
New Materialist Becomings and Futurities: A Panel Intra-view

Jacqueline Barreiro
Simon Fraser University.

Melisse Vroegindewej
Utrecht University

Received: 19/10/2019

Accepted: 02/12/2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1344/jnmr.v1i1.30132>

Abstract

Derived from Karen Barad's intra-action, the term intra-view aims to do justice to the continuous process of becoming that is evident in the asynchronous, generative dialogue of this panel. This panel intra-view provides readers with the opportunity to think with the participants, Fernando Hernández-Hernández, Iris van der Tuin, Nathalie Sinclair, Olga Cielemeńska and Monika Rogowska-Stangret, and their encounters and engagements with new materialism, and how they in turn affect our scholarship.

Keywords

Intra-view, becoming, futurity, asynchronous dialogue, encounters

The term *intra-view*₁ is derived from Karen Barad's intra-action which "signifies the mutual constitution of entangled agencies" (2007, p. 33). In other words, entities emerge out of performative relationalities in a continuous process of becoming. Through intra-action, worlds are (re)configured in diffraction patterns (Barad 2007;

¹ We first heard the term intra-view from Nathalie Sinclair.

2014). Following Karen Barad's intra-action we conceptualize intra-view to show the mutual constitution of questions, responses, comments and technologies (Google Docs, email, Skype, computers, etc.) from which new understandings and questions emerge. In curating this interview we have made specific cuts by posing questions and bringing people and ideas together. It is our hope that as these bodies of thought come into contact and affect each other creating diffractive patterns that new possibilities and virtualities are opened for the reader.

This panel intra-view took place digitally, via email and Google Docs in the period between June and November 2019. Entangled in this intra-view are Fernando Hernández-Hernández (FHH), Iris van der Tuin (IvdT), Nathalie Sinclair (NS), Olga Cielemeńska (OC) and Monika Rogowska-Stangret (MRS) as respondents; and Jacqueline Barreiro (JB) and Melisse Vroegindeweyj (MV) as co-editors. We chose the respondents among the section editors of the journal because we thought it would be interesting to hear the different voices of the scholars involved in producing the very first issue of *Matter: Journal of New Materialist Research*.

In choosing the questions² for this first intra-view, our aim was to provide readers with the opportunity to think with the participants about the different ways in which each of us encountered new materialisms, how we engage with new materialist theories, and how they in turn affect our scholarship. This aim is represented in questions 1 and 2. Questions 3 and 4 invites us to think critically about new materialisms and some of the issues that have been raised within the field. Question 5 opens the conversation and encourages us all to speculate on the futurities of new materialisms.

In a first instance, participants were emailed the questions and invited to respond. Responses were then compiled in one document. In a second instance the participants were invited to respond to the responses of others via a Google document. In a third instance, and given the asynchronous timing of their responses, some of the comments, requests for clarification or questions posed to each other, were sent via email to participants to invite them to respond or clarify. We have tried

² We would like to thank Suzanne Smythe and Nathalie Sinclair for their feedback on our questions.

to represent this process in the text by indenting the responses and in some instances inserting a commentary in parenthesis.

In bringing together the responses of the participants we realized that the conversation was indeed generative because although the questions were posed to the participants, the asynchronous dialogue created by their responses and comments highlights the rhizome of our thinking together.

Last but not least, we want to express our appreciation to Fernando Hernández-Hernández, Iris van der Tuin, Nathalie Sinclair, Olga Cielemecka and Monika Rogowska-Stangret for the time and energy they put in engaging with our questions and each other's thoughts.

Intra-view

JB, MV: How did you first encounter new materialism, and what drew you to it?

IvdT: I first encountered new materialism as an intuition, a vague idea or feeling that what I was teaching (Sandra Harding's 1986 monograph *The Science Question in Feminism*) was not what I was reading (Sara Ahmed, Karen Barad, Rosi Braidotti, Claire Colebrook, Vicki Kirby, ...).

