual doesn't per se imply that hierarchy vanishes. The ethical responsibility for the Other only *attaches* to such an idea, "as if it's there already" (Haraway, 2015a, p.257). Affinities which are rather based on entanglement and co-creation, enact another set of concepts, which do not only opens up for identities' transience and heterogeneity, but rather for their move-ability, queerness, relationality and sym-poiesis. Those are affinities based on *kindship* rather than *kinship*, and response-ability rather than responsibility (cf. Haraway, 2013).

Now that the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education was further elaborated as the posthumanist concept of *move-ability* (which is an ongoing, relational, and performative phenomenon)—through a diffraction of the re-configuration of otherness as im/possibilities, which emerged of the first part of the diffractive reading, and of the posthumanist theoretical concept of *move-ment*, which was developed of the posthumanist theoretical inspiration of this study, through each other—the second research question of this study is responded to. The next and last part of this thesis will deal with what I call *att/endings*, attentive endings. The following chapter, which aims at responding to the third and last research question, serves as a brief discussion, an example and further elaboration of the developed concept of move-ability, in relation to educational practice. Its intention is to open up and call for further engagement within educational research, with the development of educational approaches in which the concept of move-ability can come to matter, and which attends to possible pragmatic challenges of such approaches.

### III. MOVE-ABLE ATT/ENDINGS

...I have now begun revealing words  
so I will not enter shamefully into the world that is coming.  
I have begun! I will speak!...  
I have seen that all those sparks, sparkle from the High Spark,  
Hidden of all Hidden!  
All are level of enlightenment.  
In the light of each and every level  
there is revealed what is revealed.  
All those lights are connected:  
this light to that light, that light to this light,  
one shining into the other,  
inseparable, one from the other.  
The description of the unification of all ends with the observation:  
“It and Its name is one.”

—Rabbi Shim'on testimony, *The Zohar*  
(Translation and commentary by Daniel Matt) In Nissan (2010)

The attending ethico-onto-epistemological questions have to do with responsibility and accountability for the entanglements "we" help enact and what kinds of commitments "we" are willing to take on, including commitments to "ourselves" and who "we" may become.

—Karen Barad  
Meeting the Universe Halfway, p. 382

## Towards a Move-able Educational Approach

This study, being an “agential cut”, aimed at seriously engaging with the possibility of understanding inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon. The engagement started in the first two chapters, with the consideration as well as challenging of a crucial tension in the contemporary notion of inclusion within education, by responding to the possibility of atomistic presumptions behind such a notion, and through the diffractive elaboration of the posthumanist theoretical concept of *move-ment*. The concept of move-ment, together with its posthumanist theoretical inspirations, became productive in the diffractive reading of this study, which was performed in the fourth chapter; a reading of which the posthumanist (post-atomistic) concept of *move-ability* emerged, as a further elaboration of the contemporary notion of inclusion within the field of democratic education—a concept which more clearly emphasizes movability, transformation, and relationality. It is herein, in the development of the posthumanist perspective, and of the fields of democratic education and philosophy of education, that the main contribution of this study to educational research lies.

Move-ability is a concept, which is material-discursive-ethical, and which understands inclusion as an ongoing, relational and performative phenomenon. It is a concept, which takes *proximity* seriously, something that even previous posthumanist research is calling for. Ceder (2015) develops proximity as a concept that departs from relations rather than subjects. Gammelgaard (2014) discusses the presumption of the radical alterity as a challenge for understanding the transience of subjects’ identities. She offers proximity rather than alterity, and calls for attentiveness to “the effects of the cuts we make” (p. 55). This study *plugs in* such ideas to the discussion on inclusion within education. It performs a reading of atomistic presumptions behind the contemporary notion, applies posthumanist ideas of move-able sympoietic “otherness” emerging within phenomena, leaving the narratives of boundaries between educational “relata” behind, re-membering that “relata” are always already threaded through “each other”, and through the infinite im/possibilities for move-able non/human co-becomings. Crucially, the study develops a conceptual move-able “framework” for further engagement with the notion of move-ability within education; it provides with new ideas for theorizing new educational ideas with, for creating new worlds (cf. Haraway, 2011).

