3. Poszerzanie Wspólnoty

Marietta Radomska

Towards a Posthuman Collective[1]: Ontology, Epistemology and Ethics

> "[...] we know because »we« are of the world.
> We are part of the world in its differential
> becoming." [2]

> "We are all matter, and we all matter."[3]

Introduction. Basic Distinctions

The times we live in require adequate accounts. We have always been entangled in various relation(ship)s with nonhumans – animal, earth and technological ones. Twentieth and twenty first centuries ecological devastation has brought environmental issues, having their own spokespersons, into the political arena. The rapid development of advanced technologies makes us realise that agency might not be only about human subjectivity and autonomy. The nature/culture dichotomy is no longer valid. In fact, it has never been. We live in a collective of humans and nonhumans, as Bruno Latour suggests. The belief in the autonomous, rational human subject seems irrelevant, as the centre has already been decentred. Sometimes we hear that we are living in a posthuman world. I am ultimately far from neo-liberal seers, foretelling the end of history and the last man, such as Francis Fukuyama, as well as from futurists such as Ray Kurzweil. Instead, I would like to pose the question of a posthuman collective. How to think adequately such a "community" of humans and nonhumans? Is it possible to think a posthuman(ist) politics? How? These enquiries are becoming increasingly urgent. Yet, in order to attempt to give an answer, first one has to define precisely what kind of tools one is going to use. I would like to suggest that posthumanist theory is an excellent and relevant tool for this task. In this article I will formulate the basic premises of my account

---

[1] I employ the Latourian term "collective" (understood as a "procedure of collecting associations of humans and nonhumans" – B. Latour, *Politics of Nature,* trans. C. Porter, Harvard 2004, p. 238) instead of "community" or "society" because I think these notions are specifically entangled in the humanist discourse. However, in the Polish translation of the title I do use the term "wspólnota" (community, commonwealth) for two reasons: (1) it appears to be the most appropriate out of the possible alternatives, and (2) the anthropocentric burden in the Polish translation of this term is less visible (due to the above-mentioned alternative terms).

[2] K. Barad, *Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter,* "Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society" 2003, Vol. 28, No. 3, p. 829.

[3] L. Birke, M. Bryld, N. Lykke, *Animal Performances: An Exploration of Intersections between Feminist Science Studies and Studies of Human/Animal Relationships*, "Feminist Theory" 2004, Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 178.

of posthumanist theory (or the "posthumanist tool" as I like to call it). Only by conducting such meticulous analysis and mapping all the components of this tool, one will be able to proceed to think the collective and its politics.

The notion of posthumanism traces back to the late 1960s. As Manuela Rossini[4] points out, it was mainly associated with Friedrich Nietzsche's announcement of the death of God and Martin Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*. What followed was the most explicit expression of the debate over the end of humanism, namely Michel Foucault's famous statement closing his book *The Order of Things*: "[...] man would be erased, like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea."[5]. Posthumanism has been placed alongside and considered as a companion to postmodernist and poststructuralist currents of thought, being at the same time defined as a specific carrier of "helplessness"[6].

However, defining posthumanism is not as simple and unproblematic as one may assume. Even if we agree on its basic premises, such as: overcoming humanism (or rather humanist anthropocentrism[7]), taking into account nonhuman (animal or technological) others, a specific affirmation of difference[8], we have to encounter a number of notions used interchangeably with "posthumanism" (not to mention its various, sometimes contradictory or at least incompatible characteristics). Among the most significant of these terms are: transhumanism, cybernetic posthumanism, critical posthumanism, metaposthumanism, antihumanism. What Rossini suggests as a basic definition and beginning of posthumanism, namely the one directly related to Foucault's death of man or Jean-François Lyotard's "inhuman" (which I cannot draw upon in this article due to limited space), I would rather call "antihumanism", using the Althusserian term that remains inscribed in structuralist, poststructuralist and postmodernist theories. Doubtless, it has been an important attempt of decentring the subject, the One, the Same, as well as pointing out the lack of human's autonomy and agency. Although "posthumanism" that I want to discuss in this text has its origins in those movements and theories, I would understand it as a current of thought coming "after" postmodernism, even if deeply rooted in it, as a theory not only overcoming humanist, but also anthropocentric premises, and paying much more attention to nonhuman others.

---

[4] M. Rossini, *To the Dogs: Companion Speciesism and the New Feminist Materialism*, "Kritikos" 2006, Vol. 3, http://intertheory.org/rossini [2.01.2010].
[5] M. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of Human Sciences,* New York 1994, p. 387.
[6] As stated by literary critic Ihab Hassan in: *Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Posthumanist Culture? A University Masque in Five Scenes*, "Georgia Review" 1977, Vol. 31, No. 4, p. 830-850, according to Rossini, *To the Dogs...*
[7] At this point „overcoming anthropocentrism" is not so clear, and to be precise, it cannot be associated with every branch of "posthumanism". I will explain it in further parts of this paper.
[8] Again, I use a simplification and a generalisation here, which I will explain later.

In a common understanding, the notion of posthumanism is often associated with the hype narrative on the scientific, technological and cultural progress, leading "from hierarchical differentiation in traditional humanism [...] to at least the possibility and »active utopia« of non-hierarchical difference in posthumanism"[9]. In this sense, the latter connotes a life which is no longer dependent on the biological, material embodiment; the human body is treated there as "a prosthesis and can be extended and its parts replaced *ad infinitum*"[10], constantly being enhanced. Such a perspective is directly connected to Norbert Wiener's idea of cybernetics with intelligent machines taken as "»natural« descendants of *homo sapiens*"[11]. Those ideas were flourishing during the second-world-war and especially after-war periods of insecurity and tensions, when bringing back order and stability was at stake. As Rossini points out, N. Katherine Hayles even uses the term of "cybernetic posthumanism" in order to demonstrate the common line of thought between Wiener's cybernetics and posthumanist ideas of technological, prosthetic and neuropharmacological enhancement of the human body as well as, what follows, theory-of-information-driven disembodiment. Furthermore, one may find precisely these themes in the Swedish philosopher, Nick Bostrom's project of transhumanism[12] treating transformation technologies as a sort of deepening the Renaissance and Enlightenment tradition of developing and perfecting the human capacities (both mental and physical in this case) via different (technological) means. The latter are to be e.g. genetical pre-programming aiming at "superhappiness, superlongevity and superintelligence"[13], psychopharmacology, prosthetics, consciousness uploading[14], etc. Transhumanist movement appears to be quite variable within itself, comprising different political perspectives: from the (neo)liberal to the leftist, and different fields: from philosophy, through hard sciences to art. Among other well-known names associated with

