Edinburgh Research Explorer

Writing as PARTicipation

Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology

Writing as PARTicipation: working towards in:tuition and intimating

Fiona Murray, University of Edinburgh, School of Health in Social Science, Medical School, UK, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0744-7385, Fiona.A.Murray@ed.ac.uk

Ken Gale, University of Plymouth, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UK, kjgale@plymouth.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper is a thought-experiment into the question, "How might we participate in the writing of this paper together?" Having been both inspired and moved by Erin Manning´s beautiful chapter "Me Lo Dijo un Pajarito: Neurodiversity, Black Life and the University as we Know It' (2020) we pick up the baton of moving thinking into how we can begin to work together to contribute to the reconceptualization of educational and research practices and specifically through practices of inclusion and participation within them. We do this with the starting point of our own participation in the writing of this paper. We follow the faint line of two emerging techniques. The first technique, *in:tuition*, emerges to help make operational a practice of participation that engages participants, students, us, on the register of the preindividual. The second technique, *intimating*, works towards a notion of transindividual participation.

We offer an immanent and processual approach to practice, involving a '(r)eaching toward one another, (in which) our individuations qualitatively alter our "individuality." With Manning, we work with 'thinking-feeling (as) the transversality of all planes of experience in the immanent twist' with the desire of twisting into new and socially just practices.

Keywords: Participation, intuition, intimating, undercommon, neurodiversity

Introduction

This paper is a thought-experiment into the question, "How might we participate in the writing of this paper together?" All too often participation is an "afterthought of a practice already under way," (Manning, 2016, p. 29). It seems nonsensical for participation to be an afterthought when as Massumi writes in an interview with Seigworth (2016) that participation is all there is and comes even before affect. Therefore, in this paper it is from participation we start as we recognise that, "participation is always already there, active as the more-than at the heart of the event in its formation. Participation is not the way the outside adds itself to a process already under way, but the operational multiplicity of a practice in its unfolding" (Manning, 2016, p. 30). From an awareness that practices are built on techniques (Manning et al., 2019, p. 10), we present this paper as a thought experiment that we hope may move towards an imagining of techniques for how we may participate in the writing of this paper together. Our hope is that through this we can contribute towards socially just pedagogies and research practices in education through experimenting with practices of participation.

Having been both inspired and moved by Erin Manning´s beautiful chapter, '*Me Lo Dijo un Pajarito: Neurodiversity, Black Life and the University as we Know It'* (2020), we hope that through our writing together, through our thinking-doing, we can experiment with possibilities of working together that aim to attune to the undercommon way of 'cawing' (Manning, 2020, p. 217). To explain the undercommon way of cawing, Manning writes,

> *We must instead begin with the differential of the more-than human that composes us, with the tendencies that make us more-than ourselves, engaging the edifice of power/knowledge not frontally but with the very asymmetrical durations that (de)compose us. Connecting to power/knowledge this way may allow us to hear how else knowledge is being crafted on the undercommon edges where a caw can be heard, attuning to modes of knowing that exceed capture. (2020, p. 216).*

We begin our writing mindful of the not necessarily known asymmetries between us beyond our human and gendered identities and (im)personal contexts that mark our angle of participation. We are aware the problem we pose may not be solvable, but we do hope that it can be operational, that it can move us into the dephasing of new practices of participation to come in our writing, researching and teaching. We follow Manning´s (2016) proposition that through 'research-creation' problems can be intuited in the inquiry.

In what we have come to refer to as, ´*Me lo Dijo´,* Manning (2020) writes of a student:

> *She speaks, stuttering from the edges of language´ (p. 213).*

In this we recognise the stutter (Deleuze, 1998), a familiar bodying, taking place. We also understand the value of the stutter. Deleuze (1998) writes,

A great writer is always… a foreigner in his own language: he does not mix another language with his own language, he carves out a nonpreexistent foreign language within his own language. He makes the language itself scream, stutter, stammer, or murmur. (p. 109)

Too often participation in the classroom and in the field is recognised as polished, coherent voice in a language that we can understand. We mark essays against a criteria that promotes a language of clarity, certainty and technical accuracy and recognise this as good scholarship, and by this we mean a neurotypical scholarship. We tend to look for verbal participation in class discussion as proof of engagement. In this paper we grope around for ways of participating that not only allow space and time for the stutter but that are aligned to the undercommon caw.

In '*Me lo Dijo',* Manning (2020) continues to draw on this student who stutters from the edges. She is a student who does not pass. She fails and is failed by authorized and constituted ways of working together that do not know how to listen to different ways of thinking and doing. There are forces we recognise at play that are also felt in our own classrooms where this student can also be found. It is with *her* we write. It is with *her* we need to learn to attune in order to think-do participation differently.

We look to Manning (2020) as she continues to write of this student and the experience of challenge to participation.

'She fails, her work refusing to order itself to the measure she has been given' (p. 213).