It is now time for the move-able att/endings—attentive endings—of this study. Responding to the third and last research question, I want to open up and call for the consideration of how the elaborated posthumanist concept of *move-ability* can come to matter within education. I want to therefore briefly experiment by exemplifying, discussing and further developing the

concept, in relation to educational practice, by means of diffractive speculative fabulation<sup>30</sup>, inspired by Haraway’s idea of speculative fabulation and Barad’s and Haraway’s ideas of *diffraction*. The performed storytelling is re-told diffractively through Charles Lutwidge Dodgson’s novels *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass and what Alice found there*, Barad’s notions of *touch* and *response-ability* (2012a) and of *im/possibilities* (2010), Haraway’s notions of *worlding* (2008; 2011; 2015a; 2015b) and of *sym-poietic storytelling* (2010), Biesta’s (2011) idea of “doing” democracy instead of teaching it, and through the developed concept of *move-ability*. In that, a *wonderworlding* educational approach, inspired by Haraway’s (2013) approach of “staying with the trouble”, in which the notion of move-ability can come to matter, is briefly speculated and suggested for educational practice. Additionally, possible pragmatic challenges of such an approach are acknowledged. This kind of att/ending is in and of itself both *moved by* and *moves* possible move-able beginnings for further engagement within educational research. And now let’s start the performance of the diffractive re-telling<sup>31</sup>:

## ***Wonderworlding***

“Who are YOU?” said the Caterpillar.

This was not an encouraging opening for a conversation. Alice replied, rather shyly, “I—I hardly know, sir, just at present— at least I know who I WAS *not yet* when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been *moved* several times since then.”

“Then *who/what do you imagine ‘our’-move-able-‘self’ not-yet-co-being/already-co-becoming?*”

Alice laughed. “There’s no use trying,” she said: “one *can’t* believe impossible things.”

“I daresay you haven’t had much practice *of move-ability*,” said the Queen. “When I was your age, I always did it for half-an-hour a day. Why, sometimes I’ve *moved and been moved by* as many as six *im/possible move-able* things before breakfast.”

‘Oh, I’ve had such a curious dream!’ said Alice, and she told her sister, as well as she could *re-member* them, all these strange Adventures of hers, and when she had finished, her sister kissed her, and said, ‘It WAS a curious dream, dear, certainly: but now run in to your tea; it’s getting late.’ *But Alice said it indeed already/not-yet was getting late, which is precisely why she would rather stay with the trouble. So instead of closing her eyes so that all would change to dull presumed “reality”, she (re)opened her eyes to, move-able to, the risky play of Wonderland, were nothing and all was im/possible and move-able, where no linear causality exists, and where fish-footman is neither a fish nor a footman, or even a flexible, fluid, though untangled, clear-cut-mix of those “two” too many, but rather a move-able phenomenon whose boundaries never sit still but are rather iteratively and sym-poietically re-worked, where each “part/position” is never an absolute stranger to the “Other” but*

<sup>30</sup> For more on the methodology of diffractive speculative fabulation, see the third chapter of this study.

<sup>31</sup> The ideas that were used for this diffractive speculative fabulation are enclosed in the appendix of this study.

rather always written in the flesh of the other, as the other. And she imagined how she already-would, enfolded and threaded through the before-yet-already-after-spacetime-mattering of the universe, co-become a phenomenal “grown woman”, or some “other” ghostly move-able co-being; and how she would be threaded through the move-able heart of her not-yet-childhood and of her already-adulthood; and how she would gather about her “other” little move-able critters, and “they” would make-together “THEIR” bodies-minds move-able of many a strange tale, taking chances with “one another”, telling stories upon stories for still possible recuperation, how they already-will be co-wonderworlding; how their move-able bodies-minds are always already in-viting, involving, of the other within, rather than “understanding” the “exterior Other” who never existed; and how she already-would move and be moved of all “their” propositional sorrows and joys, always move-able to kinships which can make a positive change for the world’s iterative not/becoming, always already re-memembering and re-working the sedimented enfoldings of move-able im/possibilities written into the fabric of the wonderworld.

THE NOT YET MOVE-ABLE END

## ***Educational move-able challenges***

How can move-ability come to matter within educational practice? Is the connection between move-ability and education what Biesta (2011) calls “a strong, and to a certain degree inherent” [my translation] (p. 112) connection, which is

based on the assumption that unique individuals’ coming into the world can only occur in a “worldy” world [...] which is characterized of plurality and difference [my translation] (ibid.).