---

[9] M. Rossini, *To the Dogs...*
[10] Ibidem.
[11] Ibidem.
[12] See Nick Bostrom's website: http://www.nickbostrom.com/ [2.01.2010], especially his articles: *What is Transhumanism?* (first published in 1998 and reviewed in 2001, also on the website: http://www.nickbostrom.com/old/transhumanism.html) and *A History of Transhumanist Thought* (published in 2005 in "Journal of Evolution and Technology", Vol. 14, No. 1, also http://www.nickbostrom.com/papers/history.pdf). In 1998 with David Pearce he co-founded World Transhumanist Association, which later evolved into Humanity +; in 2004 together with James Hughes, Bostrom launched the Institute for Ethics and emerging Technologies.
[13] As Bostrom's colleague, David Pearce, claims in the interview with both: Pearce and Bostrom to be found on the website: http://sexgenderbody.com/content/interview-nick-bostrom-and-david-pearce-about-transhumanism [2.01.2010].
[14] Transhumanists claim that one of the future possibilities of prolonging human life will be by uploading one's consciousness on a special computer.

transhumanism (and futurism at the same time), one may point out Hans Moravec[15], Ray Kurzweil[16] or Natasha Vitamore[17]. Although such projects contribute to fragmentation or even deconstruction of traditionally understood humanism with its vision of autonomous human subject, as Rossini suggests[18], in fact they just continue, reinforce and reinscribe the Cartesian schema of thought. Even if transhumanist thinkers and theorists speak about the necessity of the preservation and protection of environment, as it is mentioned e.g. in Transhumanist Declaration[19], they still treat these issues as means for human's own well-being. Therefore, the logic, which I would call speciesist, remains the same. Although deconstructed and reconfigured, it is the human nature and humanity which are at stake, and which are cared about. In addition, the transhumanist narrative about disembodiment and "post-biological future"[20] surprisingly evokes a Christian vision of the eternal life.

Taking into consideration all of the above characteristics, I would like to make clear some necessary distinctions. In other words, I would like to reserve the notion of "transhumanism" to all those currents of thought that claim the overcoming or pushing further the Enlightenment humanism, while focusing on the human subject and her/his well-being and enhancement. Such naming would be also in accordance with the emphasis on transformation technologies among transhumanist theorists, and on the other hand with the rise of the institutions using "transhumanism" as their label. Concomitantly, I would use the name of "posthumanism" to call quite different lines of thought.

Rossini in her article "To the Dogs: Companion Speciesism and New Feminist Materialism" mentions "critical posthumanism" and "metaposthumanism" (which in actual fact mean almost the same thing) as theories taking "a critically-distanced stance and not a totalising one"[21] towards the excitement of the above-discussed futurist ideas. Nevertheless, as Rossini points out, they still remain entangled in the liberal (speciesist) ideals. That is why in this article (as in my other articles treating these issues), I will use the notion of "posthumanism" to call such theories and stances which not only go beyond humanism, but

---

[15] Moravec's website at Robotics Institute of Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh (USA), where he works as an adjunct faculty member: http://www.frc.ri.cmu.edu/~hpm/ [2.01.2010].
[16] Official Kurzweil's website: http://bigthink.com/raykurzweil [2.01.2010].
[17] Media artist, transhumanism lecturer and director of H+ Lab for scientific and artistic collaborations; her personal website: http://natasha.cc/ [2.01.2010].
[18] M. Rossini, *To the Dogs...*
[19] Point 7 of this declaration says: „We advocate the well-being of all sentience, including humans, non-human animals, and any future artificial intellects, modified life forms, or other intelligences to which technological and scientific advance may give rise." – to be found on the website: http://humanityplus.org/learn/philosophy/transhumanist-declaration [2.01.2010].
[20] M. Rossini, *To the Dogs...*
[21] Ibidem.

also overcome anthropocentrism, which has always been a humanistic core. In this sense, transhumanist claims just miss the posthumanist point due to the fact of being utterly anthropocentric (even when they seem to care about the environment).

Having made the essential distinctions between the terms and formulated basic definitions, I would like to argue that the posthumanist theory is an essential, important and very productive tool that may be used to account for human and nonhuman relations and interactions[22]. Birke, Bryld and Lykke[23] provide the evidence for how Barad's concept of "posthuman performativity" can bring benefits for thinking and examining human and nonhuman animal relationships. Moreover, they demonstrate in what way feminist science studies (and feminist theory in general) and animal studies intersect, and how important it is to explore this intersection. This can be achieved by using the posthumanist tool. Nevertheless, in order to operate this tool, first one has to examine and define the basic components of posthumanist theory. In this article, I would like to suggest four threads composing posthumanist theory. The first one, modes of being, treats the issue of ontology, or rather its reformulation; the second one, modes of knowing, touches epistemology, and precisely the entwinement between ontology, epistemology and ethics. The third and fourth threads concern the question of subject and its formation. Strictly speaking, the third one gives the account of matter, and the fourth and last one – of alliances.

In this connection, I will start my reconstruction of the posthumanist theory by drawing upon the ontology which composes its basis, while taking into account the context of feminist theory (the ontology of sexual difference). Then I will proceed to the analysis of the relation between ontology, epistemology and ethics, or namely, their entwinement. In the third section of this paper I will focus on the formation of subject through the consideration of the concepts of matter and alliances.

It is only by undergoing such a meticulous analysis, by doing such a mapping and defining the precise components of the posthumanist tool that one will be able to think the posthuman collective as well as imagine the posthuman politics.