We work in sympathy with the preceding sentence, sensing that to achieve this ordering, the student is absorbed in the shifting movements and spatio-temporalities of becoming and, a movement toward a fixity of Being, in a disciplinary practice, a mode of participation. This movement entails the concomitant production of what Foucault (1995) might refer to as, 'docile bodies'. We agree with Manning (2020) as she writes, "Those bodies that "pass" have been there all along, "functioning" at the limits of what constitutes the docile body they, we, have been taught to mimic" (p. 214). Our ability to mimic aligns with the assumption that we can uphold the system as we know it, that we can align with the ´baseline 'of what it is to be an academic. For this reason, we seek to think about ways of participating in the writing of this paper that come from the inside of our writing rather than drawing on methods that we already engage in, as a way to avoid mimicking them.

And so, perhaps inevitably, Manning has to take us to a seemingly irrevocable conclusion, when she succumbs to commenting of this student:

´She forgets to cite. She forgets that there was a beginning, a place from which knowledge traced itself. She forgets to impress. She doesn't pass' (p.213)*.*

And so, we too pause. We too sense a soreness as we move and might have betrayed the failing

student, how we might have betrayed our own onto-epistemological values, how our own gate-keeping might at times have forced out difference. This paper perhaps is born from a push back against times when, perhaps, although that student wrote a wonderful essay, we point out that they failed to answer the question or to produce the expected and familiar knowledge. We have both been working in education for some time and have no doubt upheld current practices. We are writing this paper with a recognition of the urgent and bold statement that, "We must change things or die. All of us." (Harney & Moten, 2013, p.10).   In this paper we draw on Manning´s thinking around neurodiversity as a way of stepping away from the typical as the baseline for what it is to be human. We open to the same hauntings of the words that haunt Manning's *Pragmatics of the Useless* (2020) to haunt our paper*:* 'black life is always neurodiverse' (p. 1). We do this to write against practices where the "(white) (neurotypical) human (is the) purveyor and guarantor of experience (that) reigns supreme" (p. 214) and from where "difference asserts its" (p. 214). We do this in the recognition that our help is not needed but we need to recognise that "this shit is killing (us), too, however much more softly" (Harney and Moten, 2013, p. 10). In this paper, we seek also to address *how* this shit kills.

We offer our paper as a thought experiment because from reading ´*Me Lo Dijo*´ we understand that finding spaces where difference can assert itself is counter-productive.   Manning (2020) writes,

> *Creating the conditions for neurodiversity in the university is not about creating a space for difference, a space where difference sequesters itself, it is about attuning to the undercommon currents of creative dissonance and asymmetrical experience always already at work in, across, and beyond the institution (p. 214).*

We think from the in-act of our writing, a grappling in the dark, not knowing what may happen, if anything at all. And so, a grappling in the dark …We come from and bring with us our own separate writing practices we have been working and thinking with prior to coming together to write this paper.

Assemblage/ethnography

For some time Ken has been working and developing the practice of "assemblage/ethnography" (Wyatt & Gale, 2013) that shifts away from the autonomous bounded sole author towards the notion of assemblage (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988, p.306) "with its flows of affect, time, space and place, human and non-human bodies, and... and... and…" (Deleuze and Parnet, 2002 as cited in Gale and Wyatt (2013).   Assemblage/ethnography,

> *works to elude and trouble the potential discursive construction that the naming of a category of difference can create and, at the same time, offer a mode of practice that always brings the materiality of relational space into play as a method of inquiry."* (Gale and Wyatt, 2013, p.139).

We have faith in the writing process to do as Wyatt and Gale (2013) write,

*We know that as soon as we talk of our experience, our genealogies and our
histories, as soon as we align our relational ontologies in particular ways,
something shifts; our assemblage, a "body-without-organs" (Deleuze & Guattari,
1988), disassembles and in so doing, follows a new and different line of flight, is
part of a new affect, striating space differently, and is always becoming" (p. 301)*

Preformative writing?

Fiona has been beginning to experiment and play into what a *"preformative"* rather than a
performative writing can do (Murray, 2019a). Preformative writing as a poly and transphasal
writing practice. It seems obvious that if writing takes form in symmetry to the subject then they
both must be in-formation together. Manning (2020) writes, "For Alfred North Whitehead, there is
never a subject that preexists an occasion of experience and there is never a time into which we
can bathe fully formed" (p. 33). His subjective forms are not strong subjects. They are the
"subjects of the event" and they are the way the "event gathers its complexity into itself"
(Manning, 2020, p. 34). Both superject and subject, writing is necessarily always at once
preforming and performing. Sylvia Wynters (as cited in McKittrick, 2015, p. 25) writes that we are
homo narrans, and that we write to break through the ineffable, across different registers. In
ontogenesis, we write to create new subjects to come, we write from "incipiency towards new
modes of existence" (Manning, 2016, p. 68). Preformative writing is a practice that works to find
the balance between the "static and the chaotic" (Manning, 2016, p. 68), it is a practice that
stutters and doesn't always answer the question.