And does that mean that “instead of teaching children and teens how to become ‘good democrats’” (Biesta, 2011, p. 128), educators shall take a role “in gathering up and enhancing the *possibilities* for learning of the incalculable events in which democratization ‘occur’” [my emphasis] (ibid.)—events which “can emerge as dissolution of the attempts to teach democracy” (ibid.). Should educators be finding ways “of existing together in which *we* bear with strangers and *they* bear with us” [my emphasis] (Biesta 2013, p. 114)?

Crucially, such ideas *do* take seriously *transient* otherness and existing *together*. However, the relationality, the move-ability and the co-transformation are at risk, in so far as separation and re-production can continue circulating, and creation is thus endangered—those are indeed urgent matters to re-materialize. How can educational practice seriously engage with a move-able approach, without falling back on categorical atomistic presumptions of positions/identities, as fluid as those might be? How can the ethical aspect consider matter *as well as* meaning, re-moving old phantasies of effectuality, according to which ethics is “a superimposing of human values onto the ontology of the world” (Barad, 2010, p. 265)?

I want to argue that if we want to take the concepts of move-ability seriously, we need to re-think new kinds of educational approaches. We indeed need to “do democracy” (cf. Biesta, 2011); we actually need to re-memember that we *always already are* doing democracy. What is

at stake is to *sym-poietically* speculate and experiment a *wonderworlding* educational approach. It means to not “wake up from the dream”, returning to the comfortable, but also re-productive narratives of separation and unique *human* becomings, in which it seems important to acknowledge and *understand* the existence of seemingly *different* positions, and the different possibilities for “effects” on inter-connected and transient “identities”, but to rather re-turn such becomings, “stay with the trouble”, stay *of* wonderworld, and together be move-able to the infinite im/possibilities for move-able non/human co-becomings, always already threaded through “them” and through “each other”. It is an understanding according to which an “individual” is not “one” or the “other” position (for example feminine-masculine), but it is neither a flexible mix of both, resulting from discursive practices. “It” is rather always already threaded through the infinite im/possibilities in the dynamic material-discursive move-ment of the world. “We” are neither the same nor radically different, we are inseparable, without clear boundaries separating between us. This kind of understanding has crucial effectuality on our understanding of the process of inclusion. It is a risky but certainly playful matter, which indeed matters. As Haraway (2015) reminds us “[p]lay always involves the invitation that asks ‘are we a “we”’? A “we” that does not pre-exist the propositional risk and testing” (p.261). It is about seriously engaging within education “in storytelling as a sym-poietic practice, which is propositional and invitational” (ibid.), with re-moving, re-turning, re-telling stories, re-configuring move-able, queer and sym-poietic identities, “building and destroying machines, identities, categories, relationships, space stories” (Haraway, 2000, p. 316), always move-able to what already emerges but also response-able, move-able, to what could yet emerge, and how all of this comes to matter in the world’s iterative becoming. Remembering that it is not first about a meeting, and then an ethics that is attached to it, but that ontology, epistemology and ethics are intimately entangled, and that it really *matters* which stories we are co-telling, co-materializing, but also which ones we are not. Such educational approaches materialize ethics and inclusion as *relational*, thus attending to an urgent call made by previous educational research (see, Nxumalo, 2012; Taylor & Giugni, 2012).

Wonderworlding is certainly not an easy approach, but we seem to not have another choice but attending to it and developing it, we actually always already are doing it. Alice meets many queer creatures, always trying to categorize them into boxes, wanting “them” to “be” either a fish or a man. She wants to “get to places”; the cat reminds her that if she only goes long enough, she is sure to get somewhere. Maybe this going-(and-re-turning-)together-long-enough will always already get us somewhere? Alice is afraid of meeting “mad people”, and the cat reminds her that all are mad. If we are all mad, always “other” to “everyone”,

including to ourselves, and are all threaded through “each other”, how can we—as Biesta calls for—bear with “each other”? As the cat appears and goes so suddenly, Alice asks it to vanish slowly, as those ghostly dis/appearances make her giddy. And so it does; and then she thinks it is a curious thing when she sees a grin without a cat. What makes her be curious, and at times still want to wake up from the dream? How can we not fall back on wanting to “wake up” from the dream when it seems dangerous, but also not to want to “stay” in the same story, when it feels comfortable? How can we stop separating differences and rather see their entanglement? How can educators together-with students, always be move-able to the infinite im/possibilities for move-able non/human co-becomings—and to how such becomings can come to matter in our co-wonderworlding—without getting giddy? Alice is afraid going into the March Hare’s house—it is huge! She eats from a mushroom, which makes her grow, in order to dare taking the risk. She finds the otherness within “herself”, in this entanglement with the house and the mushroom, and it is *of* this otherness-within—the infinite im/possibilities—that this affinity re-becomes positive—for Alice, for the Hare, and for the worlding they are always already “part” *of* (cf. Chapter 6: Pig and Pepper., n.d.).