Modes of being. Ontology

In this section I will focus on two theoretical propositions, which, on the one hand, converge with each other in an excellent way, and give an account of different aspects of the

---

[22] Following Barad, I will problematise this notion in the main body of this text.
[23] L. Birke, M. Bryld, N. Lykke, *Animal performances...*

posthumanist (more "fundamental"?) ontology, on the other. I will start with Jami Weinstein's proposition of transspecies zoontology, the logic of which appears to be the result of "pushing to the limit"[24] the logic of sexual difference, and in this way truly deconstructing Enlightenment Humanism structured according to the logic of Sameness. Her project, being highly inspired by the Deleuzian line of thought, engages in a dialogue with Luce Irigaray's take on a fundamental ontology and proposes an alternative, which is no longer haunted by the spectre of anthropocentrism. Subsequently, I will draw upon Karen Barad's concept of agential realist ontology (being related to Bohr's philosophy-physics, as Barad demonstrates it), which, according to her, forms the basis for the formation of subject. Finally, I will attempt to point out the resonances between these two projects, what will enable me to pass to the issue of entwinement between ontology, epistemology and ethics.

Transspecies zoontology

The project of transspecies zoontology, a truly fundamental ontology, which in actual fact eschews the trap of Enlightenment Humanism, and thus its intrinsic anthropocentrism, emerges, as Weinstein suggests, from the intersection of feminist theory and Deleuzian thought. Both Weinstein and Colebrook, to whom she refers, follow Deleuze in their treating of a concept as always related to a problem, since "concepts are only created as a function of problems"[25]. Moreover, for Deleuze and Guattari concepts are "centres of vibrations"[26]; a philosophical concept is "the configuration, the constellation of an event to come"[27]. In other words, philosophical concepts with their related problems already contain (virtually) in themselves a possibility to think them through and move further, to "push [them] to the limit" and go beyond them. Although it seems quite abstract, it is precisely what happens when Weinstein engages in her article with the concept of sexual difference, its logic and ontology in order to create "new concepts, new questions and new problems [...] enabling new events [...] and new possibilities"[28]. This situation enables her to undo sexual difference and "move to zoontology"[29]. Here I will attempt to reconstruct her argument.

---

[24] In a Deleuzian sense.

[25] G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, trans. H. Tomlinson, G. Burchell, New York 1994, p. 16.

[26] G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, p. 23, [cited in:] J. Weinstein, *Introduction Part II*, "Deleuze and Gender. Deleuze Studies" 2008, p. 20-33, p. 23.

[27] G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, p. 32-33 [cited in:] J. Weinstein, *Introduction...*, p.23.

[28] C. Colebrook, *Is Sexual Difference a Problem?* [in:] *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*, ed. C. Colebrook, I. Buchanan,. Edinburgh 2000, p. 114.

[29] J. Weinstein, *Introduction...*, p. 26.

As I suggested earlier, sexual difference is treated here as a concept and a problem in a Deleuzian sense. As Weinstein refers to Deleuze and Guattari, if "a concept is unable to constitute itself, it is likely the result of it being mired in other problems"; this means that a concept "evokes an event that helps create future concepts to better resolve the problems to which it was originally linked"[30]. An event to come in a case of sexual difference, according to Irigaray and other advocates of sexual difference theory, is "the materialisation of a fundamental ontology of sexual difference, the coming into existence of the subject woman"[31]. Nevertheless, the inabililiy of sexual difference (with its fundamental ontology) to materialise is inherently related to the problem of humanism, and precisely its intrinsic anthropocentrism, as Weinstein argues. Moreover, a concept in that sense is always about a logic[32].

Ontology in a traditional sense has always been about the One, monadic and "fundamentally singular"[33] – no matter if in a version of ancient Greek philosophers, or in a Heideggerian project of a fundamental ontology. In fact it has been a patriarchal and phallocentric model according to which everything was structured. That is why language, all forms of knowledge, science, representation as well as other symbolic, social and economic structures are coded as masculine, where woman remains as untheorised lack[34]. What Irigaray proposes (and what is the basis for sexual difference theory) is her version of a fundamental ontology, that is the ontology of (at least) Two – "where woman and man are irreducible others"[35]. Nonetheless, though such an ontology appears to be an invaluable step forward, it is only a first step to acknowledge what it means "to *be* a human", and furthermore, "to *become* human", as Weinstein argues. I would even say: what it means "to become", without this literal reference to human. Due to space limits, alas, I cannot invoke here Weinstein's argumentation at full length. Yet, what she suggests, is to undo sexual difference not by returning to the One (or the Same) of the traditional account of ontology, but by "a repetition of pure difference". The latter means that first we have to understand sexual difference, go through it (pushing it to the limit) in order to arrive at an ontology which would be truly fundamental, that is no longer anthropocentric. The solution appears to be the Deleuzian ontology and politics of imperceptibility that may be virtually found in the concepts of sexual

---

[30] Ibidem, p. 23.
[31] Ibidem.
[32] Ibidem.
[33] Ibidem, p. 24.
[34] It is explicitly visualised by Jacques Lacan's diagramme of sexual difference; the website briefly explaining the diagramme: http://nosubject.com/Formulae_of_sexuation [2.01.2010].
[35] J. Weinstein, *Introduction...,* p. 24.

difference and becoming-woman. In other words, what needs to be done is a "deterritorialisation of the human"[36].

If we stop at the ontology of sexual difference, the logic of the One starts to work again in some sense. Namely, in regard to the issue of animality, even if we acknowledge sexual difference in its fundamental and fixed form, it is the nonhuman (as opposed to the human) that appears as an untheorised lack. Thus man/woman *in*difference characteristic to the logic of the One (and Enlightenment Humanism) is just transposed to another level: a human/nonhuman animal *in*difference[37]. Moreover, in a commonly accepted binary opposition: human – animal, the notion of "the animal" (or as Derrida presents this problem: the general singular of "the Animal"[38]) appears to cover the whole multiplicity of different species and in this way is simply speciesist. The multiplicity of humans (recognised through the theory of sexual difference) as opposed to the multiplicity of animals cannot be reduced to the opposition of singular human versus singular animal.