IvdT: Here, I am talking about the Sara Ahmed of *Differences that Matter*, for example, Ahmed's 1998 PhD book that traverses postmodernism and marxism. And about books such as *Strange Encounters*. I was not worried about Ahmed's later dismissal of new materialism or about new materialism as a label. I was simply teaching a certain set of texts and reading another, and wondering about these two sets as disjunctive.

[IvdT answer continues]: Upon the occasion of a PhD seminar with Barad,³ offered by the thematic gender studies unit at Linköping University in Sweden, I developed

³ March 2005, PhD Course "From Social Constructivism to New Materialism: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology and Knowledge Production" offered by the Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary Gender Studies (Linköping University)

the idea that something was happening on the intersection of generationality and theories of meaning, body, and matter. I coined this intersection ‘third-wave feminist materialism’ and had a topic for my PhD dissertation!

NS: Interesting to think of waves as they relate to diffraction. A third wave not in the sense of coming after a first or a second one, but more.

FHH: I cannot say there’s a moment, a first encounter, like an epiphany. This question makes me think that I already had a materialistic attitude before I heard of the ‘New Materialisms.’ One of the first research projects I was involved with explored the relationships between pedagogical models and the materiality of two early childhood classrooms. Although my initial training was in psychology, since I was an undergraduate, I considered behaviour is not placed in a vacuum, but linked to and affected by the materiality and discursive frameworks with which it intra-actuated. That’s why I was interested in the ecological perspective of psychology, although I was conscious of its functionalist character.

MRS: I really like Fernando’s notion of having a ‘materialist attitude’ before he heard of new materialism. It relates well to me with Iris’s ‘intuition, a vague idea’ and with how Fernando writes below about dissatisfaction with research to which he was being trained – which, I believe – was also Olga’s and mine case with traditional Western philosophy. It makes me think that we have always already been new materialist, that we have felt it more at first than knew it.

lvdT: I am thinking about the difference between an attitude and a methodology? I think an attitude helps one, even a student, intuit a method’s potential. Strong intuitions may guide one’s choices. Alternatively, or in conversation with this, there is the potential of grounded theory, where the research materials guide or co-define methodological choices.

The latter point by Monika can be pushed to an interesting instantiation of new materialism itself, an entanglement of matter and discourse, or to a definition of discourse that gives equal importance to words (‘new materialism’) and material

practices (a certain way of reading, a certain feeling). It also demonstrates the emancipatory force of 'labels' whereby something felt, but not known, suddenly becomes an established academic practice. With labelling and emancipation obviously also comes exclusion: where does new materialism end? And who can be a new materialist?

NS: I think Iris's comment on attitude and methodology connects well with some of the indigenous methodologies that are being written about and underscores the ethics of methodology. I heard yesterday an indigenous research talk about the protocols of research...⁴ 'Protocol' derives from 'first' and 'glue.' What an interesting word: first+glue.⁵ Very material!

[FHH answer continues]: Later, my interest in ethnography brought out the role of the material and the immaterial play in social relations. Another important moment was the discovery of actor-network theory, and the consideration of how the different actors (human and non-human) are affected within the systems to which we pay attention. After this trajectory there comes a period where my dissatisfaction with the kind of qualitative research I was doing brought me to read about the post-qualitative turn and, as part of it, the new materialism became part of my agenda of interests. In this journey, in the stage that I now find myself, the collaboration with Beatriz Revelles Benavente in our research group⁶ contributed to having an interlocutor with whom to share readings and debate on new materialism in the seminars we organized in the doctorate of Arts and Education. Thanks to her, I also participated in a COST⁷ meeting where I could appreciate the value of the international network of colleagues that shares their interest in new materialisms.

MRS: I love how certain topics link our voices with one another – collaborations were also important for Olga and me and are linked directly

⁴ It was Vicki Kelly, from Simon Fraser University, who talked about protocol in a faculty meeting.

⁵ For its etymology, see: <https://www.etymonline.com/word/protocol>.

⁶ The research group refers to ESBINA: Subjectivities, visualities and contemporary learning environments. See: <https://esbrina.eu/en/home/>.

