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is at risk; for the riverine dwellers have so much knowledge, they provide us
with pivotal information about the behaviour of the river through their oral
narratives and memory of the last centuries’. This was said to me by Jorge
Abad, an environmental scientist specializing in hydrodynamics and sedi-
ment transport for tropical rivers, as we talked last summer over a vaso de
chicha de maíz (a treebark drink) on one of the floating bars of the Iquitos River,
in the Belem neighbourhood. There was lots of plastic trash surrounding the
place where we were. ‘There is so much research we need to do to learn about
the river; much of it is still a mystery to us. To get the whole picture of what is
happening right now with the river and its future behaviour our technological
devices are not enough; we need to complete the information with what the
indigenous and riverine people teach us about these waters and lands; there
is a lot in their memories. And now we don’t know what is going to happen
with those plans of turning the river into a hydro via. The Amazon River, for
example, has a need to form islands every 26 kilometres. What will happen
if, with all the dredging required, the river were not able to have its islands?
There is no scientific research on that. We are just starting’. While we sat
on the floating bar, pondering the fate of the upper Amazon River and many
other rivers already damaged due to oil drilling in the region, Don Pedro our
friend and owner of the bar talked to other customers with concern. They
chatted together about the fact that the Amazon River had been pounding
with all the power of his waters on the small stretch of land that separates his
main channel from the city of Iquitos. If the Amazon River does that, he will
come and take away this bar and then the whole city of Iquitos. The custom-
ers continued to speculate about the possibility that the mighty Iquitosama,
the mother of the river has gotten very upset. In their rumouring they say she
is mad, for all the latest overfishing of her children and especially now with
the news about the dredging on the river. One of them says ‘She must be tell-
ing the Iquitosana and other spirits to come back with the force of the water
against the people of Iquitos’.

Chapter Nineteen
Can the Humanities Become Posthuman?
A Conversation
Rosi Braidoi and Cosetta Veronese

CV: Your latest book is called The Posthuman. In consideration of your philo-
sophical development, which is rooted in the study of Foucault, in an uninter-
upted dialogue with Deleuze as well as in feminisms and feminist activisms,
could you explain how your idea of posthumanism developed? In other
words, what have been your transitions on the way towards posthumanism?

RB: For me as a student of Foucault, Deleuze and Irigaray, the crisis of
humanism means the rejection of all forms of universalism, including the social-
ist variation. ‘Man’ cannot claim to represent all humanity because that ‘Man’
is a culture-specific, gender-specific, race-specific and class-specific entity: is
it a European, male, white, intellectual ideal. Moreover, that ideal posits itself
as a norm that everyone else is supposed to imitate and aspire to; but all those
who differ from the Eurocentric, masculinist, white, intellectual norm are clas-
sified as ‘different from’ it. And being ‘different from’ means to be ‘worth less
than’. This hierarchical organisation of difference as negative becomes a very
politically charged issue for feminists, postcolonial, and anti-racist thinkers.

In fact, if you think about it, the structural others of the humanistic sub-
ject re-emerge with a vengeance in postmodernity (Braidotti 2002). It is a
historical fact that the great emancipatory movements of postmodernity are
 driven and fuelled by the resurgent ‘others’: the women’s rights movements;
the anti-racist and de-colonization movements; the anti-nuclear and pro-
environment movements are the voices of the structural Others of modernity.
They inevitably mark the crisis of the former humanist ‘centre’ or dominant
subjects-position and are not merely anti-humanists, but move beyond it to an
altogether novel project. These social and political movements are simul-
aneously the symptom of the crisis of the subject, and for conservatives even
its ‘causa’ and also the expression of positive, proactive alternatives.
In the language of my nomadic theory (see Nomadic Subjects and Nomadic Theory), they express both the crisis of the majority and the patterns of becoming of the minorities. The challenge for critical theory consists in being able to tell the difference between these different flows of mutation.

In other words, the posthumanist position I am defending builds on the anti-humanist legacy, more specifically on the epistemological and political foundations of the poststructuralist generation, and moves further. The alternative views about the human and the new formations of subjectivity that have emerged from the radical epistemologies of Continental philosophy in the last thirty years do not merely oppose humanism but create other visions of the self. Sexualsted, racialized and naturalized differences, far from being the categorical boundaries-keepers of the subject of humanism, have evolved into fully fledged alternative models of the human subject.