That is precisely why the Deleuzian "fluid multiple" ontology brings an indispensable solution. Furthermore, for Deleuze and Guattari "becoming and multiplicity are the same thing"[39]. Whereas in sexual difference theory one may find visible traces of "being"[40], of fixed entities and a sort of teleological thinking, Deleuzian and Guattarian "becoming" is about a movement, a process, about "a middle". Becoming other does not mean becoming another "pure entity", but utterly "becoming imperceptible". In a Deleuzian perspective, difference is always "pure", it is "shown differing". To put it more simply, the Deleuzian difference is not defined with regard to an identity; it is a pure difference in itself, not formulated in any opposition. It is in this field of the pure difference that we may think of and move toward a fundamental transspecies zoontology, as Weinstein suggests. Consequently, such an ontology genuinely faces and deconstructs the anthropocentric humanism still underlying sexual difference theory. Furthermore, it is more adequate, since only the very

---

[36] Ibidem, p. 26.
[37] Ibidem, p. 28.
[38] J. Derrida, *The Animal that Therefore I Am (More to Follow)*, trans. D. Wills, "Critical Inquiry", Winter 2002, Vol. 28, No. 2, p. 369-418; see especially p. 408-409. There he writes: "This agreement concerning philosophical sense and common sense that allows one to speak blithely of the Animal in the general singular is perhaps one of the greatest, the most symptomatic idiocies *[bêtises]* of those who call themselves humans." (p. 409).
[39] G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. B. Massumi, MA 1987, p. 249, [cited in:] J. Weinstein, *Introduction...,* p. 28.
[40] Nevertheless, as Weinstein (*Introduction...*, p. 28) argues in her article, Irigaray also speaks in favour of "becoming". Yet, sexual difference theory, as it is commonly conceived, is basically concerned about fixed, pure entities.

small (and evolutionary recent) amount of species is "organised" according to sexual difference.

To summarise, sexual difference as a concept in a Deleuzian sense is a "centre of vibrations", it contains a logic. These are the reasons for which the concept as such already virtually contains the possibility of moving further and authentically breaking through the problem of Enlightenment Humanism, and thus arriving at a fundamental transspecies zoontology, which Weinstein calls "a robustly *human* transspecies transhumanism"[41], and I would call posthumanism. In the next part of this section I will scrutinise Karen Barad's proposition of agential realist ontology, while demonstrating how it converges with the above-discussed project of transspecies zoontology, constituting thus a basis for the posthumanist theory.

Agential realist ontology

For Karen Barad, ontology always already intertwined with epistemology and ethics forms the essential ground of her account of posthumanism. The latter for her is "about taking issue with human exceptionalism while being accountable for the role we play in the differential constitution and differential positioning of the human among other creatures (both living and nonliving)"[42]. Hence, a characteristic feature defining posthumanism in an opposition to humanism and antihumanism, as she states, is its integral refusal of anthropocentrism. Posthumanism "marks the practice of accounting for the boundary-making practices by which the »human« and its others are differentially delineated and defined"[43]. I will attempt to explain it now. Barad formulates her definition of posthumanism as opposed to representationalism, which together with metaphysical individualism and humanism have been haunting our thinking up till now. What appears to be foundational for representationalism is the notion of separation. According to Barad, representationalism "separates the world into the ontologically disjunct domains of words and things, leaving itself with the dilemma of their linkage such that knowledge is possible"[44]. Posthumanism, on the other hand, does not "presume separateness of any-»thing«"[45], any pre-existing entities (including humans). What is significant here, is Barad's account of matter (as well as of

---

[41] J. Weinstein, *Introduction...,* p. 29.
[42] K. Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Durham-London 2007, p. 136.
[43] Ibidem.
[44] Ibidem, p. 137.
[45] Ibidem, p. 136.

difference), which is always agentive, "not a fixed essence or property of things", but "generated and generative"[46], always about differentiating and mattering (in its double, non-univocal sense). I will get back to the issue of matter in the next sections of this paper.

In order to thoroughly scrutinise the questions of "ontology, materiality, and agency", which appear to be essential for the issue of posthumanism, Barad proposes a *posthumanist performative* approach. The latter enables "understanding technoscientific and other naturalcultural practices that specifically acknowledges and takes account of matter's dynamism"[47]. It is precisely because a performative account of discursive practices "insists on understanding thinking, observing and theorising as practices of engagement with, and as part of, the world in which we have our being"[48]. Although one may immediately associate the notion of a "performative" approach with theories granting a great importance to the language (from Austin's performative utterances to Butler's performativity), Barad's performativity goes exactly in the opposite direction, while contesting this great power granted to all forms of representation (e.g. language). A feature marking the difference between posthumanist performativity and representationalist theorising (as she defines it) resides also in an optics that each approach assumes[49]. Whereas representationalism (with its epistemology, a way in which we get to know the world) is characterised by the geometrical optics of reflection, posthumanist performative approach functions along the physical optics of diffraction. As Barad argues, diffractive reading of theory, science studies and physics is like "the diffraction patterns illuminating the indefinite nature of boundaries – displaying shadows in »light« regions and »bright« spots in dark regions – the relationship of the cultural and the natural is a relation of »exteriority within«"[50]. Such a posthumanist reading, a posthumanist performative approach does not follow the line of distinct, pure, atomic (yet not existing in any sense – as it happens in various versions of representationalist thinking: from Cartesian epistemology to social constructionism) entities and realms of nature and culture, but think them together, intertwined, agential, differentiating, entangled.

Barad builds her own project of an agential realist ontology (essential as a basis for the posthumanist theory), taking as a point of departure (and consequently developing it)

---

[46] Ibidem, p. 137.
[47] Ibidem, p. 135.
[48] Ibidem, p. 133.
[49] We can find the same distinction of optics in the writings of Donna Haraway, e.g. see: D. Haraway, *Modest−Witness@Second−Millennium. FemaleMan−Meets−OncoMouse: Feminism and Technoscience*, New York-London 1997.
[50] K. Barad, *Meeting…*, p. 135.

Niels Bohr's[51] philosophy-physics. What is crucial for Bohr's theory is that "things" are not conceived as ontologically basic entities: "things do not have inherently determinate boundaries or properties, and words do not have inherently determinate meanings"[52]. Not only does he pose a "radical challenge" to Newtonian physics, but also to the Cartesian epistemological structure of things, knowers, and words, as Barad states. He rejects the transparency of both: language and measurement as well as the Cartesian distinction between the subject and the object[53]. Although he breaks with the presumed fundaments of knowledge and science – Newtonian physics, Cartesian epistemology and atomistic metaphysics of Democritus, he proposes a new epistemological framework with the possibility of objective knowledge, which is based on the new discoveries in the field of quantum physics (that is an ultimately empirical domain). However, as Barad claims, one cannot find as full elaboration on the ontological issues as on his epistemology. That is why she examines this field very properly herself, arriving at an agential realist ontology, being the ground for her posthumanist performative account of both human and nonhuman material bodies. What this account examines and demonstrates is

> *a relationality between specific material (re)configuring of the world through which boundaries, properties, and meanings are differentially enacted (i.e., discursive practices,[...]) and specific material phenomena (i.e., differentiating patterns of mattering*[54].