### ***Implications for future research***

The speculative fabulation done in this discussion is merely an attending, a call for further engagement. More research is needed in order to further understand and develop educational approaches in which the notion of move-ability can come to matter, and also in order to find ways for overcoming possible challenges of such approaches, or perhaps—ways for *staying with* the challenges. The “human” experience is often felt as being “limited” in time and space, how do we attend to im/possibilities? One interesting and productive option, which I would have wished to experiment with, is an empirical study using a methodology of sym-poietic storytelling within educational practice, as a possible “way out of the maze of dualisms in which we have explained our bodies and our tools to ourselves” (Haraway, 2010, p. 316). Experimenting with such a methodology with students, and examining how it can materialize sym-poietic co-becomings, seems to offer a productive way for further engagement with the notion of move-ability in relation to educational practice. Can such a methodology re-open up for move-able co-becomings, rather than actively trying to “search after” and “actualize” possibilities? *Could such an educational approach of wonderworlding and of move-ability imply a kind of “inclusion” without the old narratives of separation, an inclusion that can come to matter?*

## Not Yet Epilogue

To try to “conclude” this thesis suddenly seems like a queer idea. The journey does not yet end at this “point”. By diffractively reading theoretical-philosophical ideas from posthumanist and educational research, through each other, this study helps develop the posthumanist perspective, as well as contributes to the fields of democratic education and philosophy of education, by further elaborating the contemporary notion of inclusion. It suggests the posthumanist concept of *move-ability*, which more clearly emphasizes questions of movability, transformation and relationality. The study is both *moved by* and *moves* possible move-able beginnings for further engagement with the concept. Such a theoretical-philosophical elaboration, which is performed of this study, is thus important in order to create new ways of thinking that open up for further engagement with the phenomenon of inclusion within educational research and practice. It calls for further engagement with the development of educational approaches inspired of the idea of *wonderworlding*, engaging seriously with propositional, risky and playful sym-poietic storytelling. Enacting agential cuts is inevitable; it is part of what mattering is, what worlding is, what move-ing is. What matters is always re-remembering that “[e]ven the smallest cuts matter” (Barad, in an interview in Dolphijn & van der Tuin, 2012, p. 69). That is what move-ability is and wherein its urgency lies—in the ability to together move and to be moved by the other, “who is not entirely separate from what we call the self” (ibid.), always considering the transience, movability and inseparability of the cuts, which are enacted of our moves, always being move-able, being response-able, to/of boundaries enacted of such cuts, to inclusions as well as exclusions, to the infinite im/possibilities for move-able co-becomings (cf. Barad, 2003; 2007). The cut enacted of this thesis plays a role “in the intertwined practices of knowing and becoming” (Barad, 2003, p. 812), and my hope is that this role will come to matter in a positive way for educational research and practice, and for the world’s becoming.

## References

- Alvehus, J. (2013). *Skriva uppsats med kvalitativ metod: en handbok*. 1. uppl. Stockholm: Liber.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1977). Truth and politics. In H. Arendt, *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Arendt, H. (1994). Understanding and politics (the difficulties of understanding). In H. Arendt & J. Kohn (Eds.), *Essays in understanding 1930-1954*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Assarson, I. (2007). *Talet om en skola för alla: pedagogers meningskonstruktion i ett politiskt uppdrag*. Diss. Lund : Lunds universitet, 2007  
Available online: <http://dspace.mah.se/handle/2043/3417>.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(3), pp. 801-831.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. (2010). Quantum Entanglements and Hauntological Relations of Inheritance: Dis/continuities, SpaceTime Enfoldings, and Justice-to-Come. *Derrida Today*, 3(2), pp. 240–268.
- Barad, K. (2012a). On touching – The inhuman that therefore I am. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 23(3), pp. 206–223.
- Barad, K. (2012b). What is the measure of nothingness? Infinity, virtuality, justice. *dOCUMENTA (13)*. Ostfildern. Hatje Cantz.
- Barad, K. (2014) Diffracting Diffraction: Cutting Together-Apart. *Parallax*, 20(3), pp. 168-187, DOI: 10.1080/13534645.2014.927623.
- Barenblat, R. (2013, July 03). *Gleanings on kabbalah and quantum physics* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://velveteenrabbi.blogs.com/blog/2013/07/gleanings-kabbalah-physics.html>
- Bergström, G. & Boréus, K. (2012a). Samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys. In G. Bergström & K. Boréus (eds.), *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. 3., [utök.] uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

