

ROUTLEDGE ADVANCES IN RESEARCH METHODS



Walking
Methodologies
in a
More-than-Human World:
WalkingLab

Stephanie Springgay and Sarah E. Truman

Walking Methodologies in a More-than-Human World: WalkingLab

**Stephanie Springgay and
Sarah E. Truman**

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 Stephanie Springgay and Sarah E. Truman

The right of Stephanie Springgay and Sarah E. Truman to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

Cover Image Credit:

Cover image background: *Peak District May 2010*, “white is nothing, dark is nothing”

By Sarah Cullen. Used with permission.

Queering the Trail badge by Mary Tremonte.

ISBN: 978-1-138-29376-2 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-23191-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Introduction

Walking methodologies in a more-than-human world

The impetus for this book sprang from a walk-with Micalong Creek, in Wee Jasper, New South Wales, Australia. We had gathered in Wee Jasper with a group of women at the creek, for a queer feminist *Bush Salon*, to think and walk-with water, and to open up questions about human and nonhuman entanglements.¹ Walking the rocky crevices of the Micalong Creek, we paused to swim and sit on the grassy shore. Stephanie engaged the group in felting red wool around small rocks, and Affrica Taylor and Lesley Instone, the *Bush Salon* organizers, read aloud from a series of texts. Astrida Neimanis invited us to float in the creek as she read from a poem, and Mindy Blaise captured some of our fleeting gestures with her Artographer, a body-mounted camera. The group experimented with perambulatory writing techniques, proposed by Sarah. Insects buzzed and dogs chased each other through the shallows of the water. The air screamed with Australian heat. A bag of cherries was passed around the group of women wearing ‘trucker’ style hats with the word ‘quivering’ emblazoned on them.

Informed by Isabelle Stengers’ (2005) ‘politics of slowness,’ and Rosi Braidotti’s (2013) ‘becoming-earth,’ we sat on the banks of the creek and raised questions about research methodologies. We attuned ourselves to what Stengers (2005) calls a collective thinking “in the presence of others” (p. 996).² For Stengers, to think ‘in the presence of others’ creates a space for hesitation and resistance that produces new modes of relating. Collective thinking demands “that we don’t consider ourselves authorized to believe we possess the meaning of what we know” (Stengers, 2005, p. 995). Rather, thinking ‘in the presence of others’ is about the “unpredictability of opening ourselves to possibility” (Instone & Taylor, 2015, p. 146). Braidotti (2013) contends that this presentness must include a “geo-centred dimension,” which requires we consider different scales than those that are human centered. The *how* of the slow demands that we respond to the question of inheritance where ‘in the presence’ does not mean we know beforehand how to respond, but rather in the event of relation, ethics and politics become situated, indeterminate, and artful. For Donna Haraway (2008a), inheritance begs the question of accountability.

We walked-with many other freshwater creeks in Australia, ambled through lush valleys, clambered along the rocky sea coast, and facilitated a series of

2 Introduction

walking events and research-creation projects in urban spaces. Research-creation draws attention to the conjunctive at work in its process. Instead of perpetuating an idea of art as separate from thinking, the hyphenation of research-creation engenders “concepts in-the-making” which is a process of “thinking-with and across techniques of creative practice” (Manning and Massumi, 2014, p. 88–89). Research-creation can be thought of as “the complex intersection of art, theory, and research” (Truman and Springgay, 2015, p. 152).

In Canada, we continue to walk and organize walking research-creation events. Our walking research has evolved over a number of years through a diverse range of practices and theories. *WalkingLab*, which is the collective research-creation practice of Stephanie Springgay and Sarah E. Truman, emerged from a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Partnership Development Grant, *Performing Lines: Innovations in Walking and Sensory Methodologies*. The Partnership Grant was between Principal Investigator Stephanie Springgay and co-applicants Kimberly Powell, Andrew Hickey, and Louise Phillips. Sarah E. Truman was Lead Research Officer for the grant.

WalkingLab often works in collaboration with other artists and scholars, and the online hub [www.walkinglab.org] archives these networked activities. We gratefully acknowledge the many collaborators and artists who have worked with us over the years. *WalkingLab* also hosts an online residency and supports a blog that investigates what it means to move. Provoked by the encounter on the banks of Micalong Creek, and ongoing conversations about walking research and qualitative methodologies, we began to respond to the question of inheritance.

This introductory chapter situates the book in two methodological areas in qualitative research: i) walking methodologies in the humanities and social science; ii) qualitative methodologies that are informed by new materialisms and posthumanisms, and which are called by different names including non-representational methodologies and post-qualitative methodologies. We refer to these as more-than-human methodologies. The research-creation events that compose the empirical research in each of the chapters bring more-than-human methodologies to bear on walking research. The introductory chapter unfolds as a preliminary map for the book, acquainting readers with the theoretical frameworks and questions that inform our research-creation walking practices.