In order to call such a causal relationship Barad uses the term of an "agential intra-action", as opposed to a commonly used notion of an "interaction". "Intra-action" means that what is pre-existing ("ontologically primitive") here is a relation (not relata), from which the relata emerge. It is precisely through intra-actions that the boundaries and properties of the components of phenomena are being constituted, and concepts gain their meaning. Bohr talked about phenomena as characterised by "the inseparability of the object and measuring agencies"[55]. Drawing upon that, Barad claims that the basic ontological units are phenomena (and not distinct objects) defined as *"the ontological inseparability/entanglement of intra-acting »agencies«"*.

---

[51] Niels Bohr won a Nobel Prize as an author of a quantum model of the atom (being one of the first contributions to the development of the quantum physics).
[52] K. Barad, *Meeting...,* p. 138.
[53] Ibidem.
[54] Ibidem, p. 139. Italics in the original (also in the case of further quotations).
[55] Ibidem.

Nonetheless, what takes place (or is effected) within phenomena during ongoing agential intra-action is an "agential cut" between "subject" and "object". What does it mean? Barad defines an "agential cut" as opposed to the well-known Cartesian cut, which means that entities (e.g. subject and object) are distinct from the very beginning. Concomitantly, intra-actions ongoing within phenomena and effectuating an agential cut result in a sort of "exteriority-within-phenomena", which is conditioned by the "agential separability"[56]. Barad proposes a reformulation (or "reworking") of a traditionally conceived notion of causality. In other words, "causes" and "effects" are not pre-existing, but emerge within phenomena through the agential cut. That is why the possibility of objectivity is still valid.

Barad defines phenomena also as "differential patterns of mattering". That means that they emerge through the agential intra-actions of "multiple material-discursive practices", which she also calls the "apparatuses of bodily production". The latter are to be understood as boundary-making practices, *specific material (re)configuring of the world – which come to matter*[57]. Although the above definitions seem quite difficult and abstract to comprehend, it is precisely through such complex intra-actions of the material-discursive practices (or apparatuses) that the "boundaries between humans and nonhumans, culture and nature, science and the social, are constituted"[58]. What is new in Barad's analysis of apparatuses and their specificity (in comparison to Bohr's primary version) is twofold: first, the focus on discursive practices (and not on linguistic representations), and second, it is through apparatuses as material-discursive practices that the distinction between nature and culture is enacted[59]. Material-discursive practices appear, thus, as primary semantic units (instead of traditionally assumed words).

To complete Barad's account of agential realist ontology, let us look at four significant definitions that she proposes. The first one is reality, which is always composed of "things-in-phenomena", not awaiting outside of or behind phenomena. The second – the definition of the world as an open, dynamic process of intra-activity and materialisation (or mattering) in the effectuating of "determinate causal structures with determinate boundaries", features, meanings, marks on bodies[60]. Moreover, the space-time topologies of the world are changing along the ongoing changes of the dynamics of these processes. Thirdly, Barad equates dynamism and agency, which serves as a term for the "ongoing reconfiguring of the world".

---

[56] Ibidem, p. 140.
[57] Ibidem.
[58] Ibidem.
[59] Ibidem, p. 141.
[60] Ibidem.

Last, but not least, she defines the universe as the "agential intra-activity in its becoming"[61]. Although this compounded elaboration on Barad's concepts and particular and entirely new ways in which she defines traditionally approved notions may seem unnecessary, I find it exactly the other way round. It is only through such meticulous mapping and positioning the concepts, through defining them properly, and through drawing common points, alliances, looking for resonances that we will be able to acknowledge Barad's agential realist ontology that forms a ground for a truly posthumanist account.

Karen Barad's (and Bohrian) understanding of concepts as "specific physical arrangements"[62] from which the meanings emerge as a result of agential cut thoroughly seems to resonate with Deleuzian and Guattarian idea of concepts as "centres of vibrations", virtually containing the possibility of an event to come. Also Barad's mattering converges with Deleuzian becoming, as well as her horizontal structure with apparatuses ultimately corresponds with Deleuze and Guattari's account of rhizomatic structure and assemblages, where both material and discursive are at place. I will explore common points between Barad and Deleuze and Guattari in the short section on matter in further parts of this article.

Nonetheless, both parts of this section devoted to the issue of ontology provided us with some deep insights on how the posthumanist ontology may look like. Moreover, both propositions (transspecies zoontology and agential realist ontology) complement each other in an excellent way. Hence, in the next section I will draw upon the entwinement between ontology, epistemology and ethics that we encounter in Karen Barad's project of posthumanism, as well as in other posthumanist-feminist theorists, such as Donna Haraway.

Modes of knowing. The entwinement of ontology, epistemology and ethics

A concept which is crucial for our understanding of the intertwinement between ontology and epistemology (artificially leaving ethics out of my analysis for a moment) is the concept of material-discursive practices (or apparatuses). Barad in her account mostly draws upon Michel Foucault's notion of discursive practices and Niels Bohr's concept of the apparatus, arriving at her own, posthumanist and agential realist formulation of discursive practices (or apparatuses)[63]. She understands discourse in a Foucauldian sense, as that which

---

[61] Ibidem.
[62] Ibidem, p. 139.
[63] Among other theorists and notions that resonate with and the traces of which one may find in Barad's project, we should point out: Foucault's dispositif (apparatus), Haraway's apparatuses of bodily production, Latour's inscription and translation, Butler's performative, etc. – see: K. Barad, *Meeting…,* p. 141.

"constrains or enables what can be said"[64] and what finally is treated (and exists) as a meaningful statement. For Foucault discursive practices are "the local sociohistorical material conditions", which enable the practices of disciplinary power-knowledge. Conditions are acknowledged here as immanent, actual and "historically situated"[65]. Such an understanding appears as the opposite to Kantian transcendental and universally-valid ones. Moreover, it is through these historical, immanent conditions that subjects and objects of knowledge practices are produced. Barad points out moments in which Foucauldian account of discursive practices converges with Bohrian concept of the apparatuses, by which he understood "particular, physical arrangements that give meaning to certain concepts to the exclusion of others; [...] the local physical conditions that enable and constrain knowledge practices such as conceptualising and measuring; they are productive of (and part of) the phenomena produced; they enact a local cut that produces »objects« of particular knowledge"[66].