- Bergström, G. & Boréus, K. (2012b). Diskursanalys. In G. Bergström & K. Boréus (eds.), *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. 3., [utök.] uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Biesta, G. (2004). 'Mind the gap!' Communication and the educational relation. In C. Bingham & A. Sidorkin (eds.), *No education without relation* (11–22). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Biesta, G. (2011). *God utbildning i mätningens tidevarv*. [Good education in an age of measurement] 1. Edition. Stockholm: Liber.
- Biesta, G. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Book chapters and script. (n.d.). Retrieved May 17, 2016, from <http://www.alice-in-wonderland.net/resources/chapters-script/>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carlsson, R. & Nilholm, C. (2004). Demokrati och inkludering – en begreppsdiskussion. [Democracy and inclusion – discussion of concepts]. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 13(2), pp. 77-95.
- Ceder, S. (2015). *Cutting through water: towards a posthuman theory of educational relationality*. Diss. Lund: Lunds universitet, 2015.
- Chapter 6: Pig and Pepper. (n.d.). Retrieved May 17, 2016, from <http://www.alice-in-wonderland.net/resources/chapters-script/alices-adventures-in-wonderland/chapter-6/>.
- Davies, B. (2014). Reading Anger in Early Childhood Intra-Actions: A Diffractive Analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), pp. 734–741, doi: 10.1177/1077800414530256.
- Dempster, B. (2000). *Sympoietic and autopoietic systems: A new distinction for self-organizing systems*, in: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Systems Sciences and ISSS, edited by J. K. Allen and J. Wilby, pp. 1-18.
- Di Leo, J. R. (ed.) (2015). Posthumanisms. *Symploke: A Journal for the Intermingling of Literary, Cultural and Theoretical Scholarship*, 23 (1-2).
- Dolphijn, R. & van der Tuin, I. (2012). *New materialism: interviews & cartographies*. Ann Arbor: Open humanities press. Retrieved at <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.11515701.0001.001>
- Edwards, R. (2012). Theory Matters: Representation and experimentation in education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(5), pp. 522-534, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00719.x.

- Foucault, M. (1989[1974]). *The order of things: an archaeology of the human sciences*. Repr. London: Tavistock/Routledge.
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ). (n.d.). Retrieved May 17, 2016, from <http://www.alice-in-wonderland.net/resources/faq/#copyright>.
- Gammelgaard, S. L. (2014). Cutting up the sensible. Rancièrian politics in a posthumanist perspective. In B., Revelles Benavente, A. M., González Ramos & K., Nardini (coord.). *New feminist materialism: engendering an ethico-onto-epistemological methodology*. *Artnodes*, 14, pp. 51-56. UOC [Accessed: 05/05/16].  
<<http://journals.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/artnodes/article/view/n14-gammerglaand/n14-gammerglaand-en>> doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/a.v0i14.2409>.
- Gilbert, S. F., Sapp, J. & Tauber, A. I. (2012). A Symbiotic View of Life: We Have Never Been Individuals. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 87(4), pp. 325–341.
- Guerrero, R., Margulis, L. & Berlanga, M. (2013). Symbiogenesis: the holobiont as a unit of evolution. *International Microbiology*, 16(3), pp. 133-143, doi: 10.2436/20.1501.01.188.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), pp. 575-599.
- Haraway, D. (1992). The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others, In *Cultural Studies*, Eds. L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, P. A. Treichler, New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (2000). A Cyborg Manifesto. Science, technology and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century. In *The Cybercultures Reader*. D., Bell & B., M. Kennedy (eds.). London: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (2008). *When species meet*. Minnesota, MI: University of Minnesota Press.
- Haraway, D. (2011). *SF: Science Fiction, Speculative Fabulation, String Figures, So Far*. SFRA meetings, July 7, 2011. Available online:  
<http://people.ucsc.edu/~haraway/Files/PilgrimAcceptanceHaraway.pdf>
- Haraway, D. (2013). Multispecies Cosmopolitics: Staying with the Trouble. *Institute for humanities research* [Online lecture]. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/62081248>.
- Haraway, D. (2015a). Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Chthulucene Donna Haraway in conversation with Martha Kenney. In H., Davis and E., Turpin (eds.), *Art in the Anthropocene Encounters Among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments and Epistemologies*, London: Open Humanities Press, 2015.
- Haraway, D. (2015b). Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making