In the first section of the chapter, we summarize the impact of walking methodologies on qualitative research. In our extensive review of the field of walking methodologies, four major concepts appeared repeatedly within walking research: *place*, *sensory inquiry*, *embodiment*, and *rhythm*. These concepts, we maintain, mark significant contributions to social science and humanities research in that they foreground the importance of the material body in disciplines that have traditionally privileged discursive analysis. Building on the important work that has been done in walking research, we offer four expanded concepts that are accountable to an ethics and politics of the more-than-human: ***Land and geos***, ***affect***, ***transmaterial***, and ***movement***. These concepts inform our theoretical orientations to the research-creation walking events that we activate in each of the remaining chapters.

Following our discussion on walking methodologies, we return to the problems of inheritance, accountability, and more-than-human ethics introduced in our opening narrative. *Walking Methodologies in a More-than-Human World* interrogates the more-than-human turn in qualitative methodologies. Each chapter engages theoretically and conceptually with ongoing debates in qualitative research on *matter*. Specifically, we make new materialist methodologies and walking research accountable to critical race, feminist, Indigenous, trans, queer, critical disability, and environmental humanities scholarship. Indigenous scholars have interrogated the more-than-human turn, arguing that it continues to erase Indigenous knowledges that have always attended to nonhuman animacy (Todd, 2016). Queer, trans, disability, and critical race scholars argue that while a de-centering of the human is necessary, we need to question whose conception of humanity more-than-human theories are trying to move beyond. As Zakiyyah Jackson (2015) argues, “appeals to move ‘beyond the human’ may actually reintroduce the Eurocentric transcendentalism this movement purports to disrupt, particularly with regard to the historical and ongoing distributive ordering of race” (p. 215).

The final section in this introductory chapter provides an overview of the chapters. Each chapter thinks-with exemplifications from *WalkingLab*'s many research-creation events. Exemplification, according to Brian Massumi (2002), is not concerned with illustration or explanation, where an example becomes a model for research. Rather exemplification is concerned with improvisation and a degree of conceptual openness. In thinking-with walking we shift from an individual account of a human walker to consider an ethics and politics of ‘walking-with.’

Walking methodologies

Walking as a method and methodology in qualitative research is practiced and theorized through different and varied approaches (Lorimer, 2010; Springgay & Truman, 2017a). Examples include Wylie (2005) and Solnit's (2001) discussion of walking's relationship to leisure and landscape; and Lorimer and Lund's (2008) exploration of human experience and knowledge of the natural environment. There are walking accounts of mundane urban practices (Vergunst, 2010), of pedestrianism (Middleton, 2010), mapping (O'Rourke, 2013), and writing and thinking (Gros, 2014). Walking features in mobilities research (Bissell, 2016; Vannini, 2012) with an emphasis on technologies, movement, and stillness, and in research on place-making and space (Ingold, 2007; McCormack, 2014; Pink, 2009/2015). In ethnographic methods, walking has been utilized through the ‘go-along’ (Kusenbach, 2003) or the walking interview (Jones & Evans, 2012), which recognize the ways in which lived experiences, perception, and meaning-making are constructed through place and spatial practices of sociality and positionality. In the arts, walking proliferates as both an individual aesthetic and as a relational and socially engaged practice (Evans, 2013). Walking has also been addressed by sensory ethnographers (Gallagher, 2015; Pink, 2009/2015) and by

4 Introduction

feminist scholars examining the politics of location and the ideologies and practices that govern and limit bodies in movement (Heddon & Turner, 2012). Educational scholars incorporate walking methods in qualitative research, particularly in relation to somatic and sensory place-making (Banerjee & Blaise, 2013; Powell, 2017; Springgay & Truman, 2017b), as critical place inquiry (McKenzie & Bieler, 2016) and as defamiliarization (Truman & Springgay, 2016). Margaret Somerville's (2013) contribution to walking, water, and Indigenous knowledges offers cogent ways to think critically about place and movement. Recent articulations of walking as a social science methodology are found in Charlotte Bates and Alex Rhys-Taylor's (2017) edited collection *Walking through Social Research*. Maggie O'Neill's (2017) work on walking, mapping, borders, and resistance is another important contribution to critical walking methodologies.

We identify four major themes in walking research: *place*, *sensory inquiry*, *embodiment*, and *rhythm*. Here we offer a brief summary of each of these themes as they appear in walking research. Each of these concepts are critically investigated in more detail in the first four chapters of the book.

Place

Place features as a significant concept in walking research. Place is understood as a specific location and as a process or an event. Walking scholars discuss the ways that walking is attuned to place, how place-making is produced by walking, and the ways that walking connects bodies, environment, and the sensory surrounds of place. Walking becomes a way of inhabiting place through the lived experience of movement. Walking is a way of becoming responsive to place; it activates modes of participation that are situated and relational.