Nonetheless, while reading Foucault and Bohr (as well as Judith Butler's account of performativity and materiality, to which I will get back in the next section of this paper) through each other, Barad draws upon their failings or self-entrapments.

She aims at reworking the notions of discursive practices and apparatuses in such a way as to relieve them from the anthropocentric burden. One may find Bohr's propositions – firstly, that the apparatus (which had been previously conceived only as a measuring instrument) plays a much more active role in the experimental practices, and secondly, that concepts are materially embodied, being a part of the apparatus – as almost revolutionary. Indeed, Bohr's ideas do account for how science works in an ultimately new way. Nonetheless, Barad points out in what way his perspective may (or even must) be pushed further in order to avoid his failings. Although Bohr aims at deepening and broadening the understanding of scientific practices, he finally overlooks the dynamic nature of scientific practices. Namely, he perceives the apparatus as constant, immutable, without rearrangements or alterations, as something fixed and bounded. Incidentally, Bohr "mistakes the apparatus for a mere laboratory setup"[67]. Another thing is that in his account, human is implicated in the very conditions of determinability and measurability[68], and thus Bohr's stance remains entangled in the liberal humanist theory of the subject. That is why Barad emphasises the need for a posthumanist perspective on the apparatus, the role of the human, and the

---

[64] K. Barad, *Posthumanist…*, p. 819.
[65] Ibidem.
[66] Ibidem.
[67] K. Barad, *Meeting…*, p. 144.
[68] Ibidem, p. 143.

relationship that appear between them[69]. Consequently, she proposes several developments to Bohrian idea of apparatuses, which appear as specific material-discursive and boundary-making practices formative of matter and meaning; they are "material configurations/dynamic reconfiguring of the world"[70]. In other words, they are always dynamic, in a movement, generative of meaning, of subject and object (which are co-consitutive), without intrinsic boundaries, they are not "in" the world, but "of" the world.

In her reading of Foucault (and following his concepts Judith Butler), Barad also remarks their humanist anthropocentric entanglement. Despite the emphasis on the production of meaning and bodies through specific (discursive practices), they remain concerned only with the production of human bodies, agency is only of a human domain, and thus, the nature-culture binary is continued. Furthermore, they fail to provide an account of technoscientific practices and the profound impact they have on the production of the human bodies as well as the relations of power. Nonetheless, reading Bohr, Foucault, Butler and some other theorists through one another, Barad reformulates the concepts of both: discursive practices (understood as not specifically human-based (re)configuring of the world, through which boundaries, properties and meanings are effectuated, or – to put it otherwise – "ongoing agential causal intra-actions of the world"[71]) and the apparatuses. The latter are also defined as boundary-making practices or "the material conditions of possibility and impossibility of mattering". In other words, it is through apparatuses that both: entities (matter) and meaning (to matter = to mean) are produced. When speaking about agential intra-actions, she mentions "causality", because due to "agential cut" (that I talked about in the previous section) there is a structure enacted within phenomena in which some components emerge as the "effects" and the other as the "causes". Moreover, Barad constantly emphasises the ongoing dynamics and movement of discursive practices (apparatuses). What is extremely important here, is that she does not fix the boundary between human and nonhuman – they emerge from the phenomena through material-discursive practices, they are mere products, not substrates or points of departure, "parts of the world in its open-ended becoming"[72].

I would like to approach one of the most interesting features of her posthumanist performative perspective, namely her account of intelligibility and the nature of knowing. In a traditional understanding, "intellection" and "intelligibility" have been always defined as uniquely human characteristics. Nevertheless, in Barad's agential realism, intelligibility is

---

[69] Ibidem, p. 145.
[70] Ibidem, p. 146.
[71] Ibidem, p. 149.
[72] Ibidem, p. 150.

acknowledged as "an ontological performance of the world in its ongoing articulation", its differential becoming. This means that intelligibility is not a specific human feature. Furthermore, in this perspective, knowing is "a matter of intra-acting"; it entails "specific practices through which the world is differentially articulated and accounted for" as well as "differential responsiveness and accountability as part of a network of performances"[73]. In this way, Barad's posthumanist proposition goes beyond other (transhumanist, anti-humanist) challenges to humanism, because knowing is no longer an activity from the "outside", enacted by a specific knowing subject (no matter how deconstructed or "enhanced"). In addition, she provides examples of nonhumans that appear as "partaking in the world's active engagement in practices of knowing"[74]. To put it once again, the "knower" is no longer external, outside of the world s/he attempts to understand, and neither is s/he situated in a particular place in the world. We are part of the world in its ongoing changes, reconfigurations, dynamics, production of meaning and entities (in "its ongoing intra-activity"), of "the world-body space in its dynamic structuration"[75]. As Barad claims, practices of knowing and being are mutually implicated, not isolated from one another. Repeating the quote from Barad with which I have opened this paper: "we know because »we« are *of* the world. We are part of the world in its differential becoming"[76]. Taking all that into account, Barad argues that the separation of epistemology from ontology is simply an inheritance of traditional metaphysics cutting off human from nonhuman, subject from object, mind from body, etc. (a sort of the "ontological hygiene"[77]). That is why she proposes instead "the study of practices of knowing in being" – an onto-epistemology. The production of meanings is always already entwined with the production of material boundaries (or bodies).

However, she also points out the need for an adequate posthumanist ethics (since the broadly acknowledged humanist ethics does not suffice), which means precisely the accountability and responsibility for all relationalities that we (not only we – humans) engage in and are part of.

> Intra-acting responsibly as part of the world means taking account of the entangled phenomena that are intrinsic to the world's vitality and being responsive to the possibilities that might help us and it

---

[73] Ibidem, p. 149.
[74] Ibidem (Barad describes the instance of a brittlestar. See also: ibidem, p. 369-384).
[75] K. Barad, *Posthumanist…*, p. 829.
[76] K. Barad, *Meeting…,* p. 185.
[77] The concept by Elaine L. Graham. See: E. L. Graham, *Representations of the Post/Human: Monsters, Aliens and Others in Popular Culture,* Manchester 2002.

flourish. Meeting each moment, being alive to the possibilities of becoming, is an ethical call, an invitation that is written into the very matter of all being and becoming[78].

