

Digital Slow:
Brahmanisms, Zetetic Wild Sciences, and Pedagogics

Anne B. Reinertsen

Østfold University College, Norway

Corresponding Author: Anne.B.Reinertsen@hiof.no

(Submitted: 27 March 2020; Accepted: 21 August 2020)

Abstract

Our digital society and education systems are produced and simultaneously constrained within powerful political discourses. *Brahmanisation* (Piketty, 2019) of left-wing parties and policies is an example of this preventing substantial and conflictual but productive transformation, hence leaving the educational field in stasis. This article is a critique of discursive productions of policies and offers a view of digitalisation and/or education collectively produced through *zetetic* or curious wild science, productive doubts and Slow scholarships, ultimately turning inquiry into our systems' signature pedagogics and/as change: inquiry as pedagogy as change. The focus is the becoming-child infused with immanent life, our educational institutions and policies turned into spaces for exploring and experimenting with new ways of minded mattered living, and making possible the realisation of post-structural and more-than-human concepts such as the disintegration of subjectivity. All concepts are seen as critical, hence simultaneously performative and methodological, as critical engagements oriented towards inclusion, sensed democracy¹.

Keywords: affective computing, Brahmanisation, Pedagogy of the Concept, Sensed Democracy, Slow scholarship

¹ Many sentences in this article might appear abrupt and incomplete. Grammatical rules are challenged. I write messy. I write messy texts. This is deliberate and part of my plea for openness and newness, to escape the legacy of the *linguistic turn* in science and research and the discursive certainties that are created through it. Creating new words and word assemblies is part of my plea. Inquiry as pedagogy as constant change needs concepts and genres that are indirect and vibrating with potentialities, not positivist representation. *Cesi n'est pas une pipe* (Wikipedia, 2020a)





During springtime 2005 and before demolition, the Norwegian artist Lars Ramberg (born 1964) installed the word *Zweifel*, *Doubt* in English, at the top of *Palast der Republik* in Berlin, Germany (Ramberg, 2005). Ramberg (2005) aimed at turning the palace into a virtual institution for doubt, *Palast des Zweifels*, in English a Palace of Doubt, doubt as a proof of reflection and democracy. The installation caused quite a stir and actually became a monument over the debate in itself, an aggregate for politics itself to perform new debates on national identity. Objecting to any ideological solutions, *Palast des Zweifel* also became a critic of historical monuments.

Our digital society and education systems are produced and simultaneously constrained within powerful political discourses. These are discourses historically developed within the *linguistic turn* of research and science and subsequent science/knowledge processes, structured along axes of self-reflexive individualism and self-evident scientific rationality, indexed on a linear notion of time and a teleological vision of the purpose of both scientific thought and human existence. Through this, discourses form norms, shape habits and traditions, policies, ideologies, identities, institutions, systems and structures, cultures and so to speak, monuments. In his latest book *Capital et Idéologie* (2019), Piketty claims that the *brahmanisation* of the traditional left-wing parties and policies is one of the most prominent features of our times. The Brahmins were members of the upper class in the Indian caste system, the priesthood. Brahmanisation implies that a class of learned people win political power by claiming moral and intellectual supremacy, and through this, become a stand, class, or group of its own, influencing the society with its own values. They also explain differences in society by those same values. According to Piketty, modern Brahmins forward middle-class values and draw voters from the well-educated middle class. They also reduce distribution issues and focus on values anchored in the self-assertive asceticism of the educational elite. Gradually, this produces discourses that turn the field of education and educators into carriers of a middleclass moralism estranged from the working classes and helps Nativist movements get in (more below). Left-wing right-wing divisions in politics, therefore, no

longer express divisions between classes, only a rivalry between money elites and educational elites (Jakobsen, 2019: 25). Rivalry within logics of symbolic liberal illiberal bifurcations only, preventing substantial and conflictual but also productive transformation, hence leaving the educational field in stasis, wordless and vulnerable: wordless and vulnerable with respect to what might be between, the between, and how to live it. Rivalry leads to polarisation, and doubt is, this way, turned into signs of weakness or even worse, reserved for the weak, the unworthy, the others, the ones far away from me, very different from me, strange, strangers...