Sensory inquiry

With the turn to alternative ethnographic methods that would enable researchers to investigate non-visual senses, walking became an important means by which to conduct sensory inquiry. If, as walking researchers contend, walking is a way of being in place, then walking enables researchers and research participants to tune into their sensory experiences. Walking researchers interested in sensory inquiry sometimes isolate a sense on a walk – for example, a soundwalk – or they consider the ways that the walking body is immersed in a sensory experience of place, such as the texture of feet touching the ground, air brushing against cheeks, or the smells of city streets.

Embodiment

Walking methodologies privilege an embodied way of knowing where movement connects mind, body, and environment. Walking scholars typically describe embodiment as relational, social, and convivial. Embodiment is conventionally understood through phenomenology, where researchers and participants examine

the lived experiences of what it means to move in a particular place. This experiential understanding either focuses on an individual account of a walker, or is conceptualized through community-based or group walking practices that highlight the social aspects of walking.

Rhythm

The pace and tempo of walking is another theme that emerges in walking research. Here, researchers are interested in the flows of everyday life, pedestrian movements in a city, or the topological features of walking in a landscape. Rhythm is described through embodied accounts of moving and sensory expressions of feet, limbs, and breath. In other instances, rhythm pertains to the pulse of the city, such as traffic, crowds, music, and other environmental phenomena that press on a walker.

The chapters in this book extend these four themes through more-than-human theories that are accountable to critical race, feminist, Indigenous, trans, queer, and critical disability theories. We propose four additional concepts: ***Land and geos***, ***affect***, ***transmaterial***, and ***movement***. We use these concepts to think frictionally with *WalkingLab* research-creation events. Friction is a force that acts in the opposite direction to movement. It slows movement, “resist[s] the consensual way in which the situation is presented” (Stengers, 2005, p. 994). Friction exists every time bodies come into contact with each other, like different strata grinding against one another. Writing about the intersection between assemblage theory and intersectionality, Jasbir Puar (2012) argues that the convergence of the two theoretical frameworks is neither reconcilable nor oppositional, but *frictional*. Puar (2007) argues that theoretical concepts need not be united or synthesized, but that it can be productive to hold concepts together in tension.

Land and geos

More-than-human walking methodologies must take account of the ways that place-based research is entrenched in ongoing settler colonization. As such, place in walking research needs to attend to Indigenous theories that centre Land, and posthuman understandings of the geologic that insist on a different ethical relationship to geology, where human and nonhuman are imbricated and entwined. Land and geos are important concepts for walking methodologies because they are attentive to situated knowledges that disrupt humancentrism.

Affect

In tandem with more-than-human methodologies is a turn to affect theory. Affect, informed by vital and materialist theories, attends to the intensities and forces of an affecting and affected body. However, because there is a tendency to ascribe affect to pre-personal sensations, some uses and theorizing of affect can consequently erase identity. In contrast, ‘affecting subjectivities’ brings intersectional

6 Introduction

theories to bear on affect theories, emphasizing the ways that subjectivity is produced as intensive flows and assemblages between bodies (Lara, Lui, Ashley, Nishida, Liebert, Billies, 2017).

Transmateriality

If embodiment conventionally focuses on a phenomenological and lived account of human movement, then trans theories, which rupture heteronormative teleological understandings of movement and reproduction, disrupt the notion of an embodied, coherent self. Trans theories emphasize viral, tentacular, and transversal conceptualizations of difference.

Movement

Movement, as it is conventionally understood in relation to walking, suggests directionality. One walks to move from one place to another. The movement theories we draw on in this book understand movement as inherent in all matter, endlessly differentiating. Movement as force and vibration resist capture. This understanding of movement is indeterminate, dynamic, and immanent and intimately entangled with transmaterial theories and practices.

In addition, there are particular inheritances that proliferate in walking research. For example, walking is often positioned as inherently radical, and a tactic to subvert urban space, yet often ignores race, gender, and disability. Figures like the flâneur and the practices of the *dérive* become common tropes, often assuming that all bodies move through space equally. In Chapter 3 we analyze these methods in detail and offer crucial insights from critical disability scholars and critical race scholars, arguing that the unequal labour of walking needs to be more fully interrogated.

In the next two sections of the introductory chapter, we situate *Walking Methodologies in a More-than-Human World* within the new materialist and posthumanist methodological approaches to qualitative research. It is these theoretical frameworks that we use to conceptualize and enact our four concepts of *Land and geos*, *affect*, *transmaterial*, and *movement*.