CV: The last chapter of your book is dedicated to the future of the human sciences. With a pinch of irony you refer to the 'proliferation of studies' that have developed in the humanities over the last couple of decades. Could you comment on the specific future of literature, or literary studies?

RB: I have observed in Holland, Northern Europe, and the United Kingdom, that the current crisis of the human sciences translates itself at the level of university politics in radical cuts to funding, structures and chairs in the humanities. At the moment, the public image of the human sciences is the worse one we have witnessed since the end of World War II. The dominant image of the humanities today is that of a totally useless university category, which does not produce anything and does not teach anything, but only feeds unemployment. The relationship between journalism, media and the human sciences is dramatically deteriorating. There are multiple reasons for this situation, and there is space for an extensive work and investigation to be conducted upon this issue. It looks like the main, if not the sole, function of the human sciences is to provide a rough cultural mixture (the so-called 'general culture') to students, mainly girls, who are waiting for a good match to marry and who are expected to hold brilliant conversations during dinner time. It is shocking to compare the current situation in the human sciences with that of the 1950s and 1960s, when Simone de Beauvoir and Jean Paul Sartre were treated almost as Heads of States wherever they would go, because of the high intellectual prestige they enjoyed.

We live at a time when the figure of the intellectual is worth nothing. The very term 'intellectual' is barely used, because it sounds outmoded. In the 1980s a new formula to describe the intellectual class was actually coined, that of 'content provider': those individuals who provide the contents. The advent of the Internet in the 1990s and the sudden explosion in content availability transformed intellectuals into 'idea-brokers'. From the 'intellectual' to the 'content provider' to the 'idea broker': we have witnessed an epochal mutation, which deserves a study both from a semiotic and terminological point of view and from an institutional one. In the neo-liberal university focused on the idea of culture as (also) business the figure of the intellectual has lost its original role and place. The downgrading of this figure is a rather sad story.

Nonwithstanding the fact that innovation and creativity are considered the real capital, the humanities, which are the foundation of all this, are marginalized and despised. How do we reconcile these conflicting trends? I believe that instead of withdrawing back into humanism and building a sort of neo-humanistic fortress—a nostalgic and very classic structure—the humanities should open up and move towards the world, embrace with enthusiasm the new challenges that are coming up. The humanities should thus transform into posthuman sciences in the affirmative and constructive sense of the term. They should leave the notion of the crisis behind along with the rhetoric of their crisis: this also means abandoning the feeling of inferiority and subjugation, which inevitably arises from the repetition of the refrain of their economic, social and financial uselessness.

We can consider posthumanism from the point of view of the humanities and that of anthropocentrism. In the former perspective, the urge to reinvent the human is the pivot of the various social movements of the 1970s (feminist, postcolonial, pacifist, anti-nuclear movements among others). The crisis of humanism provided the opportunity to respond to an epochal call for new ways of being and new forms of subjectivity. The critique of universalism triggered the development of new fields of study, which, instead of linking with traditional disciplines, concerned about their purity such as literature and philosophy, grew in-between theirclefs. They gave birth to interdisciplinary groups called 'studies': women studies, gender studies, gey studies, media studies and so on. This constellation of studies reinvented and opened the human sciences after the collapse of humanism, bearing testimony of their great vitality and innovating on both themes and methods.

From the perspective of anti-anthropocentrism, Darwin stands out as one of the colossal figures of modernity. However, his name is totally absent from the humanities. To think of ourselves as one of the members of one of multiple species, with an evolution and genetic structure that is one among many, is not just part of our vocabulary, it is not conceivable within the humanities. From this point of view, there seems to be a dramatic equation between the human sciences and anthropocentrism. To do humanists 'means' to think about the man of humanism: 'If this equation is there to stay, then we have a problem, because the foundation of knowledge in today's world is no longer anthropological, let alone male-centred or Eurocentric. The old fundamental metaphysical categories of male and female have been replaced by a system based on complexity codes, cellites, the infinitesimal levels of dynamics and interaction of what constitutes
the basic foundation of life. Moreover, if, on the one hand, the human consists of a series of informative, genetic, neurological and evolutionary codes, on the other hand, anthropos has been displaced from its former central position by information technology; there is reason to speak about a systematic posthuman turn. There has been a mutation in the centrality of the subject of knowledge, and our fundamental ontology today has become mediated in biogenetic as well as informationalt ways. Information networks live independently of us, as confirmed by the fact that computational and network system are capable of self-repairing without the need of direct human intervention.