In the undoing of the bounded autonomous self that both these writing practices entail, we write
to attune to the "undercommon caw." We take as a provocation Manning´s (2020) questions,
"'(w)hat are these undercommon ways of cawing, the sounds lost, left behind, not only
unaddressed but unregistered, in the systems of power/knowledge we call academia?'" (p. 213).
As we write into our thought experiment, we want to pause to note the humanism of the ´we´ as if
there were two bounded selves, the opposite of our aim, rather than always more than one, two
and three. Manning (2020) writes, "Any 'we' is always already composing at the interstices of
these uneasy collaborations between different valences of the more-than" (p. 215). Throughout
our writing we stay with the trouble of the 'we', we start with 'we'.

As a starting point we lean into autistic perception. Manning (2016) writes, "(w)hen we engage in
practice, when we are subsumed by process, we often seek this kind of perception, and it is
available to us all: autistic perception does not belong exclusively to autistics" (p.18). The
collective and ontologically indeterminate 'we' alluded to here embraces the affective presence of
all practice participation in-formation. We plug into Manning´s (2015) concept of 'artfulness' in a
bid to find our way into ways of working together. We might call 'artfulness' our *stARTing* point
(Strom et al., 2019). 'Artfulness' doesn't necessarily mean that we need to be good at art
(thankfully) but as Manning writes, the medieval term for artfulness: *die art* is about finding a way.
Manning (2016) writes,

The art of participation is the capacity, in the event, to activate its artfulness, to tap into its yield. Artfulness is the force of a becoming that is singularly attendant to an ecology in the making, an ecology that can never be subsumed to the artist or to the individual participant (p. 33).

We decide that a *stARTing* point for our working together may be to firstly write backwards and forwards or back and forth. To dive into the idea of fixed selves and turn take. We decide to start here because this is a mode of participation in most classrooms and traditional research practices and a stARTing point that we would like to divert from. Taking turns works with a normative way of viewing participation in a research interview or in a classroom discussion, where the assumption is that humans are ontological units with epistemological voices (Mazzei, 2016). We hope from here, in our thinking-doing-feeling, that we shift into ways of working together that are more "creative-relational". (Massumi, 2015, p. 14). In order to do this, we follow a leap into *pARTicipation* as our becoming practice of how we think about how we are participating together. Our pARTicipating writing, a writing that foregrounds the participatory practices.

stARTing

We begin making operational our question, "How might we participate in the writing of this paper together with a practice of turn-taking?" We own our writing as Ken´s and Fiona´s and feel into its pre-tensions. Ken sends Fiona *his* writing and then Fiona sends Ken *hers*. We purposefully do not challenge the assumptions behind this. We *stART* to *pARTicipate* in a way that mirrors those practices that already exist as the norm. Inevitably, it is not long before the process begins to stutter, falter, hesitate. The issues show up firstly through Fiona´s writing when she says:

In our writing, I have found myself in an uneasy rhythm, uneasy in its timely asymmetry to yours. I can´t find a way in. I struggle to write my part, write apart, or participate at all. I´m finding it hard to produce. Sole mumming and home-schooling three, its not possible to keep up or to have insight, to incite or even cite at all. Enthusiasm isn´t enough this time, endurance breaks and as now full-time carer, I just can´t grasp enough subjectivity in the morning to make it through the day (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988). This writing that I am doing now can only be about my NOT writing as there is nothing more. I wonder, what if the world just can´t speak through me at all anymore, too full as I am with other things to act as its expression? Perhaps I´ve lost the capacity to affect. The world, knowing this, steers clear. My hope is that maybe it is speaking through me now as I write into my (im)personal experience. Maybe right now in the pandemic, the world is speaking loud and clear for itself, through bird song, me lo dijo un Pajarito.

I sense that this writing isn´t much different to the informal apologies I sent you by email. But the apologies on the email felt more acceptable than they do on this formal attachment. They were formless and unregistered. You reassured me that Stengers (2011) writes about slowness being

about following the wonder, but it seems from the chaos and the dissolve, I have lost the capacity to wonder and to respond.

I have a felt sense that the space I am in is not quite as hopeful as Stengers may argue. If I have been following the wonder recently, it has been through my reading of a book a friend has lent me called *The transformative Power of Goddesses of Yoga – awakening Shakti* (Kempton, 2013), that has really caught my imagination. I realise that this is a leap, but it is an important leap into the question of 'can you find your groove when everything else falls away?'

 I can't remember the conversation that led to the lending of the book. I am not quite sure how I came across these twelve archetypal goddesses. But there is one Goddess in this book that brings me in touch with where I am with writing and I hardly feel I can introduce her when I know not a thing of her, other than she has arrived more than humanly onto this page. Dhumavati is, according to Kempton (2013) the old crone goddess, the archetypal bag-lady and I didn't apprentice with her through my own volition. I read that she can be found in barren places, she is found in the boarded-up warehouse, and in the rubble after the war. I've read that Dhumavati comes with a warning as she has the power to destroy your attachments. I think of this writing as an eventual email attachment to you and how she may be working to destroy this too. I try to hold on to the potential that I may be able to force something acceptable out but Dhumavati is the goddess of 'letting go', not holding on, and this is her double-sided boon (Kempton, 2013). I can feel Dhumavati's uncomfortable presence asking this question in my dried-up writing and on this barren page. It feels like there is no writer there, a yielding or dissolution of the self, back into the dissolve (Alaimo, 2016). She asks if I can survive collapse (Kempton, 2013).