Accountability and more-than-human ethics: walking queerly

A key concept that has gained momentum in qualitative methodologies is Karen Barad's 'intra-action.' For Barad (2003), matter and meaning do not pre-exist as individual entities. Rather the world is composed of intra-acting phenomena which "are the ontological inseparability of agentially intra-acting components," meaning that they become determinate, material, and meaningful through relations (p. 815). Objects do not exist as discrete entities that come together through interactions but are produced through entanglement. Katrin Thiele (2014) notes that such an ontological view privileges relations. Relations, she writes are "all

there is” (p. 206, italics in original). Thus, a materialist ontology recognizes the interconnections of all phenomena where matter is indeterminate, constantly forming and reforming. As Barad (2007) makes clear, ethics then is not concerned with how we interact with the world as separate entities. “Ethics is about mattering, about taking account of the entangled materializations of which we are a part, including new configurations, new subjectivities, new possibilities” (p. 384). The consequences of this ethico-onto-epistemology for qualitative methodologies and walking research are significant, as it challenges individualism and humanist notions of intentionality, destabilizes conventional notions of space as a void, and directs our attention to the highly distributed nature of collectivity and relationality. It also, as Thiele (2014) argues, requires that we reconfigure how we think about accountability.

If ontology and ethics, or being and acting, are always already relational, then ethics shifts from a responsibility to act on the world in a particular moral way “to on-going precariously located practices, in which ‘we’ are never categorically separate entities, but differentially implicated in the matters ‘we’ engage with” (Thiele, 2014, p. 207, italics in original). Furthermore, if ‘we’ are intra-actively entangled in worlding, then there will never be a final solution or outcome, rather new matterings will emerge for our entangled intra-actions. To be accountable is about “making commitments and connections” (Barad, 2007, p. 392). Accountability shifts from being responsible for, to a response-ability-with (Manning, 2012; Thiele, 2014), or what we have described earlier as a being ‘in the presence’ of others. This is an ethics, Barad (2011) contends, of entanglements, “enfolded traces” and an indebtedness to an irreducible other, where “‘Otherness’ is an entangled relation of difference” (p. 150).

Part of this accountability is in the use of queer theory to rupture the normalizing inheritances of walking research. Queer has been used to denote practices and theories that unsettle norms, and to call attention to how sexuality, gender, and race are constituted and regulated by hierarchies of humanness (Giffney & Hird, 2008). Eli Clare (2001) uses the term queer in its “general sense, as odd, quirky, not belonging; and in its specific sense, as referring to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender identity” (p. 361). According to Kath Browne and Catherine Nash (2010), queer research can be “any form of research positioned within conceptual frameworks that highlight the instability of taken-for-granted meanings and resulting power relations” (Browne and Nash, 2010, p. 4). For Jack Halberstam (2005), self-identification as ‘queer’ has a place in queer theory, but thinking beyond subject identification and with a queer relationality opens up new possibilities for understanding space and time. Understanding queer as non-normative logic of space-time, Halberstam outlines ‘queer time’ as time outside normative temporal frames of inheritance and reproduction, and ‘queer space’ as new understandings of space enabled by the “production of queer counter-publics” (p. 6). Deborah Britzman (1995) discusses how queer theory can signify both “improper subjects *and* improper theories, even as it questions the very grounds of identity and theory” (p. 153). As such, queer can tend in a multitude of directions. For example, Eve Sedgwick (2003) uses the idea of ‘queer performativity’ as a production of

meaning making, specifically related to shame, while Donna Haraway (2008b) states, “Queering has the job of undoing ‘normal’ categories, and none is more critical than the human/nonhuman sorting operation” (p. xxiv). Dana Luciano and Mel Chen (2015) maintain that “the figure of the queer/trans body does not merely unsettle the human as norm; it generates other possibilities – multiple, cyborgian, spectral, transcorporeal, transmaterial – for living” (p. 187). However, Luciano and Chen (2015) also warn against reducing queerness to solely a “movement of thought, or of affirmation or negation” in that it can slide into a kind of queer exceptionalism that resonates too easily with Western notions of progress or modernity (p. 95). As such, queer theory must remain accountable to “located histories of precarity” (p. 94). Furthermore, Lorena Muñoz (2010) calls attention to ‘whiteness’ in queer research where “[q]ueer’ sensibilities are theorized and understood through lenses that are largely academic, western, white, and privileged” (p. 57). Puar (2007) similarly argues that when queer is linked with transgression and resistance, it relies “on a normative notion of deviance, always defined in relation to normativity, often universalizing” (p. 23). When viewed through this framework the queer identity and the *ability* to queer is tied to Western rational individualism and the liberal humanist subject who can afford to be queer and to queer. It is also consequently tied to the liberal humanist subject who asserts their agency to *queer* or *be* queer. So, while many qualitative researchers in the social sciences and humanities often take up the word queer to describe letting go of traditional research boundaries such as data and theory, or researcher/researched, and utilize ‘queer’ as methodology, we need to account for the subjectivities that don’t enjoy the benefit of sliding in and out of being conveniently queer.