- Kin. *Environmental Humanities*, 6, pp. 159-165.
- Haug, P., Egelund, N. & Persson, B. (2006). *Inkluderande pedagogik i skandinaviskt perspektiv*. 1. uppl. Stockholm: Liber
- Heidenreich, S. (2016), Freeportism as Style and ideology: Post-internet and Speculative Realism, Part I. *e-flux Journal* 71 (March 2016), section "Lack of Transparency, Black Money", accessed May 3 2016, <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/freeportism-as-style-and-ideology-part-i-post-internet-and-speculative-realism/>.
- Hustak, C. & Myers, N. (2012). Involuntary Momentum: Affective Ecologies and the Sciences of Plant/Insect Encounters. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 23:3, 206–223. Doi: 10.1215/10407391-1892907.
- Isenberg, B. (2011). Kritik och Kris: Reinhart Kosellecks tes om modernitetens tillblivelse. In J. Lindgren (ed.), *Kritik*. Malmö: Tidskriftsföreningen Fronesis.
- Jonsson, R. & Milani, T. M. (2009). Här är alla lika! Jämlikhetsideologi och konstruktionen av den "Andre" i media och skola. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 18(2), pp. 67-86.
- Juelskjær, M. (2013). Gendered subjectivities of spacetime matter. *Gender and Education*, 25 (6), pp. 754–768.
- Katalys (2014). *Vägen till en likvärdig skola [Elektronisk resurs]: åtgärdsprogram för att reparera den svenska skolan* [The way towards an equal school: Action Program to the Reparation of the Swedish School]. Stockholm: Katalys.  
[http://static.katalys.org/uploads/report/pdf\\_color/9/katalys\\_no\\_7.pdf](http://static.katalys.org/uploads/report/pdf_color/9/katalys_no_7.pdf)
- Kleinman, A. (2012). Intra-actions. Interview with Barad, Karen. *Mousse*, 34, pp. 76-81.
- Krumm, H.-J. (2004). Heterogeneity: multilingualism and democracy. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 13(3), pp. 61-77.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2012). A diffractive and Deleuzean approach to analyzing interview data. *Feminist Theory*, 13(3), pp. 265–281.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. & Palmer, A. (2013). A more 'livable' school? A diffractive analysis of the performative enactments of girls' ill-/well-being with(in) school environments. *Gender and Education*, 25(6), pp. 671–687, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2013.829909>.
- Leucippus, Democritus & Taylor, C.C.W. (1999). *The Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus: Fragments: a Text and Translation with a Commentary (Phoenix. Supplementary Volume; 36 = Phoenix. Tome Supplémentaire) [Electronic recourse]*. University of Toronto Press.
- Lindblad, S. & Popkewitz, T. (2000). Educational Governance and Social Inclusion and Exclusion: some conceptual difficulties and problematics in policy and research.

- Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 21(1), pp. 5-44.
- Musil, R. (1997). [1930–42] *The Man without Qualities*, Sophie Wilkins and Burton Pike (trans.) (London: Picador).
- Nilholm, Claes & Göransson, Kerstin (2013). *Inkluderande undervisning: vad kan man lära av forskningen*. Härnösand: Specialpedagogiska skolmyndigheten.
- Nissan, G. (2010), A Password to the World That is Coming: The Wedding Celebration of Rabbi Shim'on Bar Yochai, *PARABOLA*, 31(2).
- Online Etymology Dictionary (n.d.). *Individual*. [ONLINE] Available online: <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=individual>. [Accessed 7 May 2016].
- Palmer A. (2011). "How many sums can I do"? Performative strategies and diffractive thinking as methodological tools for rethinking mathematical subjectivity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology (RERM)* Volume: 1 (2011) ISSN: SU\_SWEPUB.
- Prieto, M. (2015). The Other from an Educational Perspective: Beyond Fear, Dependence. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 34(3), pp. 297-309.
- Shapiro, R. (2003). Mistaking Pebbles for Pearls. *Nectar of Non-Dual Truth: A journal of universal religious and philosophical teachings #11 The Pearl of Great Price*, 4(2).
- Shapiro, R. (2014, May 14). 14 Ain and Ani [Web log post]. Retrieved from [http://www.patheos.com/blogs/rabbiramishapiro/2014/05/14-ain-and-ani/#disqus\\_thread](http://www.patheos.com/blogs/rabbiramishapiro/2014/05/14-ain-and-ani/#disqus_thread)
- Simon, J. (2010). Neo-Materialism, Part I: The Commodity and the Exhibition. *e-flux Journal* 20 (November 2010), under "Stealing Beauty" image, accessed May 3 2016, <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/neo-materialism-part-one-the-commodity-and-the-exhibition/>.
- Snaza, N., Appelbaum, P., Bayne, S., Carlson, D., Morris, M., Rotas, N., Sandlin, J., Wallin, J. & Weaver, J. (2014). Toward a Posthumanist Education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30 (2), pp. 39-55.
- Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. (2011). *Ancient Atomism*. Retrieved 4 May, 2016, from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/atomism-ancient/>.
- Säfström, C. A. (2010). Vad kan utbildning åstadkomma? En kritik av idealiserade föreställningar om utbildning. [What can education accomplish? A critique of idealized images of education]. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 19(3), pp. 11-22.
- Säfström, C. A. (2011). What I Talk About When I Talk About Teaching and Learning. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30(5), pp. 485-489.

- Tallberg Broman, I., Rubinstein Reich, L. & Hägerström, J. (2002). *Likvärdighet i en skola för alla: historisk bakgrund och kritisk granskning* [Equity in a school for everyone: Historical background and a critical overview]. Stockholm, Sweden: National Agency of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=1105>.
- Taylor, A. & Giugni, M. (2012). Common Worlds: Reconceptualising inclusion in early childhood communities. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 13(2), pp. 108–119.
- The New Kabbalah (n.d.). *Ein-sof*. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.newkabbalah.com/einsof.html> [Accessed 14 May 2016].
- Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Tornberg, U. (2004). "Multiculturalism" – a dead end inconceptualizing difference, or an open-ended approach to facilitating democratic experiences in the foreign language classroom? *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 13(3), pp. 127-143.
- Tynell, S. (2014). *Kritikens kris: En diskursanalys av begreppet kritiskt tänkande inom förskollärautbildningen* [The crisis of critique: A discourse analysis of the concept of critical thinking within pre-school teacher education] (Bachelor's Essay). Malmö: Barnunga-samhälle, Malmö högskola. Available online: <http://www.uppsatser.se/uppsats/8a710df5b9/>.
- Valabregue-Perry, S. (2012). The Concept of Infinity (Eyn-sof) and the Rise of Theosophical Kabbalah. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 102(3), pp. 405-430.
- van der Tuin, I. (2011). "A Different Starting Point, a Different Metaphysics": Reading Bergson and Barad Diffractively. *Hypatia*, 26(1), pp. 22-42.
- Wolfson, E. R. (2012). Nihilating Nonground and the Temporal Sway of Becoming: Kabbalistically Envisioning Nothing Beyond Nothing. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 17(3), pp. 31-44, Doi: 10.1080/0969725X.2012.722392.
- Åsberg, C., Hultman, M. & Lee, F. (eds.) (2012). *Posthumanistiska nyckeltexter*. 1. uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

# Appendix

## *Ideas used for the diffractive speculative fabulation*

The following passages are used in the diffractive re-telling of Alice's story in the diffractive speculative fabulation that is performed in the discussion of this study (fifth chapter):

'Who are YOU?' said the Caterpillar.

This was not an encouraging opening for a conversation. Alice replied, rather shyly, 'I—I hardly know, sir, just at present— at least I know who I WAS when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then.'

*(Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, Chapter 5)*

Alice laughed. 'There's no use trying,' she said: 'one *can't* believe impossible things.' 'I daresay you haven't had much practice,' said the Queen. 'When I was your age, I always did it for half-an-hour a day. Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast.'