⁷ The COST meeting refers to COST Action IS1307 New Materialism: Networking European Scholarship on 'How Matter Comes to Matter' (2014-18).

for us to how one practices feminist new materialist research, or – to use Dolphijn and Van der Tuin's (2012) term – how new materialisms are put to work.

And then there's also a question of generations here – and it links to Iris's comment (generationality) and Nathalie's comment below that mentions her former PhD student and above – about the waves that are more than linear organization of knowledge production. It is interesting to observe how new materialisms have emerged (also) out of those generative inter- and intra-generational meetings, readings, discussions...

NS: My first encounter with new materialism was through the work of Karen Barad. I had a PhD student at the time—Sean Chorney, now my colleague—who was very interested in the topic of agency as it relates to the mathematics classroom. We had noticed that while Andrew Pickering was willing to talk about material agency in the case of science, mathematics was somehow treated differently. Given my interest in the relationship between mathematics and machines, fuelled in part by Brian Rotman's work, but also by my own research on the use of digital tools for mathematics learning, I found Pickering's account wanting. But Barad's agential realism provided a way to think about the materiality of concepts more generally, and of mathematical concepts in particular. At the same time, with Elizabeth de Freitas, we had been reading Gilles Châtelet, whose material account of mathematical invention seemed to work so productively with Barad.

OC, MRS: Feminist new materialisms were – for us – always already a research practice and a collaboration-building practice. The two of us have been sharing the new materialist journey together from the very beginning. On the one hand, coming from the field of philosophy, new materialisms offered a breathing space away from masculinist, human-centric, hierarchical, and highly disciplined traditions of philosophizing to which we were trained. We were PhD students at a time in an institution formed by the tradition of analytical philosophy, the Lviv-Warsaw School. On the other hand, gender studies research in Poland was mainly coming from social sciences and literary studies. As much as we appreciated the feminist and queer

knowledge production in our region, because we used philosophical disciplinary discourses and methodologies (and not those of social science or literary studies) we were also feeling a bit alienated in terms of its concepts and methodologies. New materialisms were an interdisciplinary playground for us, where we could experiment with concepts, imagine practicing philosophy otherwise, and even unlearn deep-rooted theories' genealogies.

JB, MV: Can you mention some of the thinkers and concepts in new materialism that you are working with? How have their insights affected your own scholarship?

OC, MRS: We fathom feminist new materialisms as a process with which we interact through various concepts and thinkers, some of whom do not consider themselves as new materialist (think Elizabeth Grosz, for instance). New materialism provides tools that can be inspiring for different aims and that reorient us to take unanticipated paths. We are wary of seeing new materialism as a static set of ideas on a way of becoming a canon. For us it is rather, again, a conceptual playground that allows us to stay with – as Anna Tsing (2012) would have it – ‘unruly edges.’ However, it is also a blanket always too short. Other feminist, queer, environmentalist, anti-oppressive traditions are no less important to us.

NS: “A blanket always too short” is very nicely said! Too short but especially, always in need of new foldings.

IvdT: I have worked a lot with the theorists -- Ahmed, Barad, and Colebrook -- who were the ‘case studies’ in my PhD. Afterwards I started working on *New Materialism: Interviews and Cartographies* (2012) with Rick Dolphijn and we reached out to Manuel DeLanda, who coined ‘new materialism’ whilst Braidotti coined ‘neo materialism,’ and to Quentin Meillassoux, who worked on ‘speculative realism’ whilst Barad worked on ‘agential realism.’ Both DeLanda’s and Meillassoux’s creative responses to good-old realism made us decide to include them in the new-materialist category. In the end, the traversing of Harding’s feminist empiricism, on the one hand, and, on the other, feminist postmodernism was what defined new materialisms for us. Earlier I had taken this argument from Donna Haraway’s engagement with Harding in “Situated Knowledges” (1988).

NS: So why is it that these speculative philosophers are not usually brought into discussions of new materialism? I have often thought that it was their less political bent (esp. Meillassoux), but what else is going on?