Unsettling the ‘ontological turn’

The concept of the more-than-human emerges at time in scholarly debates that seek to challenge and de-centre human exceptionalism, taxonomies of intelligence and animacy, and the distinctions made between humans and nonhumans, nature and culture (Springgay & Truman, 2017c). Animacy, according to Chen (2012), has been historically aligned to the category of the human. Linguistically, animacy refers to the “quality of liveness, sentience, or humanness of a noun or a noun phrase” (p. 24). At the top of the animacy taxonomy are masculine, heteronormative, able bodies, with intact capacities. As you move down the schema, as bodies and things are perceived as less agentic, they become less animate. Race, disability, and gender, for example, fall at the lower end of the animacy taxonomy. This taxonomy, Chen (2012) argues, is a contributing factor in dehumanization, where qualities valued as ‘human’ are removed, and those who do not fit into the category of the human are considered ‘inhuman.’ Luciano and Chen (2015) argue that the problem with liberal-humanism and its “politics of rehabilitation and inclusion” is that any conceptualization of human is always marked with an outside (p. 188). The dehumanization of particular subjects – Indigenous, Black, trans – posits a particular human body and human sexuality as a norm. Rather than view the inhuman as the opposite of the human, the inhuman becomes a process by which human and

nonhuman frictionally come together. In fact, Luciano and Chen (2015) question the ways that posthumanism melts the boundaries between human and nonhuman as an easy flow. They posit the inhuman as a method of thinking otherwise. Jeffrey Cohen (2015) notes that the inhuman, as a concept, emphasizes both difference and intimacy. ‘In’ as a negative prefix presumes difference from something. It assumes a negative, or inept capacity. Likewise, ‘in,’ he argues, describes being within something, a touching intimacy, or an “estranged interiority” (p. 10).

Lee Edelman (2004) argues that enlivening the inhuman with animacy isn’t about demanding recognition into the category of human. Therefore, the more-than-human should not become an inclusive concept that folds bodies and subjects that have typically been positioned on the outside into the fabric of the human. Likewise, the more-than-human must not merely blur the boundaries between human and nonhuman, but operate as a *strategy* that asks, “how those categories rub on, and against, each other, generating friction and leakage” (Luciano & Chen, 2015, p. 186). A similar argument is developed by Barad (2011). She argues that terms like human and nonhuman can’t be established as polar ends and as givens, where particular actions aim to bring them into moral equivalence. Rather, she writes, “the ‘posthumanist’ point is not to . . . cross out the distinctions and differences, and not to simply invert humanism, but rather to understand the materializing effects of particular ways of drawing boundaries between ‘humans’ and ‘non humans’” (p. 123–124). Queer Crip scholar Alison Kafer (2013) writes that the human/nonhuman distinction assumes an able-bodiedness of the human. Disability, she claims, has always been marked as unnatural, or as limited, and as such is something to be overcome in order to become fully ‘human.’ Writing from a political/relational framework of disability studies, Kafer wonders how we might think disability through intra-active concepts such as interdependence, collectivity, and responsibility.

For Jin Haritaworn (2015), the question of the inhuman is risky and requires anti-colonial methodologies that would in turn be aligned with Indigenous sovereignty. This brings us to Zoe Todd’s (2016) arguments that the ‘ontological turn’ is itself a form of colonization. She writes that non-Indigenous scholars’ realization that nonhumans entities “are *sentient* and *possess agency*, that ‘nature’ and ‘culture,’ ‘human’ and ‘animal’ may not be so separate after all – is itself perpetuating the exploitation of Indigenous peoples” (p. 16, italics in original). From an Indigenous perspective, it isn’t simply about the idea that all things have vitality but that such epistemological and ontological orientations in Indigenous thought are about “legal orders through which Indigenous peoples throughout the world are fighting for self-determination, sovereignty” (Todd, 2016, p. 18). Here we think of the examples given by Elizabeth Povinelli (2016). If rock/minerals are inanimate and non-Life they can be mined for human use. If they are sacred from an animist position then they can be protected, but therefore excised and rendered of no-use. Both of these examples are grounded in legal struggles over land, access, and sovereignty. Todd (2016), like other Indigenous scholars, insist that ontological discussions of matter must take into consideration not only Indigenous world-views but material legal struggles over matter and sovereignty.

Furthermore, while Todd demands that non-Indigenous scholars engage in a politics of citation, her calls to action come with a cautionary note, one that is similarly articulated by Indigenous scholar Vanessa Watts. Watts (2013) writes:

When an Indigenous cosmology is translated through a Euro-Western process, it necessitates a distinction between place and thought. The result of this distinction is a colonized interpretation of both place and thought, where land is simply dirt and thought is only possessed by humans.

(p. 32)

Indigenous scholar Sarah Hunt (2014) also critiques the position that in order to be “legible” Indigenous knowledges “must adhere to recognized forms of representation” (p. 29). These ‘recognized’ forms of representation become institutionalized through academic and Euro-Western cultural discourses. We attend to the challenges of recognition in Chapter 6, proposing a re-mapping practice that is speculative and future oriented.

