

Transversal Posthumanities

ROSI BRAIDOTTI

ABSTRACT: Transversal Posthumanities emerge within the posthuman convergence of posthumanism and postanthropocentrism. Environmental, medical, and digital humanities reposition academic practice towards advanced technologies and climate change issues. A neomaterialist theoretical framework will help distinguish different kinds of Posthumanities: from the profit-oriented knowledge production practices of cognitive capitalism, to community-driven, non-profit experiments with minor knowledges.

KEY WORDS: posthuman thought, Posthumanities, transversality

Most research universities today proudly display programs, curricula, and institutes in areas known as: the environmental humanities, digital, medical, neural, geo, global and other “new” humanities. What are we to make of this proliferation of institutions and discourses? My aim in this essay is to present an overview and a theoretical framework of analysis.

The emergent phenomenon that I have named the transversal Posthumanities occurs within the posthuman predicament (Braidotti 2013, 2017, 2019; Braidotti and Hlavajova 2018), defined as the convergence of post-humanism on the one hand and post-anthropocentrism on the other. Post-humanism prioritizes a critical assessment of the Humanist ideal of “Man” as the allegedly universal measure of all things, while post-anthropocentrism criticizes species hierarchy and anthropocentric exceptionalism. Although they overlap and tend to be used interchangeably in general debates, they are rather discrete and separate events, both in the intellectual genealogies and in their social manifestations. By stressing the convergence aspect of their encounter, I mean to respect their specificity but also avoid segregating their respective knowledge claims.

The Posthumanities is a term that describes the repositioning of the humanities within this posthuman historical condition, opening new perspectives for both

the subjects and the objects of knowledge. The Posthumanities express empirically grounded critical approaches to the posthuman convergence, as well as creative and speculative modes of dealing with it. In both cases, far from being a mark of disregard for the human, the posthuman as a conceptual tool aims at expanding our understanding of it, by emphasizing transversal connections and a multiplicity of scales, layers, and locations for contemporary posthuman subjects. These materially embedded and embodied coordinates help us understand the diversity of living matter which, in its organic and technological variables, is anything but the exclusive prerogative of humans. As a matter of fact, the human is just one of the formations currently being reconfigured in the posthuman convergence.

The posthuman convergence is situated in a particularly fraught historical context, within the accelerations (or de/re-territorializations) of advanced capitalism. This is a schizoid, or structurally fractured system (Deleuze and Guattari 1987): a knowledge economy driven by the inhuman intelligence of advanced technologies. Also known as cognitive capitalism (Moulier-Boutang 2012), or platform capitalism (Srniczek 2016), this Fourth Industrial Revolution (Schwab 2015) also happens to coincide with the planetary devastation of the environment and the acceleration of climate change, also known as the Anthropocene, or the Sixth Extinction (Kolbert 2014).

The convergence of these contradictory phenomena intensifies the question which has been at the core of academic posthuman knowledge production all along, namely: what is the human in the humanities? What assumptions about the basic unit of reference for the human are implied in both the discourses and the institutional practice of this field? My argument is that the Posthumanities, far from being a crisis of the traditional humanities, are a productive instance. They provide a generative redefinition of contemporary knowledge, taking on the ubiquity and pervasiveness of technological mediation on the one hand, and the escalation of environmental damage and species extinctions on the other. The notion and practice of transversality is helpful in striking a balance between the two poles of the posthuman convergence.

Mindful that the human is not a neutral term, but rather one that indexes access to power and entitlements, I argue that the traditional humanities accepted and incorporated Humanism as their normative epistemic structure. They consequently applied what can be assessed alternatively as uncritical (Foucault 1970) or bellicose (Said 2004) forms of universalist, Eurocentric, heteronormative, and masculinist world-views (Braidotti 2011a, 2011b). The limitations of these in-built assumptions have been exposed over the last thirty years by social movements and critical discourses that called themselves “studies” (Braidotti 2013, 2016a). Women’s, gay and lesbian, gender, feminist and queer studies, race, postcolonial and subaltern studies, alongside cultural studies, film, television and media studies, and science and technology studies are the prototypes of the first generation

of studies. They constitute the radical epistemologies that have voiced the insights and knowledge of the structural “others” of the humanistic “Man of reason” (Lloyd 1984) and have carried them into trans-disciplinary forms of knowledge production. But, as I will go on to argue next, their anthropocentrism is so intrinsic as to remain unthought-of and therefore under-examined.