IvdT: I always think this is mainly a matter of genealogy. Speculative realists do not ground themselves in discussions about Marxism and feminist standpoint theory. Or in feminist discussions about realism, for that matter. They don't read Lynn Hankinson Nelson who, by the way, published one of Barad's (1996) earliest agential realism papers!

NS: I would say that Barad is the main one, but with and through her, many of the ideas of prior thinkings, such as Deleuze and Whitehead, have resonated in new ways.

MRS: And here again inter- and intra- generationalities and waves disturbing linearities are at play!

[NS answer continues]: I think that the concept of intra-action has been particularly generative as a way to think about ontological aspects of concept formation in the mathematics classroom and also the idea that tools can be productive of concepts, and not just mediators of pre-existing mathematical concepts. The kind of diffractive analysis that Barad uses has also been important methodologically in my work. And at a more general level, the kind of 'yes, and' thinking of new materialism has influenced my scholarship in pushing me to find new ways to think about how different theories or sets of assumptions can work side-by-side, without necessarily ever cohering. This new kind of logic is highly relevant to current questions in British Columbia such as, how do we indigenize the mathematics curriculum?

IvdT: Can you say a few words more, perhaps, about this process of indigenization?

NS: I think that at this point, through work that Elizabeth de Freitas and I have done, the main question has been around how to recover/repeat a minor mathematics, and how to do so in a way that it is not already a secondary, 'ethno' mathematics (like the shape of teepees). I think there is something to

be pursued in relation to aesthetics/ethics, that is, the values at stake in a minor mathematics.

MRS: It makes me think of the roundtable discussion Olga and I have curated for this first issue of *Matter* – we have a short essay from Professor Gurminder Bhambra who addresses the question of decolonization of curriculum.

FHH: There are three concepts that I consider most present in my trajectory. Barad's (2007) intra-action, because it has made possible to consider the whole 'non-human' dimension and to explore, on its basis, what post-humanist research and pedagogy may become. The notion of affection, because it allowed me to reread Spinoza's work from another perspective and appreciate his figure and contribution from another frame. One of my interests is related to affective pedagogy, or if you will, to the consideration of learning as a process that takes place when someone feels affected by others and the world, in the sense that there is a change of gaze of themselves. In this issue, the contributions of Anna Hickey-Moody and Dennis Atkinson – especially Hickey-Moody's contribution to a genealogy of the notions of affect and affection and her linkage of learning with the notion of event have been particularly influential. Finally, and just to cite three, the notion of 'sympathy,' as is explored by Elizabeth de Freitas, helps me to expand the meaning of sharing and opens me to a new praxis on my work as an academic and citizen.

MRS: I like how in Fernando's comments academia and life 'outside' of it (that is never really outside) entangle! I read it as an effort to think academia and theoretical research in an response-enabling way, accountable to our communities, away from an image of academia as an ivory tower. But also as an invitation to rethink our material, everyday practices!

JB, MV: New materialist theory has been criticized for not having (enough) political potential, for example, as being reductionist, positivist, or too centered around Western philosophy. In a world of climate change, neoliberalism, and the rise of the political far-right, what is the political potential of new materialism? How can new materialism create a better future?

IvdT: Haraway has argued that all scholarship is partial: incomplete and biased. Partial perspectives are (to be) privileged because they demonstrate (as in: point out) an awareness of their own situatedness. Besides that she argues that we should, as situated scholars, actively construct the best possible perspectives for our work. OncoMouse™ was such an active construction of her own making, a living creature that requires care and an abstract(ed) figure to think with. She constructed the figuration in the late 1990s as to learn more about the technoscientific laboratory than STS scholars in the tradition of symmetrical anthropology possibly could (Haraway 1997). Colleagues critiquing the new materialisms for its deficient political potential want to push 'us' in the direction of a better partiality, a partiality that allows us to see more patterns of in- and exclusion and—I would add—more interesting outliers and diffraction patterns. This discussion has had an important impact on new-materialist research in Europe. Think about the Euro-Australian research on 'interfaith childhoods' by Anna Hickey-Moody and on terror/ism by scholars such as Evelien Geerts, working on Belgium and France from the Netherlands and the USA, and Katharina Karcher, working in the UK on German case studies primarily.