Nativists are nationalists who conceptualise nation as an expression of birth and ethnicity and want to distribute wealth from such criteria. This is very different from conceptualising nation as a construct created by citizens and through political participation (Jakobsen, 2019: 8). Nativists and Nativisms sadly play well with rivalry – or, as I see this, *traditional dialectics* of subject/object, body/mind, nature/culture, individual/collective – ultimately discursive Western conceptions of identity as primary and as superior to difference (*c.f.* Deleuze, 1994). Education, in line with brahmanisation, is hence predominantly conceptualised as personalised learning, growth-mindsets as a policy mandate.

To elaborate: in the tradition of Hegel (1770-1831) and Heidegger (1889-1976), the concept of identity is posited as a primary ontological concept founded on assumptions of unity, a notion that identity is core and a unity identical to itself, the Same or the similar. In this conceptual framework, identity thus constitutes the norm and normality. Difference becomes subordinated to-, and negatively defined in opposition to and inferior to identity (Deleuze, 1994). Instead of difference therefore being associated with collective conceptual potentialities of positive value and inclusion, it is associated with inflated, often negative, value and exclusion. Such rivalry and dualisms therefore preserve the production of discourses (and monuments) through *doxa*², that is: they produce echo chambers of knowledge and delay and hinder doubt as a critical engagement for inclusion. Critique here seen as productive for building-in decolonised dynamics in our pedagogical practises and in every concept we use as a perpetual state of 'digression and digressiveness' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 23). Dichotomous thinking or dualisms delay and hinder inquiry as pedagogy as constant change hence hinder Slow becoming the guiding norm and signature pedagogics in education. Instead, brahmanised current features and push in education e.g. of continuous assessment for continuous improvement, estrangement and even dehumanisation continue. The discursive moves that facilitate this push continue.

Therefore, I plea for educational policies and practises grounded on immanent inter-connections and generative differences: a transversal composition of multiple assemblages of responsive pedagogues, of inclusion. Developing learning cultures as surfaces of water spreading

² *Doxa* (ancient Greek) δόξα; from verb δόκειν *dokein*, 'to appear', 'to seem', 'to think' and 'to accept' is a Greek word meaning common belief or popular opinion. In classical rhetoric, *doxa* is contrasted with *episteme* (knowledge). Pierre Bourdieu (1977[1972]), in his *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, used the term *doxa* to denote what is taken for granted in any particular society (*Wikipedia*, 2020b)

and trickling downwards through fissures and gaps, eroding what *is* in its way. Culture as surfaces of water can be interrupted and moved, but these disturbances leave no trace, as the water is charged with pressure and potential to always seek its equilibrium, and thereby always establish another pedagogical space. These are simultaneous nomadic processes or cultures of speeding up when standing still. Education as emergent and seen as the inseparable ethical task of change, or ethology. Deleuze writes: 'Ethology is first of all the study of the relation of speed and slowness, of the capacities for affecting and being affected that characterise each thing' (1988: 125). Building on Stengers (2018) and in line with Deleuze and Guattari, the concept of 'slow', through this, paradoxically evokes a speeding up to strengthen- here; digital diversity for justice: subjective knowledge creation, affective pedagogies, computing forwarding potentialities, and pragmatic use, education – ultimately democracy – dependent on being sensed to work. Deleuze and Guattari write: '*Slow and rapid are not quantitative degrees of movement but rather two types of qualified movement*, whatever the speed of the former or the tardiness of the latter' (2004b: 409, emphasis in original). In the current COVID-19 context, this seems more urgent than ever.