These critical studies expose the contiguity of rationality and violence, of scientific progress on the one hand and practices of structural devastation and exclusion on the other. This is not intended as an anti-science stance, but rather as a non-binary, multi-directional way of assessing the workings of science, philosophy, and the arts, from the standpoint of the socially excluded. By grounding their knowing practices and quest for adequate understanding on lived experience, the studies’ discourses take power relations very seriously. They argue that “Man” is an exclusionary category that organized his hegemonic self-understanding by structuring differences on a hierarchical scale of decreasing worth. As a result, the sexualized, racialized, and naturalized “others” became not only different from the humanistic norm, but also worth less than the Man that embodies it. The others of Man were socially marginalized and reduced to the sub-human status of disposable bodies.

The critical “studies” also argued that these “monocultures of the mind” (Shiva 1993) shaped the institutional practice of the academic humanities by instilling two salient features, namely structural anthropocentrism on the one hand and Eurocentrism, or “methodological nationalism” (Beck 2007) on the other. Unsurprisingly, the critical studies initiated fierce negotiations with the rules, conventions, and institutional protocols of the academic disciplines. Some settled in their interstices, others took the nomadic path (Braidotti 1991, 2011a; Stimpson 2016) and moved outward, in what I call the becoming-world of knowledge production practices (Braidotti 2016b).

Thus, the emphasis on the experiences of those who were excluded and the campaign for their rights turned out to be only the starting point of the critical trajectory of the studies. What was also at stake is the renewed understanding of what it means to be human, that is to say a transformation of the norm itself. In a turn to radical immanence and perspectival politics of locations (Braidotti 2018, 2019), I argued that the falsely universalist ontology of “Man” becomes sexualized, gendered, racialized, and ecologized, thereby improving its inclusiveness, diversity, and objectivity.

The posthuman convergence shifts the grounds of these critical discourses further, mostly by targeting their un-acknowledged anthropocentrism. The first signs of this shift can be detected within a second generation of critical studies that engages with non-human objects and subjects of knowledge. Significant examples are: animal studies; eco-criticism; plant studies; environmental studies; oceans studies; Earth studies; food and diet studies; fashion, success and critical

management studies. New media proliferated into sub-sections and meta-fields: software, internet, game, algorithmic, and critical code studies. Because of a major concern with security, security studies emerges as a priority, alongside death, suicide, and extinction studies. And the lists are still growing. The point of these objects of enquiry is to challenge the anthropocentric core of the humanities, but this is not merely an additive measure, that is to say it does not just add a quantity of new objects of study; it also lays the ground for a qualitative shift of perspective and methods.

The transversal Posthumanities emerge within this fast-moving landscape, both as a reaction to the convulsive changes of cognitive capitalism and as an active or affirmative attempt to repurpose these changes towards non-profit and critical aims. The Posthumanities operationalize this qualitative shift and redefine the parameters of thought along heterogeneous lines of transversality (Braidotti 2019). The transversal Posthumanities come about when communities of scholars recognize the specific kind of contradictory inter-connections emerging in the posthuman convergence between academic work and scholarly research, based on critical thinking, and materially embedded and embodied social formations. The link between them is forged by the new modes of knowledge production of cognitive capitalism that cut across traditional institutional divides and add new urgency to the issues at stake. For instance, the environmental and digital humanities, which are the two pillars of the transversal Posthumanities, are prompted by the understanding that we need to work with, but also go beyond, post-humanism and post-anthropocentrism. Thinking outside the box, which seemed blasphemous in the 1970s, has become the norm at times of neoliberal governance.