Accordingly, Barad acknowledges values as integral to the nature of knowing and being. Objectivity connected with accountability appear as an epistemological, ontological and axiological issue. Since "[w]e are of the universe – there is no inside, no outside. There is only intra-acting from within and as part of the world in its becoming"[79]. Hence, we arrive at ethico-onto-epistemology, which appears as a relevant account of the dynamic production of matter (of our becoming – related to ontology) and meaning (related to epistemology), both always already entwined with the issues of responsibility and accountability for the relations in their ongoing reconfigurings.

Although I have focused on Karen Barad's posthumanist project, it is not only she who suggests the inherent connection between the material and the discursive, as well as ethics always already inscribed in these practices. We may find very similar traces in the propositions of Donna Haraway, famous for her concepts of situated knowledges[80] and the "material-semiotic". The latter means that bodies as objects of knowledge are not immediately present (that is they are not pre-existing), they are active, agentic, meaning-generative, their boundaries materialise in social interactions. Moreover, these boundaries are not fixed, they may "shift from within"[81]. Accordingly, she uses the term of situated knowledges in order to call the "embodied objectivity" with its specific, particular location and partial perspective. Only such a partial, embodied perspective may take full responsibility and accountability for and to the object of knowledge, which is treated as "an actor and agent, not a screen or a ground or a resource, never finally as slave to the master that closes off the dialectic in his unique agency and authorship of »objective« knowledge"[82].

In her most recent book *When the Species Meet*, Haraway refers to the notions of interference, performativity (so specific to Barad), multiplicity, material heterogeneity[83], when she explains the co-shaping of species[84], the reciprocal complexity of their co-constitutiveness. What is extremely important in these knots of co-shaping is the "response

---

[78] K. Barad, *Meeting…,* p. 369.
[79] Ibidem.
[80] See: chapter *Situated Knowledges* (p. 183-201) in: D. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature,* New York 1991.
[81] Ibidem, p. 201
[82] Ibidem, p. 198.
[83] D. Haraway, *When the Species Meet,* Minneapolis-London 2007, p. 41-42.
[84] Precisely, she studies the relations between human and dogs.

and respect"[85], the accountability and responsibility to and for each other. In addition, partners (relata) do not pre-exist the relation between them (their "constitutive intra-action").

On the whole, both Haraway's project and Karen Barad's agential realism (I would call both propositions: posthumanist) resonate with each other. In both cases ontology is inherently entwined with epistemology as well as ethics, both accounts emphasises the agentic character of matter and the importance of material-discursive (material-semiotic) practices, also defined as apparatuses of bodily production. Although I cannot broaden this point further (due to limited space), I would like to remark a similar theme in Gilles Deleuze's account of a monist and univocal ontology characterised by the "unity of the thing and the concept"[86]. Together with Guattari, Deleuze claimed in *What is Philosophy?* that the question of philosophy is "the singular point where concept and creation are related to each other"[87]. The idea of the connection and entwinement of ontology and epistemology, though approached in a very specific way, stays behind their statement as well[88].

Having thoroughly analysed the posthumanist account of ontology – both propositions: transspecies zoontology and agential realist ontology (in the first section of this paper) – as well as a specifically posthumanist relation between ontology, epistemology and ethics (namely, their entwinement – in the second section), I will proceed now to the question of the subject and its formation. As I argued in the introduction, I will briefly draw upon this issue, while focusing on two aspects: (1) what is the account of matter (and its dynamics, its formation)?, and (2) what is the account of relations – alliances? Moreover, I would like to remark that despite the wideness of the above questions, I will treat this section as a short, but necessary appendix to the main line of argument on the ethico-onto-epistemological structure of the posthumanist tool. In addition, as in the previous sections, I will pay special attention to Karen Barad's theory as well as to several concepts provided by Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, and Donna Haraway.

The formation of the subject. On matter and alliances

In her account of matter, Karen Barad broadly draws upon Judith Butler's stance expressed in *Bodies That Matter*[89]. Although Butler understands matter as a "process of

---

[85] D. Haraway, *When…*, p. 42.
[86] G. Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts (1953-1974)*, trans. M. Taormina, MA 2004, p. 33.
[87] G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, p. 11.
[88] For a broader discussion on that issue, see: I. van der Tuin, R. Dolphijn. *Pushing Dualism to an Extreme: On Philosophical Impetus of a New Materialism,* 2009 (under review).
[89] J. Butler, *Bodies that Matter: On Discursive Limits of „Sex",* New York 1993.

materialisation that stabilises over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity and surface we call matter"[90], and furthermore, as that which is already "fully sedimented with discourse on sex and sexuality that prefigure and constrain the uses to which that term can be put"[91], Barad points out her limitations. Namely, Butler's matter appears to be a passive outcome of discursive practices much more than an agent actively taking part in the processes of materialisation. Moreover, Butler's theory remain intrinsically anthropocentric, being focused only on human bodies, and thus it reinscribes the nature/culture dichotomy.

What Barad proposes instead in her agential realistic approach, is a (going far beyond the anthropocentric confinement) account of matter as a dynamic "substance in its intra-active becoming – not a thing but a doing, a congealing of agency. [...] a stabilising and destabilising process of iterative intra-activity"[92]. It is a discursive production in Barad's posthumanist understanding of discursive practices that I talked about in the previous section. Barad speaks about mattering – the processes of materialisation (of boundaries) and meaning production at the same time – as "a dynamic articulation/configuration of the world"[93]. She demonstrates how the material and the discursive are mutually implicated in this dynamics, while none of them is prior in epistemological, nor ontological sense. In other words, she explains how matter "comes to matter" – that is how it gets the meaning, which is already intertwined with the material boundaries which emerge in these dynamic processes. Material and discursive factors: constraints, conditions, practices, are always already con-joined. Consequently, both human and nonhuman bodies are (not pre-existent) material-discursive phenomena, which "come to matter through the world's iterative intra-activity", which Barad calls performativity. Traditionally (though, in different theoretical "wrappings"), matter has been considered either as a given, or as a discursive construct. Both ways have been simply reinscribing the binary dichotomy of nature and culture (with all its implications). Barad proposes an original and truly innovative account of materiality as dynamic processes, where agency is not attributed to the human subjectivity. Furthermore, agency is not a feature of subjects or objects in general, but it is rather understood as a "»doing«/»being« in its intra-activity"[94] always related to the issue of responsibility and accountability for our intervening "in the world's becoming". Interestingly, Barad emphasises the fact that the constitution of human and nonhuman is always "accompanied by particular exclusions and always open to