Some of the possibilities for literary studies to survive in the current posthuman context are to embrace technology (digital humanities), to include environmental studies (ecocriticism), and to reappropriate the established traditions of science fiction writing. On the theoretical level, both the emphasis on materiality and on affect are also pointing in a new direction, which is less confined by the conventions of the linguistic turn.

CV: Among the enets of posthuman theory you mention ‘transdisciplinarity’. In what does it differ from the more traditional notion of ‘interdisciplinarity’? What are your suggestions for the new vocabulary that the humanities have to build in order to face the challenges of posthumanism?

RB: Posthuman critical theory needs to apply a new vision of subjectivity to both the practice and the public perception of the scientist, which is still caught in the classical and outmoded model of the humanistic ‘Man of reason’ (Lloyd 1984) as the quintessential European citizen. We need to overcome this model and move towards an intensive form of interdisciplinarity, translatability, and boundary-crossings among a range of discourses. This transdisciplinary approach affects the very structure of thought and escapes a rhizomatic embrace of conceptual diversity in scholarship. The posthuman method amounts to higher degrees of disciplinary hybridisation and relies on intense de-familiarisation of our habits of thought through encounters that shatter the flat repetition of the protocols of institutional reason.

In order to come to terms with complex multiplicities, differential entities, rhizomatic transversal connections we need to inject into the system viable alternatives, we need to have something to propose, we need to offer counter-codes, counter-projects, and make counter-proposals. An additional problem in relation to this is that of language. Our language still rails our roads back into linearity and into processes of single focus, when in fact we need a spectrum, we need to be able to keep in our heads multiple utterances, potentially contradictory ones to even begin to make sense of the world that we are in. This is why Deluze and Guattari write in such a complicated manner: because the linearity of language is a real big problem. How can we account for a zigzagging, complex, eternally contradictory world in a linear language? I sometimes think that the humanities are really lost and doomed unless we experience with multiple languages.

This emphasis on renewed conceptual and terminological creativity requires more institutional support than the humanities are receiving at present. We need to set up fundamental humanities’ labs in order to conduct these experiments in a rigorous manner. We need more theory, more creativity.

CV: If posthumanism means demolishing dualism, breaking disciplinary boundaries (as well as nationalistic and political boundaries, in essence: getting rid of the humanistic western paradigm (as well as of any other auxiliary paradigm), which would only bring us back to humanism), which alternatives do we have to make us accountable for the world we live in?

RB: The first step requires consciousness-raising. The social theory literature on shared anxiety about the future of both our species and of our humanistic legacy is very rich and varied. Important liberal thinkers like Habermas (1983) and influential ones like Fukuyama (2000) are very alert on this issue, as are social critics like Sloterdijk (2000) and Borradori (2003). In different ways, they express deep concern for the status of the human, and seen particularly struck by moral and cognitive panic at the prospect of the posthuman turn, blurring our advanced technologies for it. I share their concern but as a posthuman thinker with distinct anti-humanist feelings, I am less prone to panic at the prospect of a displacement of the centrality of the human and can also see the advantages of such an evolution.

I define the critical posthuman subject within an eco-philosophy of multiple belongings, as a relational subject constituted in and by multiplicity, that is to say a subject that works across differences and is also internally differentiated, but still grounded and accountable. Posthuman subjectivity is nomadic and it expresses on embodied and embedded and hence partial form of accountability, based on a strong sense of collectivity, relationality and hence community building. My position is in favour of complexity and promotes radical posthuman subjectivity, resting on the ethics of becoming. The focus is shifted accordingly from unitary to nomadic subjectivity, thus running against the grain of high humanism and its contemporary variations. This view rejects individualism, but also asserts an equally strong distance from relativism or nihilistic defeatism. It promotes an ethical bond of an altogether different sort from the self-interest of an individual subject, as defined along the canonical lines of classical humanism. A posthuman ethics for a non-unitary subject proposes an enlarged sense of interconnection between self and others, including the
nonhuman or ‘earth’ others, by removing the obstacle of self-centred indi-
vidualism. Contemporary biogenetic capitalism generates a global form of
reactive mutual interdependence of all living organisms, including nonhu-
mans. This sort of unity tends to be of the negative kind, as a shared form
of vulnerability, that is to say a global sense of interconnectivity between the
human and the nonhuman environment in the face of common threats. The
posthuman recomposition of human interaction that I propose is not the same
as the reactive bond of vulnerability, but an affirmative bond that locates
the subject in the flow of relations with multiple others.