The minimal requirement for the qualitative change of perspective introduced by the transversal Posthumanities is to reposition terrestrial, planetary, cosmic concerns, naturalized others like animals and plants, and the technological apparatus, as serious agents and co-constructors of transversal thinking and knowing. Because the posthuman condition is computational, as well as environmental and ecological, and because it is also fraught with inequalities, it demands a critical turn towards *zoe/geo/techno-bound* perspectives. This re-orientation requires that the humanities accept the need to rework their relationship to the sciences, and vice-versa, thus allowing for a culture of mutual respect to emerge. At the same time, it is paradoxical to note that the humanities end up providing most of the terminology, metaphors, and representations for cyberspace, posthuman agents their weird objects of study.

The Posthumanities defy established patterns of humanistic and anthropocentric thought by challenging the nature/culture, human/non-human, *bios/zoe* distinctions. These categorical divides are not only conceptual, but also methodological, in that they support a social constructivist methodology which has proved foundational for the traditional humanities and the critical studies alike (one is not

born, one becomes a critical thinker). This binary method, however, does not always help to deal with the challenges of our eco-sophical, post-anthropocentric, geobound, and techno-mediated milieus. I propose instead a new affirmative method of co-construction and expression of vital, neo-materialist locations and perspectives.

Built into this project is the question of how to renew the social responsibility of the contemporary humanities outside the jargon of corporate directives, by posing questions that have less to do with morality than with ethics. The former deals with rules and regulations, while the latter poses questions of power in the dual sense of entrapment (*potestas*) and empowerment (*potentia*). As a discourse about forces and relations, ethics is a transversal concern that exposes the contradictions of the moralization of public life, including scientific research, under neo-liberal governance.

Foremost among these contradictions is the normative injunction that defines the dominant practice of contemporary techno-science, as analytically post-humanist, but normatively neo-humanist. For example, individuals are encouraged to develop a sense of moral responsibility for their health—via the management of life-style and the monitoring of quantified selves—without necessarily raising issues of power and social justice. The same goes for the management of one's genes, mental health, and reproductive functions.

I singled out (Braidotti 2013) examples of this dominant paradigm from brain research (Rose 2013), primatology (de Waal 2009) and media studies (Castells 2010; Verbeek 2011). I recommend some critical distance from this popular but internally incoherent injunction to combine analytic posthumanism with normative neo-humanism. What this perspective neglects is the analysis of power relations, in their multiplicity and complexity. To account for them, it is useful to suspend questions of normative judgement and focus instead on issues of power, with Foucault (1995), and empowerment, with Deleuze (1988) and his re-readings of Spinoza ([1677] 1996). This allows us to address social issues of inequality and lack of access to, for instance, the new technologies and to foreground the necro-political aspects of contemporary power. These include notably the rise of security concerns and the weaponization of the social sphere in a continuing “war on terror,” which impacts negatively on the critical function of the university and on academic freedom. These ethico-political concerns are also means by which we can increase the social relevance of the humanities and address many of the complex issues facing the world today.

Posthuman affirmative ethics is central to the project and I firmly believe that we—critical scholars in the humanities today—need to embrace the opportunities offered by the posthuman convergence and steer the transversal Posthumanities towards new forms of solidarity, social justice, and democratic debate and dissent. The praxis of constructing affirmative values, relations, and projects is central to sustain these posthuman, but all too human aspirations (Braidotti 2006, 2017).

* * *

The critical Posthumanities are currently emerging as transversal discursive fronts, not only around the edges of the classical disciplines but also as off-shots of the successive generations of the inter-disciplinary critical discourses of the “studies” I mentioned above.

The vitality is telling, as shown by the exuberant proliferation of neologisms and the terminological diversification in the field. It is also confirmed by an array of publications, institutional courses, and research projects. See, for instance the ecological humanities, the environmental humanities, sub-divided in the blue humanities, which study seas and oceans, and the green humanities which focus on the Earth. They are also known as the sustainable humanities and, in more crass variations, energy humanities and resilient humanities. Other successful instances are: the medical Humanities, also known as the bio-humanities; the neural humanities; evolutionary humanities. The public humanities are also quite popular and have spawned the civic humanities; the community humanities; the translational humanities; the global humanities; the greater humanities. More neo-liberal variations are the interactive humanities, resilient humanities, and the entrepreneurial humanities. The digital humanities (Hayles 1999, 2005), which are also called the computational, informational, and data humanities, are possibly the most powerful institutional developments of the last decades.