Similarly, Jackson (2015) cautions the use of terms like ‘post’ and ‘beyond’ in posthuman scholarship as such terms might actually re-inscribe Eurocentric values, time, and knowledge systems. Furthermore, she argues that the turn to the more-than-human signals the continued erasure of race from materialist accounts of vitality. Jackson (2013) states that although posthuman scholarship is important for its attention to vitality, it has often ignored race, colonialism, and slavery. While recognizing the contributions by feminist and queer scholars, Jackson (2013) contends that too often posthuman theories remain committed to a particular Euro-Western rationality and humanism, or what Sylvia Wynter (2003) calls ‘Man.’ For Jackson, and other critical races scholars who engage with posthumanism, the aim is not that people of colour will somehow “gain admittance into the fraternity of Man” that they have always been outside of, the aim is to “displace the order of Man altogether” (p. 672). This means re-thinking posthumanism, not as a politics of inclusion for those enslaved or colonized under liberal humanist ideals, but as a strategy of transforming *humanism*.

As more-than-human theories gain momentum in re-conceptualizing qualitative methodologies in the social sciences and humanities its fault lies in broad definitions. While consideration is given to all forms of matter and the intra-relatedness of entangled ethics, its politics is often consumed in a rhetoric of undoing dualisms where ‘everything matters’ and thus becomes flattened. Questions about the politics of new materialism are typically elided. They are absent, Peta Hinton and Iris van der Tuin (2015) reason, because there is a tendency to think that arguments about matter as dynamic, self-organizing, and intensive *are political in and of themselves*. They maintain that new materialism’s general insights into matter assume that politics is everywhere – but to the extent that it disappears. Celia Åsberg, Katrin Thiele, and Iris van der Tuin (2015) argue that not only has the question of the political been eclipsed in a lot of new materialist scholarship, queries regarding its contributions to queer feminist political agency have been lost.

Feminist geographer Juanita Sundberg (2014) takes up a further concern, stating that posthumanist scholarship in its attempt to critique dualisms actually works to “uphold Eurocentric knowledge” (p. 33). Despite the usefulness of posthumanism, Sundberg contends that it is deeply entrenched in Western European dualistic ontologies and as such does not entertain complex knowledge systems of the Indigenous Americas. Sundberg shares similar critiques of the ‘ontological turn’ to that of Todd (2016). She argues that dominant posthuman scholars operate universally and often neglect the fact that the humanist traditions they write against “originated in European societies involved in colonization, were globalized in and through colonial practices, and are currently given life in white supremacist settler societies” (Sundberg, 2014, p. 36). The “silence of location” coupled with “circumscribed references to Indigeneity” continues the legacy of colonial violence (Sundberg, 2014, p. 36). Sundberg argues that universalisms suppress other worlds, where “radical alterity is contained and reduced to sameness” (p. 38). Sundberg finds more-than-human theories productive, but articulates a need to ensure that while attending to the ‘more,’ colonization, racial violence, and legal oppressions are not ignored in the name of animacy.

In attending to multiple and other world views of animacy, Sundberg (2014) offers walking as a strategy for decolonizing research. In thinking how to move collectively, of being accountable in the presence of others, she reasons that walking enacts situated and contingent ontologies between land, peoples, and nonhuman others. She draws on examples such as Idle No More, a Canada-wide Indigenous movement, and Mexican activists, the Zapatistas movement, who articulate their practice as ‘walking-with.’ Walking-with, she states, entails “serious engagement with Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies, and methodologies” (p. 40). Walking-with should not be misconstrued with conviviality and sociality, or the idea that one needs to walk with a group of people. You could walk-with alone. We situate our conceptualization and practice of walking-with alongside Sundberg and the walkers she works with. We are also indebted to the rich feminist work on citational practices (see Chapter 8) and Alecia Jackson and Lisa Mazzei’s (2013) on thinking-with theory. Walking-with is explicit about political positions and situated knowledges, which reveal our entanglements with settler colonization and neoliberalism. Walking-with is accountable. Walking-with is a form of solidarity, unlearning, and critical engagement with situated knowledges. Walking-with demands that we forgo universal claims about how humans and nonhumans experience walking, and consider more-than-human ethics and politics of the material intra-actions of walking research.

Walking-with: chapter overviews

Place is a central concept in walking research – from considerations of the textures of gravel and pavement that shape how one walks (Vergunst, 2008; Edensor, 2008) – to the ways that everyday pedestrianism structure and produce place (Middleton, 2010). But place, Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie (2015) argue, is entrenched in settler colonial histories and ongoing practices that have not

sufficiently attended to Indigenous understandings of Land. In Chapter 1 we walk with Indigenous theories of Land and critical place inquiry (Tuck & McKenzie, 2015; Watts, 2013); posthuman theories of the geologic that disrupt taxonomies of what is lively and what is inert (Ellsworth & Kruse, 2012; Povinelli, 2016; Yusoff, 2013); and a posthuman critique of landscape urbanism (Foster, 2010). The chapter is activated by a *WalkingLab* research-creation event *Stone Walks on the Bruce Trail: Queering the Trail* that convened on the Bruce Trail in Ontario, Canada. Seventy people participated in the four-hour group walk, which was stimulated by ‘pop-up’ lectures by geologists, community activists, Indigenous scholars, and artistic interventions.