On the surface, I can also say my slowness is to do with the pandemic that I assume may also be Dhumavati's territory. I have no room of my own, no space to think, and the home-schooling that is a necessary evil is nothing compared to the unstructured nature of everyone at home for a Summer staycation. Writing doesn't work so well when sorting conflicts over the true proprietor of the mango shower gel or dealing with the daily dietary requirements and the online trombone lesson in the hall. Of course, the labour of care has not just been felt in the home at this time but to students far from home. Eventually, Dhumavati comes to offer up a letting go of swimming against the tide and offers a sinking into the necessary caring role and away from these words. I realise I want to apply for special circumstances as some of our students do but these don't stretch to staff, or to mums.

Your email about the following the wonder though is mobilising. It has reminded me to get out of the way, to let go of my attachments and to remember the point of this exercise is in our pARTicipating. And I note how you bringing Stengers in got me writing again so that I am writing this, now. Bozalek (2017) writes, 'A response-able pedagogy incorporates the ability to affect and to be affected" (p. 42) and she draws on Haraway (2016, p.1) to remind us that we 'render each other capable'. You have rendered me capable! That is something.

As I write, I notice a pale yellow tinge at the corners of a green leaf in my kitchen. My eye has

often felt drawn to pale yellow. Only recently have I understood why. I am writing a chapter for an edited collection about family estrangement, where I begin to write into intergenerational domestic violence. I write about the fading bruises have been handed down the family. I write that I didn't hold the raw purple bruise or the dissipating red but bore the fading – and as I typed the next two words, I stop in my tracks – the bruise, the fading, it was two words that appeared to me as I typed, it was pale and yellow. I hold the pale yellow of the fading bruise. It just landed. Years later, pale yellow finally lands as the hauntings of domestic violence. Was the writing about pale yellow all that time ago a *'stART'*? And if so, what other *'stARTs'* are in our writing? As I think of the student in *"Me Lo Dijo"* (Manning 2020), I realise what we are writing into is urgent. Can we wait that long for a *'stART'* or a pale yellow, as gentle and passive as it seems in relation? This is what frustrates at the edges of my dying leaf.

 Pale yellow was simply a 'prehension' (Whitehead, 1929, p.18). Writing that pale yellow is domestic violence is the moment of movement where Lambert (2011) writes that 'the operation of moving towards an individual then is when "some pre-individual embraces it's *becoming* and supply a "solution to a problem" to form an individual' (Lambert, 2011). How can we hear these whispers of participatory affections? Through our writing we wonder, if ways of thinking about participating, need to start by thinking about and with the polyphasal.

 In this preceding passage, as Fiona struggled in her writing to Ken, and when Ken sent her a solution to the problem with his message about following the wonder, it *'stARTled'* Fiona out of the dissolve. For Simondon (1989) there are two types of 'disindividuation', the temporary type that allows a resting place for garnering energy for transition and a type that creates more anxiety and can be catastrophic. For a while, until Ken´s mobilising email, she began to fear an encountering of the catastrophic kind. She felt stuck in the 'obscure zone' (Read, 2017, p. 102). But his short email mobilised her out of the preindividual's resting place (Voss, 2018, p.97) and into a transitional space, perhaps therefore into what Simondon (1989) would refer to as a transindividual. So, as Tremblay (2014) writes, 'choreography equals transindividuation, in so far as it is a color *[pale yellow?]* or tone that aggregates – or channels, redirects, alters, catalyzes, but never stops – an open-ended set of individuations' (p. 105). The email was mobilising because Fiona was reminded of how to invent- and it is through invention that we can get ourselves back into feeling a capacity for doing (Manning & Massumi, 2014).

pARTicipation

We meet on Zoom in order to *pARTicipate* together in a different platform to think of some of the issues in participation in a turn taking process that have arisen. We draw some thoughts together, we take notes, stutter through our writing so far for ways of attuning to what is heard between the lines. In the vibrant processualism of our own 'immanent critique' (Manning, 2016, p. 28), our stepping into the normatively inscribed customs and obligations of 'turn-taking' has led us into and shed some light upon the need to speculate and to create problems that have greater enormity than those substantive solutions that appear to have been provided by accepted methodologies and practices in advance.