The fast growth of rate has already prompted several meta-discursive analyses, which in turn resulted in another sequence of neologisms. For instance: the Posthumanities (Wolfe 2010); inhuman humanities (Grosz 2011); transformative (Epstein 2012), emerging, and nomadic humanities (Stimpson 2016); and my critical transversal Posthumanities.

The Posthumanities share a number of assumptions, beyond a mere focus on non-human objects of enquiry. First, that the knower—the knowing subject—is neither Man—*Homo universalis*—nor Anthropos alone. The knowing subject is no longer the liberal individual, but a more complex transversal ensemble: of *zoe/geo/techno*-related factors, which include humans, as collaboratively linked to a material web of human and non-human agents. For instance, the subject of knowledge for the digital humanities is AI-mediated; for the environmental humanities, it is geo-, meteo-, and hydro-centred.

Let me stress this point: whereas most techno-scientific posthumanists (Latour 2017) dispense with the need for a notion of the subject, replacing it with an inhuman kind of rationalism, I take the opposite view and argue very strongly for a vision of posthuman subjects worthy of our times. The transversal Posthumanities are not born by spontaneous generation, nor by automatic replication of dominant meta-patterns: if they exist at all, it is as a result of the hard work and the commitment of communities of thinkers, scholars, and activists, who are

intervening to either reconstitute or repurpose the missing links between cognitive capitalism and academic knowledge practices. They form alternative collective assemblages, transversal subjects that, through collective praxis, become a new “we,” a missing people.

These transversal subjectivities, composed in the mode of eco-sophical assemblages that include non-human actors, stress the grounded, situated, and perspectivist dimension of knowledge. Affirmative ethics is what binds them, by composing transversal subject assemblages that actualize the unrealized or virtual potential of what “we” are capable of becoming. Posthuman subjects are a work-in-progress: they emerge as both a critical and a creative project within the posthuman convergence along post-humanist and post-anthropocentric axes of interrogation. Their very transversality pre-empts any predetermined outcome for the process of composition of new subjects of knowledge: what they may become is a matter of relational alliances and on-going material practices. This is no relativism, but rather immanent neo-materialism and situated perspectivism. What constitutes subjectivity is a structural relational capacity, that is to say the specific degree of relational force or power that any one entity is endowed with: its ability to extend towards and in proximity with others. Living entities are both embedded and embodied, and have relational and affective powers. As such they are capable of different things and different speeds of becoming (Braidotti 2002). Subjects defined as transversal relational entities do not coincide with a liberal individual, but are rather a “haecceity”—which means an event of complex singularities or intensities (Deleuze and Guattari 1994). Subjectivity is thus both post-personal and pre-individual and fully immersed in the conditions that it is trying to understand and modify, if not overturn. We are after all variations on a common matter; in other words, we differ from each other all the more as we co-define ourselves within the same living matter—environmentally, socially, and affectively.

A second crucial feature of the Posthumanities therefore is that they assert the diversity of *zoe*—non-human life—in a non-hierarchical manner that acknowledges the differential intelligence of matter and the respective degrees of ability and creativity of all organisms. *Zoe*-geo-techno-entities are partners in knowledge production, which means that thinking and knowing are not the prerogative of humans alone, but take place in the world. The world is defined by the coexistence of multiple organic species, computational networks, and technological artefacts alongside each other (Guattari 2000; Alaimo 2010).

What is critical and what is posthuman about the transversal Posthumanities is a question of thematic, methodological, and conceptual aspects. Thematically, as stated above, they include non-anthropomorphic objects of study, including networked technological apparatuses and big data sets. Methodologically, the defining feature of the Posthumanities is their transversal and “supra-disciplinary”

character. The driving force for their knowledge production is not the policing of disciplinary purity, but rather multiple forms of relation and cross-hybridization. In the language of my affirmative ethics: their strength is directly proportional to their relational ability to open up to each other and to the world. They overcome the vision of a de-naturalized social order somehow disconnected from its environmental and organic foundations and enact a set of *zoe/geo/techno*-mediations that entail qualitative and methodological shifts of perspective. I will return to the issue of transversality below.