Walking methodologies invariably invoke sensory, haptic, and affective investigations (MacPherson, 2009; Gallagher, 2015). While sensory studies (Howes, 2013; Pink, 2009/2015) and affect theories (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010; Ahmed, 2004) have evolved separately, they are both concerned with non-conscious, non-cognitive, transmaterial, and more-than representational processes. Chapter 2 examines a number of *WalkingLab* walking projects through sensory, haptic, or affect theories. Crucial to our examinations of walking research is a focus on critical sensory studies that interrogate the ways that walking and the senses produce gendered, racialized, and classed bodies. Similarly, we turn to Stefano Harney and Fred Moten’s (2013) use of hapticality to think about how walking constitutes a politics-in-movement. This turn to politics is extended through our discussion of different affect theories, in particular we address recent scholarship on ‘affecting subjectivities,’ which attend to the affective messiness of race, sexuality, gender, disability and additional forms of difference (Lara, Lui, Ashley, Nishida, Liebert, & Billies, 2017). In the final section of the chapter, we argue that ‘feelings futurity’ in walking methodologies requires that sensory inquiry, haptic modulations, and affective tonalities ask questions about ‘what matters.’

Chapter 3 examines a sonic walk called *Walking to the Laundromat* by Bek Conroy, in order to develop a theory of transmateriality. Sonic or audio walks can be described as walks that use pre-recorded and choreographed audio tracks downloaded to phones or other electronic devices. *Walking to the Laundromat* probes bodily, affective, and gendered labour including domestic labour, money laundering, and the proliferation of new age self-help audio books to question how some bodies are perceived as disposable in order for other bodies to thrive (Mbembe, 2003; Puar 2007). We critique normalized and universal references to the flâneur, a man of leisure, who is able to walk, detached and privileged in a city. The flâneur, we argue, is a problematic emblem for walking methodologies. We introduce Stacy Alaimo’s (2010, 2016) important concept ‘transcorporeality,’ which takes into consideration the material and discursive entanglements between human and nonhuman entities. We extend this discussion by thinking-with a number of trans theories (Barad, 2015; Colebrook, 2015; Hird, 2006; Stryker, Currah, & Moore, 2008). Trans theories, we contend, complicate walking as embodied and emplaced in order to disassemble and disturb taxonomies, and confound the notion of an embodied, coherent self.

Walking methodologies are often framed as participatory, inclusionary, and thereby convivial. The problem with participation as inclusion is that while it promotes diversity and equity, inclusion also operates as a symbolic gesture that fails to undo the structural logics of racism, ableism, homophobia, and settler colonialism. Participation as inclusion is a universalizing and normalizing practice. In Chapter 4 we critique how participation has been framed through inclusionary logics (Sykes, 2016, 2017) and as rehabilitation (Kafer, 2013; Puar, 2017; Shildrick, 2015; Titchkosky, 2011). To do so we lean on two walking projects: *Ring of Fire*, which was a mass procession for the opening of the Parapan Am games by Trinidadian artist Marlon Griffin and the Art Gallery of York University, and *The Warren Run*, a group orienteering event by Matt Prest commissioned by *WalkingLab*. Following these crucial critiques of participation as inclusion, we ask questions about how we might think differently about participation drawing on theories of movement. While numerous walking scholars have used Henri Lefebvre's (2004) rhythmanalysis, we turn to Erin Manning's (2012, 2016) theories of movement to argue that participation begins before the invitation of inclusion commences. Here we frame movement through a different discussion of *Ring of Fire* and *The Warren Run*, and also the project *White Cane Amplified*, by Carmen Papalia.

Chapter 5 responds to agitations that are occurring in qualitative research, particularly issues related to: the incompatibility between new empiricist methodologies and phenomenological uses of methods (St. Pierre, 2016a); the preponderance of methodocentrism (Weaver & Snaza, 2016); the pre-supposition of methods (Manning, 2016); a reliance on data modeled on knowability and visibility (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013; Maclure, 2013); the ongoing emplacement of settler futurity (Tuck & McKenzie, 2015); and the dilemma of representation (Lorimer, 2005; Thrift, 2007; Vannini, 2015). These agitations have provoked some scholars to suggest that we can do away with method. Rather than a refusal of methods, we propose that methods need to be generated speculatively and in the middle of research, and further that particular (in)tensions need to be immanent to whatever method is used. We draw on numerous *WalkingLab* exemplifications to ask how we might go about doing research differently.