We know from Manning´s writing on neurodiversity and race that the kind of subjectivity required to participate is easier to grasp hold of for some more than others and in our case, in this writing, it was perhaps harder for Fiona than Ken. We imagine that this can lead to what may appear as a refusal to participate in the work, to engage, to answer the question. Normative practices of participation that require a solidly grasped subjectivity lead to work that struggles to meet deadlines and work that is produced in this way, appears to be work that is rushed, slapped on the table, without much thought to the presentation. It also raises the question: will Ken have to do all the work for the two of us? Though we argue against bounded notions of self, are these the only selves capable of participation in current practices, and those selves have to be not only bounded but white and neurotypical? And, if so, do they credit through being the only bodies who can actually participate in the work and therefore bring it to fruition? In addressing such questions we ask, what are the whispers of the caw when we write, "This writing could do with a further redraft. It reads as though it is not yet finished."

In this, we are aware at the same time that it is Fiona´s encounter with Ken and his thinking with Stengers that moves her from obscurity into invention. He facilitated her. We note the importance that this jolt happened in the in(form)al space of the email rather than in the more formal writing in the paper itself or what we could say was in a more private space, facilitation being undercover.

In our thought-experiment in pARTicipating we begin to imagine techniques that will lead to ways of participating that think with the polyphasal rather than the first person accountability of a turn-taking practice. A technique emerges that helps us to make operational a practice of participation that engages with the preindividual nature of the participants in our writing together, and another technique emerges that works with a transindividual participation.

In:tuition

From this consideration we claim that to *pARTicipate* in our working across registers, we *stART* anew here with intuition and through the dephasing of our thought experiment we arrive *at in:tuition*. We begin here at this point because we have to, because it is through intuition that artfulness will reveal itself. Manning (2016) writes,

> *Following Bergson, I turn to intuition, and its manner of making time. I argue that intuition is as key to a process as any other building-block and that through intuition, as allied to the creation of a problem, the artful comes to expression. This is intuition: the captivation, in the event, of the welling forces that activate the dephasing of experience into its more-than (p. 18).*

We begin here thinking with prehensions and the space of the not-yet. We think about writing without narrative and without content. In this, Fiona recalls certain experiences of learning:

> *Five-year-old children who were learning to write were given a brand-new jotter for their emergent writing. They were delighted, thinking that they were writing like proper grown-ups. Emergent Writing was the name given for a writing*

practice that was prewriting. It was for children to begin to make marks on paper before they had learned to form proper letters. Though the teachers could not make sense of the writing, if they asked the child to read it out to them, they often could. These jotters valued and celebrated the ineffable. The jotters authorised the sounds of the caw. The head teacher entered the classroom and walked round talking in a sing-songy voice to the children. She looked at their work. She took the teacher to the side. She was horrified. The jotters were expensive. Since they were new, she could rip the first page out of them and put the jotters back. It would be motivation for the children to earn them back by learning to write properly.

And so, in our *pARTicipating* we realise that perhaps we could have a 'new jotter' for the ineffable that marks a dephasing from incipiency to expression. This means that we could participate in the writing of the paper on perhaps a shared file where we can mark on the page thoughts, photographs, pictures of mango shower gel or Dhumavati, or for any murmuring apprehensions. We start from where we are, we start from however much subjectivity we have grasped that day. We write on to the same page, as the writing emerges through us at spontaneously different times. Manning (2016) writes,

The subjectivity feeling-thoughts effect is not that of a preexisting human subject, but the subjectivity of the occasion as such—its superject. Like Bergson's intuition, which is the art in which the very conditions of experience are felt, feeling opens the event to the as-yet-unthought within thought itself. (p.11).

This means the processual, the speculative and the experimental can be given precedence over the substantive, the representational and the ontologically prior of Being. What seems key to this is its indeterminacy, always moving toward, its capacity in the movement to the ever always not yet known. Of course, the ineffable can exist alongside the effable on the page, like the Zoom session where a voice is heard, where three little moving dots move into words and a pulsing red heart spreads warmth across the screen.   In a broader sense from our paper, we think that through participating with the ineffable, finding ways to work together across registers, there may be less need for apologies and refusals to complete work.

    Refusals seem key to thinking through what is happening in the spaces where there is an expectation of normative practices of participation (Harney & Moten, 2013; Truman 2019; Murray 2019b). Truman, Hackett, Pahl, Davies, Escott (2020) write in a paper that gives a capacious permission to the 'no' of the refusal, '

it is clear that both participation and certain kinds of resistance to participation…risk validating the frameworks against which one's participation is being measured, serving to lend evidence and truth to damage narratives about individuals and communities. (p. 9).

This focus on participation shifts a perception from a rebellious individual to perhaps, without

being too glib, a sociogenic freeze or impasse. The first refusal lies not with the student but with whiteness and the neurotypicality of present frameworks of participation that are thinking with first person accountability. Manning (2020) writes,

> *Rather than seeing the parts abstracted from the whole, autistic perception is alive with tendings that create ecologies before they coalesce into form (p. 18).*

If we understand a rebel instead to be a willing participant subsumed by process, then what can be heard in the rebellious caw is a question being, *how can I participate from here, from where I am at now? Or how can you recognise the ways that I am already participating?*

Thinking back to Manning's (2020, p. 213) student with whom we write, she reminds us that the student will not assume a neurotypical way of being, because she just does not know this way of being.