---

[90] Ibidem, p. 29 [cited in:] K. Barad, *Meeting...,* p. 150.
[91] Ibidem, p. 9 [cited in:] K. Barad, *Meeting...,* p. 150.
[92] K. Barad, *Meeting...,* p. 151.
[93] Ibidem.
[94] K. Barad, *Posthumanist...,* p. 827.

contestation"[95]. Again, it means that the boundary between human and nonhuman is not fixed, it is simply materialised in the ongoing, dynamic processes (of intra-actions), and always involves certain exclusions.

As I mentioned before, Donna Haraway also refers to the notion of performativity in the posthumanist understanding. Her account of matter is also an agentic one since the material body is always already discursive, it is a "material-semiotic actor". It is active in meaning-generating processes in which also its boundaries materialise. The matter and the body are thus the active agents. Haraway even uses the term of "world's active agency"[96]. Furthermore, when she speaks about co-constitutiveness of species (that I referred to in the previous section), she uses the term of "becoming with"[97]. One more time the "mantra" of posthumanism that relata do not pre-exist relations is being repeated.

We may find the same theme in Deleuze and Guattari, who in their monist ontology speak rather about becoming than being, while emphasising the notions of fluid multiplicity (precisely, as our ontology – far beyond binary oppositions transposed on different levels, such as mind/body, human/animal, man/woman, subject/object, etc.) and deterritorialisation of the human. The latter means exactly relinquishing the fixed, pre-determined boundary between human and nonhuman. Moreover, for Deleuze and Guattari, becoming is "a block of coexistence"[98]. I would suggest that also in the sense proposed earlier by Haraway. According to their rhizomatic structure (of thought as well as of ontology as such), "[a] line of becoming is not defined by points that it connects, or by points that compose it; on the contrary, it passes *between* points, it comes up through the middle"[99]. It is precisely the formulation of primacy of relations with regard to entities between which these relations take place.

Deleuze and Guattari demonstrate also how becoming is not organised along a vertical and hierarchical structure, such as that of evolution, where "filiation and "decency" are the key notions. Instead, they employ the notion of "alliance" as an important factor of becoming and that of the domain of symbioses[100], co-existence and co-constitutiveness. Although Haraway does not agree with Deleuze and Guattari at some points (for their lack of serious attention paid to "earthly animals"[101]), the notion of alliance as co-shaping (of

---

[95] K. Barad, *Meeting...,* p. 153.
[96] D. Haraway, *Simians...,* p. 199.
[97] D. Haraway, *When...,* p. 17.
[98] G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, *A Thousand...,* p. 292.
[99] Ibidem, p. 293.
[100] Ibidem, p. 238.
[101] D. Haraway, *When...,* p. 28-29.

companion species, but not only) and co-constitutiveness, works in her project in an excellent way.

What seems crucial then if one aims to talk about the posthumanist subject or rather subjectivity (I would argue, since it appears as a bit more dynamic) is that it always emerges from the set of changing, intra-active relations. Subjects and objects are constitutive of matter, they do not have fixed boundaries. As Haraway puts it, the relations are "the smallest possible patterns for analysis, the partners and actors are still-ongoing products. It is [...] how worlds come into being"[102].

Conclusion

The posthumanist theory appears as a very productive tool that may enable us to analyse the relations between humans and nonhumans and the complexity of the world we are living in generally. Birke, Bryld and Lykke provide us with an excellent example of such an analysis in their article on animal performances. Nonetheless, as I argued in the introduction to this paper, in order to use a theoretical tool, first one has to effectuate a precise mapping of its coordinates. In the case of the posthumanist theory it appears as particularly important due to the blurring of concepts often associated with posthumanism. That is why I defined precisely what I understand under the notion of posthumanism, while pointing out the task of going beyond humanist anthropocentrism as one of its main features. Moreover, I suggested four aspects through which I defined and analysed the posthumanist tool: modes of being (that is a posthumanist account of ontology – in the first section), modes of knowing (posthumanist entwinement of epistemology, ontology and ethics – in the second section), an account of matter and alliances (these two factors build the posthumanist perspective on the formation of the subject – in the third and last section).

In the first section I drew upon Deleuze-inspired Jami Weinstein's proposition of transspecies zoontology and Karen Barad's agential realist ontology, while pointing out how they complement and resonate with each other. Then I presented how the production of meaning and matter are always already intertwined, how the practices of knowing and being are always implicated in each other, and what is their relation to ethics, whilst suggesting the need for a specifically posthumanist ethics. In the last part I focused on Barad's, Deleuze and Guattari's as well as Haraway's accounts of matter and characteristics of realtion(ship)s. These insights lead directly to the question of the formation of subject. I would like to argue

---

[102] Ibidem, p. 25-26.

that the theorists I have analysed here manage to think the subject (or subjectivity) in a truly decentred, non-anthropocentric and posthumanist way.

The task of mapping and formulating the basic premises of the posthumanist tool has been thus fulfilled. In this way we gained indispensible insights that enable us to think the posthumanist collective. Yet, it is only the first step to question and imagine a truly posthuman(ist) politics.

Marietta Radomska, *Ku wspólnocie posthumanistycznej: ontologia, epistemologia, etyka.*

Abstrakt: Celem tekstu jest rekonstrukcja podstaw ontologicznych, epistemologicznych oraz etycznych projektu posthumanistycznego (zwanego też teorią lub narzędziem posthumanistycznym) na podstawie analizy propozycji teoretycznych Karen Barad, Gillesa Deleuze'a i Felixa Guattariego oraz Donny Haraway. Tylko dzięki tak precyzyjnemu zdefiniowaniu narzędzia teoretycznego możliwe będzie zadanie pytania o wspólnotę postludzką oraz posthumanistyczną politykę.

Słowa kluczowe: posthumanizm, transhumanizm, wspólnota, Barad, Deleuze, Guattari, Haraway.