Walking and mapping have been experimented with by artists and scholars for decades (O'Rourke, 2013). Walking cartographers incorporate hand-drawn maps, Global Positioning Systems (GPS), sensory maps, psychogeography, narrative, photography, scores, and networked databases to name just a few. Despite the many creative and inventive techniques used to walk and map place, the prevailing history of mapping is entrenched in imperial and colonial powers who use and create maps to exploit natural resources, claim land, and to legitimize borders. Cree scholar Dallas Hunt and Shaun Stevenson (2017) argue that conventional mapping practices continue to reaffirm dominant conceptualizations of Canada. Kathrine McKittrick and Clyde Woods (2007) assert that mapping and normalized geographic understandings continue the erasure and segregation of Black subjects. The racialization of space, they argue, is often theorized as essentialized or detached from actual geographic places. Chapter 6 examines three *WalkingLab*

projects that re-map – as a form of counter-cartography – erased and neglected histories. Taking up the ways that maps produce and reinforce geopolitical borders, and the geographies of race, we consider the ways that re-mapping offers possibilities for conceptualizing space that is regional and relational, as opposed to state sanctioned and static. We consider how walking can re-map archives and disrupt linear conceptualizations of time. Walking as ‘anarchiving’ attends to the undocumented, affective, and fragmented compositions that tell stories about a past that is not past but is the present and an imagined future. As counter cartographies and anarchiving practices the walking projects disrupt dominant narratives of place and futurity, re-mapping Land ‘returning it to the landless.’

In educational contexts, walking is valued because it increases creativity, focuses student attention, promotes healthy lifestyles, and supports environmental sustainability. While these claims might be important reasons to advocate for movement in schools, the tenuous link between walking and creativity can easily be commodified and normalized by neoliberalism. Furthermore, when the rhetoric of benefits or value is ascribed to walking, educational research becomes trapped in an outcomes-based model. Chapter 7 deviates from these conceptualizations of walking and focuses on two examples of walking-with research in school contexts. In contrast to an outcomes-based model that continues to uphold a particular notion of humanism, our two examples offer the potential for students to critically interrogate humanist assumptions regarding landscape and literacy. We examine the complex ways that students can engage in walking-with as a method of inquiry into their world-making. This is the *how* of walking-with as learning.

Chapter 8, which functions as a speculative conclusion or summary, is enacted as a series of walking-writing propositions that respond to questions concerning the relationship between walking and writing, and our collaborative process. Propositions are different from methods in that they are speculative and event oriented (Truman & Springgay, 2016). Propositions are not intended as a set of directions, or rules that contain and control movement, but as prompts for further experimentation and thought. Over the past number of years, as we presented early drafts of our walking research at international conferences, we were frequently asked about our collaborative walking-writing practice: how we understand the relationship between walking and writing, and how we collaborate. The chapter unfolds through a series of walks that we invite the reader to take: differentiation walks, surface walks, activation devices, ‘with,’ touch, and contours. Walking-writing we contend is an ethics that is “about responsibility and accountability for the lively relationalities of becoming of which we are a part” (Barad, 2007, p. 303).

As a research methodology walking has a diverse and extensive history in the social sciences and humanities, underscoring its value for conducting research that is situated, relational, and material. Yet, as we argue throughout the book, walking is never neutral. In a time of global crisis – emboldened White supremacy – it is crucial that we cease celebrating the White male flâneur, who strolls leisurely through the city, as the quintessence of what it means to walk. Instead, we must *queer* walking, destabilizing humanism’s structuring of human and nonhuman, nature and culture.

Walking Methodologies in a More-than-Human World provokes a critical mode of walking-with that engenders solidarity, accountability, and response-ability ‘in the presence of others.’ We opened the introduction, by invoking Stengers’ (2005) ‘politics of slowness.’ However, such a concept is risky because of dominant understandings of walking as slow, antiquated, and in opposition to more efficient forms of transportation. Rather, as Stengers so carefully articulates, slow is not necessarily about variations in speed (although it can be), rather it is intended to ask critical questions, and to create openings where different kinds of awareness and practices can unfold. Slowness is a process of unlearning and unsettling what has come before. In approaching walking methodologies from the perspective of slow, we intend to critically interrogate the many inheritances of walking, to agitate, and to arouse different ethical and political concerns.

Notes

- 1 The Bush Salons are the collective efforts of Affrica Taylor and Lesley Instone and typically take place in Wee Jasper, New South Wales, Australia. See here for more information: <https://collectivewalkingmethods.wordpress.com/category/wee-jasper-bush-salons/>; <http://commonworlds.net/bush-salon-wee-jasper-july-2015/>
- 2 See Haraway (2008a, p. 83) for a discussion of Stengers’ ‘slow’ based on Deleuze and Guattari’s idiot.