Sylvia Wynters (1999) rethinks what it is to be human by simultaneously thinking of the work as sociogenic as well as ontogenic. Wynter (1999) refers to the neurotypical personas as Man1 and Man2. Based on the classic white Eurocentric male, these are not so much gendered identities, as they are genres of human that have been so over-represented that they have become as Wynters (2003) writes 'descriptive statements' of what it is to be human (p.264). Man1, the *homo-politicus,* is the first classical representation of human as an exclusionary category. He is rational and moral, in control of himself and his external world, still earthly but only just. Man2, *Homo-economicus*, is successful, resourceful and strong. Manning (2020) picks up on Sylvia Wynters writing in order to work towards the undoing of hierarchical categories of what it is to be human. We see ourselves through the eyes of Man 1 and 2, and we seek to mimic them because they are the leading "orienter of experience" (Manning, 2020, p. 51). We mimic him because if we did not then we run the risk of being unacknowledged and unseen.

As we think about the wider processes of writing and preformative writing, we move from intuition to *in:tuition* as a technique for working together that brings authorization, authorizing a way of being that allows for the orientation of experience, for the modes of participation always already present. In:tuition makes the undercommon caw heard and felt in a way that is not purely behind the scenes, hidden and private. Manning (2016) writes,

> *The real work is seen as that which emerges before the event opens to the public. Practice thus separates itself from techniques for activation. When this happens, the participatory is set up in an uneasy dichotomy between what becomes the inside and the outside of a process. (p. 29)*

In:tuition is intuiting "How might we work together?" from the inside of the encounter as the starting point of any work. It is about ensuring that practices of participation work across different registers and don't start from a place of first-person accountability. Thinking again with Manning´s student who appeared earlier in this writing, we want to find ways of participating where all students feel like their participation is being heard, received and valued but more than this in that

its power is felt as a means of orienting experience. We draw on *in:tuition* as a technique for a practice of socially just participation. But from here we know that what we are still missing is more about the word *together* in the question. It at least seemed clearer in first person accountability what our responsibilities are/were to each other. We were both to do our fair share. How do we think this through differently? This leads us to our second technique of *intimating.*

Intimating

Intimating comes from work previously written about by Ken. '*Intimating*' (Gale, 2021) and is both a pedagogical and research-creative practice that through its rethinking of our common notions of intimacy as human to the thinking of intimacy as more than human has the potential to bring to life the vibrant processualism of encounter and event. It is an approach where, as Manning points out, bodies, as they are configured by representational and individualising forces and agencies, exceed themselves and are becoming in existence, 'as experiments-in-movement, qualitatively informed …' and no longer strictly classified and organised in discursively informed constructions of ownership and embodiment. Difference 'in-formation' (Manning, 2007, p. xvii) is becoming as differentiation, where the rigidity of those fixed identifications and subjectifications of class, gender, race and sexuality and so on, are problematised and subdued in movements, moments and the affective forces of encounter and the event. The encounter becomes a jolt or shock out of those habituated modes of thinking and being allow for the creation and thinking of the new. It came to us when it happened!

From here we world intimacy as an active relational technique, sensing that *intimating* can be (temporarily) known as a force in the play of bodies doing relationally, transindividually. And so, in these movements and moments, Fiona felt it as a jolt, but she also felt it as a facilitation, an ontological moment in our writing together. It was Ken that was there with the ability to respond and he carried Stengers to Fiona. Manning (2020) writes, "Facilitation is likely going to involve another person with whom the environment in its unfolding will be navigated in ways that will morph over time based on the needs of the relation" (p. 120). Previously we thought with the rigour of intuition that led into a technique of *in:tuition*, we now turn to the concept of sympathy as a natural unfolding that leads us to a technique of *intimating.* Manning (2015) writes,

> To make sympathy the driver of expression in the event is to bring care into the framework of an event's concrescence, to foreground how intuition is a relational act that plays itself out in an ecology that cannot be abstracted from it. Intuition leads to sympathy – sympathy for the event in its unfolding (p. 62).

Though it is helpful for us to think of these techniques in their singularity they are of course only operative through each other. The complexity that was troubling us was thinking about how do we work together when the work was remaining a draft, when one of us was less productive than the other? And when one facilitated? Through pARTicipation, and appropriating a Baradian neologism, we pause to *intra-rupt* these movements. In this, movement is sensed as individuating,

with, in and around, rather than with individualising in ways where difference between is seen as antecedent. Working in this way we were able to move away from ideas of finitude and accountability and instead think about what was happening in the stretched-out time pulsing in between. Manning (2016) writes,

> Now, the problem is not how the participant can reanimate a process, but how the process itself as emergent practice can make felt its own participatory or transindividual nature. The practice shifts from seeing the object as endpoint to exploring how to prolong the art of time in the event such that new forms of collaboration can be engendered (p.30).

We couldn't prolong the art of time any longer and with the deadline upon us we opened our process up for review, though we felt our work was not complete and new ways of working together had not yet been established. We took it to the edge and served up the paper that was not yet finished its slow cooking. Though we write about our process, our reviewers became part of our togetherness, our facilitation, our *intimating* that jolted us both once again forward to a new dephasing of our work about how we can collaborate together.