Labouring towards a non-unitary posthuman subject, we need to acknowl-
edge that there may well be multiple and potentially contradictory projects at
stake in the complex recompositions of ‘the human’ right now: many complex
and contested ways of becoming-world together.

CV: In the keynote speech you gave at the University of Zurich on 24 May
2014, on the occasion of the annual conference of the American Association
for Italian Studies, you mentioned two areas of studies that are the making
of post-anthropocentric humanities: namely animal studies and ecocriticism.
How do you explain their importance in relation to what you suggest are the
fundamental requirements of posthumanism, namely the necessity for it to be
situated, i.e., ‘embodied and embedded’, ‘affirmative’, i.e., constructive, and
for it to call for our accountability?

RB: Animal Studies, ecocriticism and the Environmental humanities as
a whole are pointing in the right direction. It is absolutely true that, once
the centrality of anthropos is challenged, a number of boundaries between
‘Man’ and his others go tumbling down, in a cascade effect that opens up
unexpected perspectives. Thus, if the crisis of humanism inaugurates the
posthuman by empowering the sexualised and racialised human ‘others’
in emancipate themselves from the dialectics of master/slave relations, the
crisis of anthropos relinquishes the demonic forces of the naturalised oth-
ers. Animals, insects, plants and the environment, in fact the planet and the
cosmos as a whole, are called into play. This places a different burden of
responsibility on our species, which is the primary cause for the meta. The
fact that our geological era is known as the ‘Anthropocene’ stresses both the
technologically mediated power acquired by anthropos and its potentially
lethal consequences for everyone else.

The crisis is especially strong in the Human and Social sciences, because
they are the most anthropocentric fields of scholarly research. How can a
historian or a philosopher think of humans as being ‘part of nature’, consid-
ering that academic discourse continues to claim transcendental grounds for
human consciousness? How to reconcile this materialist awareness with the
task of critical thought? As a brand of vital materialism, posthuman theory
contests the arrogance of anthropocentrism and the ‘exceptionalism’ of the
Human as a transcendental category. It strikes instead an alliance with the
productive and inmanent force of zo(e), or life in its nonhuman aspects. This
requires a mutation of our shared understanding of what it means to think at
all, let alone think critically. In The Posthuman I argue that the return to
Spinozist monism as opposed to Hegelian dialectics, which occurred back in
the 1970s with the generation of my teachers, is now finally becoming vi-
able. Monism gives us conceptual tools and a terminology to address humans as
being part of a continuum with all living matter. It is a great advantage.

The question is consequently what the humanities can become, in the post-
human era and after the decline of the primacy of ‘Man’ and of anthropos.
My argument is that, far from being a terminal crisis, these challenges open
up new global, eco-sophical, posthumanist and post-anthropocentric dimen-
sions for the humanities. They are expressed by a second generation of ‘stud-
ies’ areas. Thus animal studies and ecocriticism have grown into such rich
and well-articulated fields, that it is impossible to even attempt to summarise
them. Cultural studies of science and society; religion studies; disability
studies; fat studies; success studies; celebrity studies; globalisation studies
are further significant examples of the exuberant state of the new humanities
in the twenty-first century. New media has proliferated into a whole series of
sub-sections and meta-fields: software studies, internet studies, game studies
and more. This vitality justifies optimism about the future of the humani-
ties, with media theory and media philosophy providing the new ontological
grounds for knowledge production, while the curriculum of the traditional
humanities disciplines—notably philosophy—resists any interdisciplinary
contamination. In this fast moving landscape, literary analysts and critical
enquiry are fundamental navigational tools to chart a path across the disci-
plinary fractures and contradictions of the contemporary humanities.
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