*(Through the Looking Glass and what Alice found there, Chapter 5)*

'Oh, I've had such a curious dream!' said Alice, and she told her sister, as well as she could remember them, all these strange Adventures of hers that you have just been reading about; and when she had finished, her sister kissed her, and said, 'It WAS a curious dream, dear, certainly: but now run in to your tea; it's getting late.' So Alice got up and ran off, thinking while she ran, as well she might, what a wonderful dream it had been.

So she sat on, with closed eyes, and half believed herself in Wonderland, though she knew she had but to open them again, and all would change to dull reality.

Lastly, she pictured to herself how this same little sister of hers would, in the after-time, be herself a grown woman; and how she would keep, through all her riper years, the simple and loving heart of her childhood: and how she would gather about her other little children, and make THEIR eyes bright and eager with many a strange tale, perhaps even with the dream of Wonderland of long ago: and how she would feel with all their simple sorrows, and find a pleasure in all their simple joys, remembering her own child-life, and the happy summer days.

THE END

*(Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, Chapter 12)*

Finally, and not a moment too soon, sym-poiesis displaces auto-poiesis, and all other self-forming and self-sustaining system fantasies. Sym-poiesis is a carrier bag for ongoingness, for becoming-with, for staying with the trouble, of inheriting the damages and achievements of colonial and post-colonial natural-cultural histories, in the telling of story upon story for still possible recuperation.

(Haraway, 2013, 1:10:10)

For a minute or two she stood looking at the house, and wondering what to do next, when suddenly a footman in livery came running out of the wood—(she considered him to be a footman because he was in livery: otherwise, judging by his face only, she would have called him a fish)—and rapped loudly at the door with his knuckles. It was opened by another footman in livery, with a round face, and large eyes like a frog; and both footmen, Alice noticed, had powdered hair that curled all over their heads. She felt very curious to know what it was all about, and crept a little way out of the wood to listen.

*(Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, Chapter 6)*

Agential cuts never sit still; they are iteratively reworked. Inside/outside is undone. Constitutive exclusions are both the conditions of possibility for openness, for reworking im/possibilities [*sic*], and are themselves always being reworked as part of this reiterative dynamics. An uncanny topology: no smooth surfaces, willies everywhere. Differences percolate through every 'thing', reworking and being reworked through reiterative reconfigurings of spacetime-matterings – the ongoing rematerialisings of relationalities, not among pre-existing bits of matter in a pre-existing space and time, but in the ongoing reworkings of 'moments', 'places', and 'things' – each being (re)threaded through the other. Differences are always shifting within. Intra-actions don't occur between presences. Intra-actions are a ghostly causality, of a very different order.

(Barad, 2010, p. 268, footnote 9).

‘Between’ will never be the same. One is two few, two is too many.  
(Barad, 2010, p.251)

Understanding “is the specifically human way of being alive, for every single person needs to be reconciled to a world into which he was born a stranger and in which, to the extent of his distinct uniqueness, he always remains stranger” ([Arendt, 1994], p. 308).  
(Biesta, 2013, p. 113)

*In an important sense, in a breathtakingly intimate sense, touching, sensing, is what matter does, or rather, what matter is: matter is condensations of response-ability. Touching is a matter of response. Each of “us” is constituted in response-ability. Each of “us” is constituted as responsible for the other, as the other.*  
(Barad, 2012a, p. 215)

This is a sym-poietic telling of propositional stories about the origin of ethics—a string-figuring. It figures response-ability as becoming-with, and it’s rooted in the riskiness of play. It’s rooted in taking chances with one another, not in prohibition. Ethics is not primarily a rule-based activity, but a propositional, worlding activity.  
(Haraway, 2015a, pp. 261)

Is that not in the nature of touching? Is touching not by its very nature always already an involution, invitation, invisitation, wanted or unwanted, of the stranger within?  
(Barad, 2012a, p. 207)

Responsibility is not a calculation to be performed. It is a relation always already integral to the world’s ongoing intra-active becoming and not-becoming. It is an iterative (re)opening up to, an enabling of responsiveness. Not through the realisation of some existing possibility, but through the iterative reworking of im/possibility /.../  
(Barad, 2010, p. 265)

*Memory – the pattern of sedimented enfoldings of iterative intra-activity – is written into the fabric of the world.*  
(Barad, 2010, p. 261)