FHH: I would not say that the foundations of the new materialisms are positivist, since their onto-epistemology is radically different. But sometimes it can be interpreted as sustaining a certain authoritarianism. In the sense that it is configured as an opposition, on the basis of a kind of a moral supremacy. However, as Bruno Latour stated when speaking of constructionism, this positionality against something or someone, eludes the fact that what is proposed from the new materialisms is because other colleagues have reflected on these issues from other directions. In this sense, I believe that the challenge is to think from and not against. Although I can understand that, in the context in which the new materialist turn began, was as a reaction to the imposition of a hegemonic vision of what research in education and social sciences should be.

NS: This [the idea of new materialism as oppositional] is not my impression at all. I think that in the Van der Tuin and Dolphijn (2012) book, there is an explicit argument that new materialism is not about opposing or replacing at

all. It is perhaps when we write papers, we are coerced back into this situating our work (usually by pointing to difference) that it is easy to fall back into 'supremacy' and here is where methodology can ripple through much wider than it is usually assumed to—this probably resonates with the conversation around attitude.

[FHH Continues]: Another problem pointed out in this question has to do with the relation of new materialisms with some spheres of reality (whatever reality means). The forgetting of the postcolonial position is a good example, and the criticism of some Australian colleagues⁸ on this issue seems to me to be well founded, and necessary to learn from it. I have the impression that the new materialisms, as well as the post-qualitative turn, began with a certain dazzling by authors such as Deleuze, Braidotti, Barad or Massumi and this led to a notion of research considered as an expression of thought. This approach, which has been necessary to rethink the onto-epistemological-methodological and ethical foundations of an alternative approach to research, now requires research that can offer other ways of understanding the social phenomena we are interested in. If we manage to create this bridge – in our research group we are trying to do so by approaching how teachers learn – I see a promising path that can lead us to carry out another kind of research.

NS: Yes, I am familiar with this critique. Of course, it is hard to understand how the work of people like Haraway, Barad and Bennett is not seen as political. But I think this has a lot to do with the attachment of critical theories to certain ideas around identity, which new materialists are disturbing. This can make it seem like certain issues facing minorities, such as achievement gaps amongst Indigenous students in Canada, cannot be adequately addressed by new materialism because the particular history of the genocide of Indigenous people in Canada is not taken to matter enough. In recent years, I have read more Indigenous scholarship as well as critical race theory literature, and have learned so much. Fred Moten, for example, is very convincing in his analysis of the racism inherent in philosophy since Kant, in the very

⁸ See for example Gerrard, Rudolph, and Sriprakash (2017).

shaping of 'our' European ideas of what it means to know, to think, to value. While this is in line with Barad's general point about boundary-making practices⁹ (and Rancière's [2004] approach to the politics of aesthetics), the specifics of these Baradian cuts matter enormously. Speaking for myself, rather than for new materialism more generally, I think that the 'yes, and' of new materialism can help avoid an appropriation of non-Western philosophical ideas and instead allow me to think both, as precisely as possible, at the same time.

IvdT: How does this work in a situation where canonization is still a power-saturated affair? Where libraries are still bastions of discrimination and exclusion? Where knowledge is still firewalled? This more Foucauldian take on discourse needs a place in our analysis, too, besides a Deleuzean one, perhaps.

NS: Yes this is a good point. Petra Mikulan and I have experimented with what she calls a methodology of stratigraphy that tries to do this kind of reading at different scales of mattering that do not converge (necessarily) or even tell any coherent story (anathema for a research paper!). But either it is not satisfying or I have to change what I consider to be satisfying!

MRS: I very much like the openness to learn from others that – from my reading of this intra-view – emerges out of our responses! It is – to my mind – one way of destabilizing canons: experiment with reading lists and class syllabi and it links again to one of the voices in the roundtable curated by Olga and myself, that of Jessie Loyer, an Indigenous (Cree-Métis) librarian.