* * *

Taking a mainstream academic location, one could say that the Posthumanities are a reaction to the epistemic acceleration of cognitive capitalism. They provide institutional answers to the posthuman convergence, within the contemporary neo-liberal governance of universities, which encourages academic research to reach out for external encounters with a broad spectrum of corporate, civic, public, artistic, and activist venues. They support an array of research, development, and experimentation with new ways of producing knowledge. These developments are therefore resonating with the mainstream developments of advanced capitalism.

As I indicated above, however, another approach takes a less reactive, affirmative route and sees these developments as an expression of more autonomous, radical, and transversal practices and discourses. This approach takes knowledge production as a set of heterogeneous assemblages (Deleuze and Guattari 1994), fuelled by the desire to actualize post-disciplinary modes of epistemic relations (Lykke 2011). Both these aspects of the Posthumanities—reactive and active—need to be taken into account, like two sides of a coin. But it is important to be able to tell the difference between Majority-driven and minority-inspired modes of posthuman knowledge production (Braidotti 2018).

Both the environmental and the digital humanities clearly display these two patterns. On the side of Majoritarian formations, identical with and supportive of neo-liberal economics, we will encounter the dominant institutional narratives and practices. For instance, pushed by the advent of the Anthropocene, corporate ideas of sustainability invested disciplines as wide-ranging as comparative literature, demographics, anthropology, geology, and climate and environmental sciences. They then recoded this field of activity outside the traditional faculties of the humanities, as the environmental humanities. The field is well funded in research, it disposes of several specialized scholarly journals, and at this point it functions like an established academic discipline.¹

At the same time, the minority-driven fields are doing very well too: they are emerging from eco-feminism, Earth studies and other forms of arts and culture

activism, but also from post- and decolonial theories and indigenous philosophies and practices, as we shall see in the next section. As such, they are more inclusive and social-minded areas of enquiry.

Even more striking is the case of the digital humanities, which display heterogeneous sources that range from brain research, linguistics, and robotics to media studies, librarianship, and the application of computing methods to the humanities. Most of these applications concern the development of digitized archives, concordances, and other such resources. They run parallel to the commercial consumers' applications, which capitalize on the data exacted from the interfaces with people's intimate lives, recomposing intimate and often marginal practices into multiple molarities, such as the billions of Facebook pages. The field of the digital humanities is by now so advanced that it can boast at least six specialized journals, its own advanced companion, and an international network of institutionalized centres (Schreibman, Siemens, and Unsworth 2004).² But this Majoritarian meta-pattern is not all there is. On the side of minority-driven activities, for instance, the digital humanities encompass multiple communities of artists, active citizens, and activists of all kinds and denominations (including a sizable right-wing political component). Citizens science and citizens journalism alone (Blaagaard 2018) are significant examples of another way of approaching the digital humanities.

In other words, the dominant meta-pattern driven by the speed of reterritorialization of neo-liberal economics, and thus limited by it, is not the full picture. Saturation by capital does not exhaust the potential of the environmental, the digital, or of any other Posthumanities. There is another way of approaching the phenomenon, which points to both the methods and the ethical aspirations of their critical powers. This approach stresses the transversal force of the Posthumanities as a constitutive flow of supra-disciplinary discourses indexed on the becoming-minoritarian of knowing subjects and knowledge practices. They are carried by affirmative ethical forces.

At least two kinds of knowledge economies are thus at work in the posthuman convergence. The first is contiguous with the epistemic accelerationism of advanced capitalism (Braidotti 2019) in the service of dominant or "Major science" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994). The second engages with minorities, involving an affirmative diversity of knowledge traditions or "minor nomad sciences." The relationship between these qualitatively distinct practices is neither binary nor dialectical, but is constituted by constant negotiations and contestations. Their dynamic and often antagonistic interaction fuels the immense energy of the fast-growing field of the transversal Posthumanities.