Before we go on: this is a sensorial and indirect approach to learning and digitalisation informed by Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) and Félix Guattari's (1930-1992) transformational pragmatics or more precisely, the Deleuzian *Pedagogy of the Concept* (1994). It implies a view of pedagogical work construed through affect, and that experience surpasses knowledge with/in learning processes. The notion of affect bears connotations of bodily intensity: affect as a passion, as pathos, sympathy, and empathy. Pedagogy and the tasks for the pedagogues and educators in every case being to discover the libidinous or sublime speech of the body and its investments at the social area, possible internal conflicts between, relations with and to pre- or unconscious investments at the same area and then again possible conflicts between these. Instead, of asking how I/we as educators work with and use digital tools and programs, ask why and when I/we work with and use such tools. Digitalised systems, data justice and affective pedagogies and computing hence require new norms of iterative difference, as all there is always, as something eternal and affectively traversing time and place: something imperceptible, affirmative, particular, and universal. Learning transmigrating throughout the eons of time. Through this, the object in work with digital justice in theory and practice becomes work with processes of *transcurricular subjective becomings and affects*.

Foresight in research

Braidotti (2019) claims that we are situated between a posthuman collapse between the fourth Industrial Revolution and the sixth Distinction of Species, between advanced knowledge economies, all of which continue and even further discriminating patterns of inclusion, exclusion, and threats of climate change. Piketty (2014, 2019) has through his meticulous work on economic data given us the numbers and statistics for this. According to Braidotti, such collapse demands critical interventions regarding how we as educators constitute subjectivity, how we view knowledge creation generally and how we construct or form our academic work in general, and our pedagogical teaching and learning practices specifically.

Macgilchrist, et al. (2019) speculate with and sketch three possible futures for education and society that outline emerging issues for the sociotechnical configuration in which we live today. In the first future configuration, young people fit themselves into a frictionless, smoothed, capitalist society. In the second, young people devise their own routes to freedom by rejecting the nation state and the commons. In the third, collective action, experimental institutions, and public funding shape a more ecological and equitable world. While the materiality of technology is undeniably important, each future history means decisions have been taken about which technologies, institutions, funding lines, research, pedagogies, relations, designs, etc., to prioritise. These decisions are being made today and the corona virus has - for better or worse - given us a crash course in digitalisation. For the first (Orwellian) scenario to unfold however, policy can continue as it is today, but activists would have to step down. The second marks a gradual 'brain drain' from formal institutions: it therefore indirectly requires institutions to continue ignoring the growing interest in digital nomadism. The third scenario - and what I ultimately plea for - demands more. It demands a radical collective and public action, which is - I think - already underway. Another type of collective and inclusive nomadism and as Slow that is, institutions nourishing a valuable diversity of onto-epistemic cultures, embracing class, ethnicity, gender, and generation conflicts and empower learners to raise critical questions, non-linearity being in-built into its logics. We speak less for or against digitalisation for example. We seem to speak less of apps, websites, and specific tools, and more about possibilities and tools for building and safeguarding relations. In my institution, we opened the new semester with teamwork and discussions about Teams or Zoom, the one or the other, when, and why. With reference to decision-making: research shapes these decisions by focussing critical attention on aspects of potential future histories. Again, and to avoid scenarios one and two, this is here manifested as research with critical concepts and/as Digital Slow. Ultimately, a way of raising the level of embodied and embedded data literacy amongst learners.

In Norway, as already one of the most digitalised countries in the world, the problem is not access to internet and technology, but what we can do to ensure that the technology we do have access to can provide added value (Spurkland and Blikstad-Balas, 2016). Added value in terms of i.e. addressing inequality, abolishing binary divisions in favour of processes within the immanent between/s as subjective - paradoxically collective agencement³. Processes of creating futures open to - and sensed by - all, based on affective processes. In the current COVID-19 situation in which home schooling has replaced regular schooling during lockdown; students, however, report that it is difficult to stay motivated, maintain routines, and that they miss school. They miss fellow students and teachers (Ording, 2020). It is 'call to arms' for Slow.