OC, MRS: The way we see it, new materialisms value unlearning, as they train us to perceive the world through relations first and foremost (rather than objects, subjects, goals, categories, norms, etc.). Thus, new materialisms are one of many different ways of telling stories about the world. Concepts however, can take us on different journeys, and not always where we want to go, they can be ab/used to serve different political agendas. The systemic nature of neoliberalism, environmental challenges,

⁹ MRS: See also: Haraway, 1988.

and social injustices needs to be addressed by both conceptual inventiveness and direct political action. [lvdT: Is conceptual inventiveness a form of indirect political action?]. New materialisms stem from academia, thus inherit its problematic pasts, institutional hierarchies and reproduced privileges. In many ways new materialism participates in market economy (new materialism as a brand). This also requires our response and being mindful of our own situatedness and privilege.

JB, MV: New materialist ontologies disrupt 'conventional' research practices (see e.g. Elizabeth St. Pierre's work). To what extent should we 'do away' with methods and/or methodologies? How should we approach research in a way that adequately responds to the world in which we are entangled?

FHH: I consider pertinent the criticism that Jennifer Greene made in 2013 of some of the tensions she observed in the new materialisms. In my research group, experimenting with this perspective has generated intense discussions about why to move forward our relaxed trajectory within qualitative narrative research. On this point, I think that what new materialisms are proposing is an opportunity to review the foundations of the research. However, sometimes I get the impression that we are creating a new elite that, although brilliant in its way of articulating ways of thinking, moves away from the daily problems that require complex thinking and acting. In a world ruled by fake news, we also need not only articles for the initiated academics, but also for teachers, students, and social collectives to be able to think about their own struggles and challenges.

lvdT: We should not do away with any methodology or method whatsoever. We should re-read or refine what we are familiar with. Haraway refined anthropological science studies in the 1990s by inserting it with 'SF,' speculative fiction. This did not involve a doing away with anthropological fieldwork. Her in(ter)vention implied an inter- and transdisciplinary endeavour so as to shift unwanted assumptions (anthropocentrism, for one thing, or a blindness to what Braidotti has called 'methodological nationalism' [see e.g. 2010]). I have recently seen Elizabeth de Freitas (2017), and Felicitas MacGilchrist and colleagues (2019), pick up speculation in/on sociology and education, respectively. The latter new materialists refine

Haraway's ongoing scholarship and re-read canonical approaches in specific fields of scholarship.

NS: New materialism is not in the business of doing away with anything, that is, of replacing other modes of thinking. If there is anything that new materialists can do is help the research community become aware of the ontological and epistemological assumptions that their current methods entail so that the contingencies of the questions asked and methods used are clearly acknowledged. While currently limited in number, I think that some of the post-qualitative methods that have emerged already—such as Petra Mikulan's stratigraphy, but also diffraction—are very promising, even though some early uses of them are still uneasily wrapped up in qualitative methods—and that new ones are likely to emerge. A challenge, at a more general level, will be the increasingly reductive techniques now available in fields such as the Neurosciences, but also, as Isabelle Stengers points out, in the sciences in general. Scholars such as Elizabeth Wilson, who are wading into the sciences with their new materialist eyes are helping us not only appreciate the entanglement of our world, but showing that it is critical for philosophers and social scientists to engage with science, to push science to ask questions that reckon with the entanglement—and this will certainly require new methodological approaches.

OC, MRS: We agree with Iris and Nathalie! Methodologies are always political and 'doing away' with them may be an illusion invisibilizing other feminist and queer theories and activisms, especially those outside of academia. What guides us in our research and teaching is the imperative to stay alert and, to quote Deleuze, "attentive to the unknown knocking at our door," open to the possibility of being surprised (in Puig de la Bellacasa, 2012, p. 212). It resonates well with us what María Puig de la Bellacasa (2012, p. 212) wrote: "[...] we do not know in advance what world is knocking [at our door], inquiring into how we can care will be required in how we will relate to the new."

JB, MV: Lastly, what possibilities and opportunities do you foresee for the future of new materialism? How do you see the field of new materialism growing in the near future?