* * *

Transversality becomes the operative word in distinguishing between dominant states of “Major Science” and the transversal becoming of “minor science.” This distinction is ethical, but its effects are political as well as institutional. “We”—critical posthuman thinkers—are capable of sustaining affirmative assemblages, knowing that their political force lies in actualizing collective imaginings (Gatens and Lloyd 1999).

The term transversality was introduced to psychoanalytic theory and philosophy in the work of Guattari (1984) and of Deleuze (2000), and the two together (1994). The concept is meant to de-link the force of desire from the Lacanian dialectics of Lack and Law, and turn it instead towards a neo-Spinozist notion of desire as plenitude. Transversality positions desire as a positive force capable of subverting, but also re-structuring relations between entities in the world. In this major shift, unconscious processes get redefined not as the emanation of a centralized linguistic master code, but as the result of collectively enacted material interventions in the world. Unconscious desires are both disruptive and generative.

This non-dialectical understanding of desire has important implications for marginalized, under-represented, and virtual modes of thinking and knowing. What is not yet known, in other words, does not fall into the negative regime of unknowability. It rather remains transversal, virtual, in that it expresses an uncoded, transgressive, and at times illicit mode of knowledge that has not yet received the official seal of approval. It is in the process of being actualized, through the collective praxis of forming a transversal subject assemblage that can carry out the task of actually implementing new ways of knowing.

By extension, transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and post-disciplinary scholars have expertise and know-how without necessarily being (recognized as) disciplinary experts, or in spite of what they may know about the limitations of those disciplines. Marginal knowledge is dynamic, vital, and unruly in its very aspirations to change the rules of the game. This inner tension, and the positive force of the desire that sustains it, articulates some of the shifting ground that constitutes the Posthumanities and supports the intense trans-disciplinarity they require. The transversal approach has proved inspirational for posthuman pedagogy and education (Semetsky 2008; Semetsky and Masny 2013) by building on the idea of subject-formation as an event that takes place transversally, between nature/technology, male/female, black/white, local/global, present/past—in assemblages that flow across and displace binary oppositions (Braidotti 1994). Posthuman critical thinkers and educators situate themselves in and as part of the world, defending an idea of knowledge production as embedded, embodied, affective, and relational.

The emphasis on vital neo-materialism, which provides the ontological grounding for critical posthuman scholarship as a transversal field of knowledge,

is also a way to resist the business model of neo-liberal higher education. Posthuman transversality was developed (Cole and Bradley 2018) as an organizational principle that criticizes this pyramidal academic structure and the hierarchical chain of command at the core of most institutions of higher learning. It also calls into question the role of capital in higher education designed as a global market, and the unequal labour relations it engenders, with a vast “precariat” at the bottom of the academic scale. For most participants, the reality of an academic education today is a high debt and under-employment. Practices of community-driven “transversality” are the antidote to the corporatization of the university and the monetarisation of knowledge, in that they introduce a non-hierarchical model of relationality and the gratuity of affect in education.

As Åsberg, Koobak, and Johnson (2010) and Lykke (2018) suggest, the Posthumanities foreground postdisciplinarity as a transformative principle to destabilize the hegemonic power of distinct disciplines and the hierarchies of knowledge that structure the academic divides between the human, social, and natural sciences. New institutional modes and methods of organizing posthuman knowledge need to unfold in transversal conversations, through collaborative, shareable academic spaces, where community work can be enacted in a non-competitive frame.

This emphasis on the politics of immanence allows the inclusion in education of non-anthropomorphic elements, be it animals, natural entities, or technological apparatuses. *Zoe-geo-techno* transversal entities allow us to think across previously segregated species, categories, and domains. Transversality facilitates links to animality, to algorithmic systems, to planetary organism, on equal, but rhizomic terms, that involve territories, geologies, ecologies, and technologies of survival. It relocates both students and educators into the very world they are trying to learn about.