It is with Stengers (2011) we go back to the wonder into a sympathy towards the complexity around moving from incipiency to expression. In our *pARTicipation* we wonder if that though there was a forward drive to complete, was there something also about the noncompletion that felt important to our question? It is the concrescence of the process (Whitehead, 1929), where the process of the bodying of the work and of the writer is formed, and it is the point of becoming that is also the point of potential annihilation.   Thinking again with Manning´s student, what if the writer body produced by the work is one that is not allowed to pass? Manning (2020) writes,

> *How a body becomes the body it is, here, now, the body it is identified to be, also depends on what it means to be a body, here, now, on the stakes of the form-taking, on the limits of that form. Bodies are routinely obliterated at the very point where they individuate into this or that recognisable form* (p. 218).

By not finishing the work we learn to live with the question without solution, we keep experimenting, inventing. And we get to stay as alive as the problem. In reading Manning´s *Towards a Politics of Immediation* (2019) we learn that Souriau calls the space from incipiency to existence an assault course. What if the work always remains incipient, a draft, incomplete, lacking content and findings? The power may be in staying a draft or a sketch in the sense that the certain bodyings that may not pass can continue to do their intellectual work (Manning, 2019). How can we recognise and value the undercommon caw of the bodyings that the university is not ready to assimilate? Whiteness makes it less dangerous for some bodies to complete the work and at the same time it makes it less dangerous for some bodies to *not* complete and submit the work. This is why we must turn to our participatory practices. How can we collaborate together, write together and work together with our asymmetrical experiences with whiteness, with neurodiversity, so that we can hear that which we cannot readily perceive due to the tumbling out of perception? How can the unfinished be finished safely and how can it be included? Jackson (2020) writes that it is

our practices of inclusion that can be violent rather than practices of exclusion.

This brings us back to the facilitation that Ken offered Fiona. From here we recognise a relationality of facilitation arising on the register of the transindividual rather than individualism. Manning (2016) writes,

> *Though this more-than, this participatory activity, is highlighted in participatory art, it is important to recall that all events are transindividual at their core…Participation understood as immanent to the event raises a completely different set of expectations. Now, practice is considered immanent to the ecologies of an ever-shifting process. (p. 30).*

To write about facilitation is difficult. There is a Cartesian zombie around the idea of the individual meaning that though we can experiment with techniques invented for the undoing the individualism of the academy, can we bear that may mean normalising the very fact that we are not autonomous and that we may need to learn to value the art of facilitation as part of everyday participation. And can this be recognised as having a mutuality? There is no doubt resistance felt to the idea of facilitation as we barely have time to look after ourselves. Wynter´s description of Man was a category of human that would certainly not have required facilitation. Can facilitation be a fair expectation? And how can those that are having to facilitate really understand that this shit is killing us all, just even more softly?

It was facilitation carried through Ken to Fiona that got the work up and running again. It meant that Fiona was able to stay included. Facilitation was felt as a touch, a gesture of hapticality, a hand on the arm.

We look for other haptic moments of encounter to understand how this shit is killing us all no matter how much more softly. It is reciprocal as facilitation carried by Ken to Fiona and then reviewers to Fiona and Ken and then Fiona to Ken as she is moved now by his facilitation and then moved and mobilised to work through the paper's (re)writings and (re)visions.   We moved from turn-taking to *intimating*. The haptic touch is reciprocated. And through intimating, violence is undone also towards the category of the human who experienced the violence more softly. They no longer have to mimic. The striving towards the mimicking of the description of Man 1 or Man 2 in order to pass only serves to kill thought, experimentation and invention. It does not allow for the creative-relational of the non-docile body known as the rebel. *Intimating* as a technique for working together means an insistence on understanding the reciprocity of facilitation in that frees up the creative-relational for everyone including those that may easily be assimilated into the university but at the price of of thought. Ken did not do the writing for Fiona and Fiona did not do the writing for Ken.

As Blackman (2013) writes ´you can't waltz or foxtrot without a partner´. We were never writing alone. It was a creative-relational endeavour.   It is not a participatory practice where difference is facilitated by typicality but also where typicality is facilitated by diversity to think anew until the

undercommon caw is recognised as not belonging to only certain bodies but as the sound of the movement towards the new. The diverse can facilitate the more typical to find and hear their lost caw.

Final pARTicipation

At the end of our thought-experiment our question of how might we participate together to write this paper became operational. And as we finish writing we turn once again to Manning´s Me Lo Dijo. Manning (2020) writes,

> *I know some of us will get through. I made it through the gates, past every single hurdle until I hit the highest ceiling. I thought it would protect us. I thought it would make it possible for me to squeeze you through the membrane. But they didn't let you through. We didn't let us through (p. 234).*

It is our hope that through the writing of this paper that our work continues to think through us as we strive with Manning, taking the baton of experimentation to find ways of participating and working together that continue to think with practice and research in education that are socially just.