FHH: I think that my diagnosis on the future of new materialisms has been raised with the answers that I have been thinking and sharing to the previous questions. I come from an academic culture that works on collective proposals, that tries to confront binarism as a political attitude and make a contribution to another project of common life. It seems to me that it is necessary to generate collective projects – this journal could be an opportunity to do that – where others feel invited – not excluded – to take part. Even for those who do not fully share what is being proposed. It will be the only way not to create the sect of new materialists.

MRS: This relates to me again with the roundtable discussion Olga and I have curated for this issue of *Matter* – we invited scholars who are not always feminist new materialist to partake, which as I believe is a practice that addresses the question of canonization and classifications (Van der Tuin, 2015).

NS: This is a difficult question. I wonder if it is worth asking whether new materialism could also not have a future, and what that would mean. Could some of the ideas that we have associated with new materialism find better or just different homes elsewhere? Does being a thing, and ‘ism,’ get in the way of becoming, of thinking, of feeling?

OC: I find this remark so thought-provoking! Indeed, ‘we’ often seem so attached to the idea of future, of growth, and expansion. What would happen if we let go of it? What new openings, new transformations of thought would become possible then?

OC, MRS: We wish to care for the ways of thinking that stay away from canonizations, that cultivate engagement, and avoid having – to use Judith Butler’s (1997) expression – ‘the last word.’ It might be our responsibility to keep new materialisms alive, immune to stagnation, self-congratulatory approaches, definite answers or solutions. In a way, new materialism will stay what it was for us from the beginning – community building practices, in which ethics stays at the forefront and informs our unorthodoxas.

IvdT: The sections of this journal—MATTER: Journal of New Materialist Research—are my leap into the future. [MRS: Yes!]. The section description page shows us where new-materialist research is going, I think. Collectively developing the ideas for the sections, under the inspiring leadership of Beatriz Revelles Benavente, was very inspirational to me.

Bibliography

Ahmed, Sara (1998). *Differences that matter: Feminist theory and postmodernism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ahmed, Sara (2013). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. Routledge.

Barad, Karen (1996). Meeting the universe halfway: Realism and social constructivism without contradiction. In L. H. Nelson & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Feminism, science, and the philosophy of science*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Press (pp. 161-94).

Barad, Karen (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Barad, Karen (2014). Diffracting diffraction: Cutting together-apart. *Parallax*, 20(3), 168-187.

Braidotti, Rosi (2010). Nomadism: Against methodological nationalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(3-4), 408-418.

Butler, Judith (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge.

De Freitas, Elizabeth (2017). Nonhuman findings from the laboratory of speculative sociology. *Minnesota Review*, 88(1), 116-126.

Dolphijn, Rick & Van der Tuin, Iris (2012). *New materialism: Interviews & cartographies*. Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press.

- Greene, Jennifer C. (2013). On rhizomes, lines of flight, mangles, and other assemblages. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 749-758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788763>.
- Haraway, Donna (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Haraway, Donna (1997). *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan©_Meets_Oncomouse™. Feminism and Technoscience*. New York – London: Routledge
- Harding, Sandra (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Macgilchrist, Felicitas; Allert, Heidrun & Bruch, Anne (2019). Students and society in the 2020s: Three future 'histories' of education and technology. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 1-14.
- Puig de la Bellacasa, María (2012). 'Nothing comes without its world': Thinking with care. *The Sociological Review*, 60(2), 197-216.
- Rancière, Jacques (2004). *The politics of aesthetics: The distribution of the sensible*. Translated by Gabriel Rockhill. Continuum.
- Tsing, Anna (2012). Unruly edges: Mushrooms as companion. *Environmental humanities*, 1(1), 141-154.
- Van der Tuin, Iris (2015). *Generational feminism: New materialist introduction to a generative approach*. Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Gerrard, Jessica; Rudolph, Sophie & Sriprakash, Arathi (2017). The politics of post-qualitative inquiry: History and power. *Qualitative inquiry*, 23(5), 384-394.