* * *

The different Posthumanities are best approached as non-linear assemblages themselves: they resonate and intersect with each other in disjunctive as well as conjunctive ways. One of the binding affects that flows through them is the desire to reach a more adequate understanding of the conditions that sustain the posthuman convergence, by adopting an affirmative transversal approach. There are multiple inhumane and unjust factors in the contemporary posthuman condition, as well as a wealth of possibilities. As I argued above, transversality is a non-normative, but nonetheless highly ethical approach that demands collective praxis and implies a shift in habits, in frames of reference, but also in daily interactions and activities.

The Posthumanities are a clear expression of the current energy and creativity of a field so many in neo-liberal governance have given up for dead. They are

intensely critical and creative without being bound to any disciplinary identity, and that can also be a means for intellectuals and researchers to develop critical attention to their own working habits and modes of thought. Beyond the established and too often binary requirements of constructivist methodology and the mere cognitive mapping required by recognition of situation, the transversality in the Posthumanities goes beyond discourse analysis, by pushing their critical reach to the field of knowledge production that is coextensive with cognitive capitalism and its material consequences.

Considering the posthuman convergence, there is nothing left for critical thinkers to do than to pursue the production of critical posthuman knowledge. This includes the all too human praxis of speaking truth to posthuman power, in the midst of the multiple accelerations of advanced capitalism. To cope with them “we” need sharper focus on the complex singularities that constitute our respective locations. The critical Posthumanities can be the epistemological vehicle for this project, notably for working towards the composition of planes of immanence for the missing peoples, the “we” who are committed to posthuman resistance. Recent developments in the digital, postcolonial, and decolonial humanities, in queer inhumanism and posthumanism, as well as in the lasting legacy of the critique of racialized ontologies (Wynter 2015), of Black neo- and posthumanism (Gilroy 2016), and of indigenous philosophies (Todd 2015; Whyte 2016) cast important new insights upon the posthuman convergence.

They teach us that “we,” the dwellers of this planet at this point in time, are interconnected but also internally fractured. Class, race, gender and sexual orientations, age, and able-bodiedness continue to function as significant markers in framing and policing access to “normal” humanity. The critical Posthumanities provide a diversified array of the changing perceptions and formations of the “human” in the posthuman era. This field is not aiming at anything like a consensus about a new humanity, but it gives a frame for the actualization of the many missing people, whose “minor” or nomadic knowledge is the breeding ground for possible futures. The neo-materialist ethics of affirmation that sustain the complex re-composition of minor science in the transversal Posthumanities is giving us a measure of what we are actually in the process of becoming.

Utrecht University

NOTES

1. See the two major ones: <http://environmentalHumanities.org/>; <http://www.resiliencejournal.org/>.
2. This is the CenterNet Network that publishes the *Digital Humanities Commons*: <http://www.dhcenternet.org/>.

REFERENCES

- Alaimo, Stacy. 2010. *Bodily Natures: Science, Environment, and the Material Self*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Åsberg, Cecilia, Redi Koobak, and Ericka Johnson, eds. 2010. "Post-humanities Is a Feminist Issue." *Nora* 19(4): 213–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2011.625369>
- Beck, Ulrich. 2007. "The Cosmopolitan Condition: Why Methodological Nationalism Fails." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24(7/8): 286–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764070240072505>
- Blaagaard, Bolette. 2018. *Citizen Journalism as Conceptual Practice: Postcolonial Archives and Embodied Political Acts of New Media*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 1991. *Patterns of Dissonance: On Women in Contemporary French Philosophy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2002. *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2006. *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2011a. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2011b. *Nomadic Theory: The Portable Rosi Braidotti*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2016a. "The Contested Posthumanities." In *Contesting Humanities*, edited by Rosi Braidotti and Paul Gilroy, 9–46. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2016b. "The Critical Posthumanities; Or, Is Medianatures to Naturecultures as Zoe is to Bios?" *Cultural Politics* 12(3): 380–90. <https://doi.org/10.1215/17432197-3648930>
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2017. "Posthuman, All Too Human." *The 2017 Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Lecture series, Yale University, Whitney Humanities Center, March 1–2.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2018. "A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities." *Theory, Culture & Society* 36(6): 31–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418771486>
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2019. *Posthuman Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Braidotti, Rosi, and Maria Hlavajova, eds. 2018. *Posthuman Glossary*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Castells, Manuel. 2010. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Volume 1: The Rise of the Network Society*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cole, David R., and Joff P.N. Bradley, eds. 2018. *Principles of Transversality in Globalization and Education*. New York: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0583-2>
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1988. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Translated by Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 2000. *Proust and Signs*. Translated by Richard Howard. London: Athlone Press.

- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchill. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Epstein, Mikhail. 2012. *The Transformative Humanities: A Manifesto*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Foucault, Michel. 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gatens, Moira, and Genevieve Lloyd. 1999. *Collective Imaginings*. New York: Routledge.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2016. *The Black Atlantic and the Re-enchantment of Humanism*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. 2011. *Becoming Undone: Darwinian Reflections on Life, Politics, and Art*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822394433>
- Guattari, Félix. 1984. *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics*. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. London: Penguin Books.
- Guattari, Félix. 2000. *The Three Ecologies*. Translated by Ian Pindar and Paul Sutton. London: Athlone Press.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. 1999. *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226321394.001.0001>
- Hayles, N. Katherine. 2005. *My Mother Was a Computer: Digital Subjects and Literary Texts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226321493.001.0001>
- Kolbert, Elizabeth. 2014. *The Sixth Extinction*. New York: Henry Holt Company.
- Latour, Bruno. 2017. *Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lloyd, Genevieve. 1984. *The Man of Reason: Male and Female in Western Philosophy*. London: Methuen.
- Lykke, Nina. 2011. "This Discipline Which Is Not One: Feminist Studies as a Post-discipline." In *Theories and Methodologies in Postgraduate Feminist Research: Researching Differently*, edited by Nina Lykke, Rosemarie Buikema and Gabriele Griffin, 137–51. New York: Routledge.
- Lykke, Nina. 2018. "Postdisciplinarity." In *Posthuman Glossary*, edited by Rosi Braidotti and Maria Hlavajova, 332–35. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Moulier-Boutang, Yann. 2012. *Cognitive Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Rose, Nikolas. 2013. "The Human Sciences in a Biological Age." *Theory, Culture & Society* 30(1): 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276412456569>
- Said, Edward. 2004. *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schreibman, Susan, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth. 2004. *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405103213.2004.00002.x>

- Schwab, Klaus. 2015. "The Fourth Industrial Revolution: What It Means and How to Respond." *Foreign Affairs*, December 12, 2015. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2015-12-12/fourth-industrial-revolution>.
- Semetsky, Inna. 2008. *Nomadic Education: Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087904135>
- Semetsky, Inna, and Diana Masny, eds. 2013. *Deleuze and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Shiva, Vandana. 1993. *Monocultures of the Mind*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. 1996. *Ethics*. London: Penguin Classics. First published 1677.
- Srnicek, Nick. 2016. *Platform Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Stimpson, Catherine. R. 2016. "The Nomadic Humanities." *Los Angeles Review of Books*, July 12, 2016. <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-nomadic-humanities/#!>
- Todd, Zoe. 2015. "Indigenizing the Anthropocene." In *Art in the Anthropocene: Encounters Among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments and Epistemologies*, edited by Heather Davis and Etienne Turpin, 241–54. London: Open Humanities Press.
- Verbeek, Peter Paul. 2011. *Moralizing Technology: Understanding and Designing the Morality of Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226852904.001.0001>
- Waal, Frans de. 2009. *The Age of Empathy*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Whyte, Kyle P. 2016. "Is It Colonial Déjà Vu? Indigenous Peoples and Climate Injustice." In *Humanities for the Environment: Integrating Knowledges, Forging New Constellations of Practice*, edited by Joni Adamson, Michael Davis and Hsinya Huang, 88–104. Abingdon-on-Thames: Earthscan Publications.
- Wolfe, Cary. 2010. *What is Posthumanism?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wynter, Sylvia. 2015. *On Being Human as Praxis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.