Acknowledgements

References

Alaimo, S. (2016). *Exposed: Environmental Politics & Pleasures in Posthuman Times.* University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816621958.001.0001

Blackman, L. (2013). *Carrying autism, feeling language.* Smashwords.

Bozalek, V. (2017). Slow scholarship in writing retreats: A diffractive methodology for response-able pedagogies. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *31*(2), 40–57. https://doi.org/10.20853/31-2-1344

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish.* Vintage.

Deleuze, G. (1998). *Essays critical and clinical.* Verso.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* Continuum.

Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (2002). *dialogues II.* Continuum.

Gale, K., & Wyatt, J. (2013) Assemblage/ethnography: Troubling constructions of self in the play of materiality and representation. In Short, N., Turner, L., Grant, A. (Eds.), *Contemporary British Autoethnography* 139-157. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-410-9_9

Gale, K. (2021). Now you see me, now you don't: living with Deleuze, intimating in the dance of movements, moments and sensation. *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies.* https://doi.org/10.1177/15327086211037760

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822373780

Harney, S., & Moten, F. (2013). *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & Black study.* Minor Compositions

Jackson, Z. I. (2020). *Becoming human: Matter and meaning in an antiblack world.* New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479890040.001.0001

Kempton, S. (2013). *The transformative power of the goddesses of yoga: Awakening Shakti.* Sounds True Inc

Lambert, L (2011). # Simondon/ Episode 06: Transindividuation and contagion of the crowds after Tarde's sociology. The Funambulist. Retrieved from: https://thefunambulist.net/philosophy/simondon-episode-06-transindividuation-and-contagion-of-the-crowds-after-tardes-sociology

Manning, E. (2007). *Politics of touch: Sense, movement, sovereignty.* University of Minnesota Press.

Manning, E. (2015). Artfulness. In Grusin, R. (Ed.). *The Nonhuman Turn.* University of Minnesota Press.

Manning, E. (2016). *The minor gesture.* Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv111jhg1

Manning, E. (2019). Toward a politics of immediation. *Frontiers in Sociology 3*(42). 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2018.00042

Manning, E. (2020). *For a pragmatics of the useless.* Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781478012597

Manning, E., & Massumi, B. (2014). *Thought in the act: Passages in the ecology of experience.* University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679669.001.0001

Manning, E., Munster, A., & Thomsen, BMS. (2019). *Immediation 1.* Open Humanities Press.

Massumi, B. (2015). The supernormal animal. In Grusin, R. (Ed.) *The nonhuman turn.* University of Minnesota Press.

Mazzei, L. (2016). Voice without a subject. *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies, 16*(2), 151–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708616636893

McKittrick, K. (2015). *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis.* Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822375852

Murray, F. (2019a). February *Preformative Writing* [paper presentation]. European Congress of Qualitative Inquiry.

Murray, F. (2019b). Between brexit and Trump: Looking at the stain on the floor. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 12*(1), 42–51. https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2019.12.1.42

Read, J. (2017). *The politics of transindividuaility.* Haymarket Books.

Seigworth G. J. (2016). Writing space: Interviews. Interview with Brian Massumi. *WTF Affect.* Retrieved from: http://wtfaffect.com/brian-massumi/

Simondon, G. (1989). *L'individuation Physique et collective*. Aubier.

Stengers, I. (2011). *Another science is possible! A plea for slow science.* Inaugural lecture Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, ULB, 13 December 2011.

Strom, K., Ringrose, J., Osgood, J., & Renold, E. (2019). PhEmaterialisms: Respons-able research & pedagogy. *Reconceptualising Educational Research Methodology,10* (2-3), 30–40. https://doi.org/10.7577/rerm.3649

Tremblay, J. T. (2014). Waltz with Manning. *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory, 25*(1), 103–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/0740770X.2014.923173

Truman, S. E. (2019). Inhuman literacies and affective refusals: Thinking with Sylvia Wynter and secondary school English. *Curriculum Inquiry, 49*(1) 110–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2018.1549465

Truman, S., Hackett, A., Pahl, K., Davies, L.M., & Escott, H. (2020). The capaciousness of no: Affective refusals as literacy practices. *Reading Research Quarterly, 0*(0), 1–14.

https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.306

Voss, D. (2018). Simondon on the notion of the problem, *Angelaki, 23*(2) 94–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725X.2018.1451471

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *Process and reality: An essay in cosmology.* Cambridge University Press.

Wyatt, J., & Gale, K. (2013). Getting out of selves: An assemblage/ethnography. In Holman Jones, S., Adams, T., Ellis, C. (Eds.) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.

Wynters, S. (1999). Towards the sociogenic principle: Fanon, the puzzle of conscious experience of "identity" and what it's like to be "Black." In Durán-Cogan, M. & Gómez-Moriana, A. (Eds.) *National Identity and Sociopolitical Change: Latin America Between Marginalization and Integration.* University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2004.0015

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the c of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation: An argument. *The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257–337.