The goal of the Digital Slow becomes to shape society collaboratively, embracing the strife and conflict that such processes require. Nothing is innocent or neutral, and as we shall see, slowing down requires new norms of *iterative difference*, as all there is always, but simultaneously

³ *Agencement* asserts the inherent implication of the connection between specific concepts and that the arrangement of those concepts is what provides sense or meaning. It translates narrowly to English as 'arrangement', 'fitting', or 'fixing' (*Wikipedia*, 2020c).

as something eternal affectively, traversing time and place. According to Deleuze (1994: 94), *internal difference* lies at the heart of *difference in itself*. In order to distinguish difference in itself from the traditional concept of difference, Deleuze therefore creates the concept *multiplicity* which is plural and continuously in/as processes of *becomings*. A multiplicity is heterogeneous and cannot be identical to itself. Ultimately, the Slow takes up the provocations of concepts, which in turn reminds us that in strategies to change oppressive social systems, education and technology are only ever partial aspects. Furthermore, that digitalisation and digitalised systems of deep learning, Machine Learning (ML) and systems of Artificial Intelligence (AI), are not weakening causality but creating new ways of finding indirect factors correlations, and that these processes make it possible for us to talk about e.g. preliminary and approximate causality, as well as about a situated causality or causality not.

With reference to discursive production of educational policies and brahmanisation, habitual dualistic ways of thinking, the image of productive doubts, processes of/as constant becomings, inclusion between/s, and so on, might appear almost as *a schizophrenic monstrosity* or *incomprehensible magic*. Instead of speaking about knowledge, evidence, truths, findings or results, I here speak of something imperceptible, something affective, affirmative, particular and universal, and something inclusive that collectivises freedom and paradoxically might make us even more human. Digital Slow as *processes of transcurricular subjective becomings*. The schizophrenic therefore is/as 'the universal producer' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 7).

Affective forces in immanence and logics of intensities

I am not naïve or a techno positivist; I am aware of huge privacy issues: technologies learn from a constantly growing pile of data. Precisely therefore, and with the concepts of democracy ultimately justice in mind, I think we need a new norm of difference, an alternative form of perception – a perception in becomings and affect. Affect as an act of thinking embodied in the maximum intensity of an immanent evaluation of experience, as 'a power to affect itself, an affect of self on self' (Deleuze, 1988: 101). Affect therefore seen as that, which expresses our innermost intense and as yet a-conceptual feelings forcing every concept open to yet-unknown territories of thought⁴. Between all affective forces, Deleuze prioritises love (he presents the immanent evaluation of experience in the affective language of "I love or hate" instead of "I judge") (Deleuze, 1989: 141; Semetsky, 2020: 5). Through affect, through love, ultimately through Slow, knowledge turns provisional and contingent; education become *eventicised* (Reinertsen, 2020a). The subject is turned into a *structure of affectivity* and/in as/of a life and dwelling as change in *Pure Immanence* (Deleuze, 2012).

Experiential learning through doubt is not a form of chaotic education and definitely not a form of anti-education of/free will, but education that seeks to get knowledge to work and/to produce constant importance for those involved. It is a view of learning as collective processes and collectivity with/in learning and that- and again, implies a change of learning cultures.

⁴The theoretical concept of justice for example is detached from judicial rights connotations *per se* and thought of as a critical performative and methodological concept, as processes of becomings.

Sweeping away the deadening disjunctions that paralyses the adventure of experience. Spreading towards available spaces towards new, any data program, application or platform hence designed for knowledge production as change itself, the only constant being *difference in itself*, in a constant process of *becoming*.

Even the many is a multiplicity; even the one is a multiplicity... Everywhere the differences between multiplicities and the differences within multiplicities replace crude oppositions. Instead of the enormous opposition between the one and the many, there is only the variety of multiplicities – in other words, difference... everything is multiplicity, even the one, even the many. (Deleuze, 1994: 64-65)

Learning can therefore probably never be a visible phenomenon, and as we shall see, Deleuze's model of experiential informal learning is built on the explication of subtle signs, images, aesthetic and/or artistic signs as potential sources of meanings. I add love, writing love stories and novels, novel writing. I will come back to it and come back to writing love stories and novels. 'For it is through writing that you become animal, it is through colo[u]r that you become imperceptible, it is through music that you become hard and memoryless, simultaneously animal and imperceptible: In love' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a: 208).

Slow scholarships and educational science

Paradoxically, it is a writing as science that is objective but subjective, slow but fast, strong but weak, therefore a humble and open approach. Humble towards the range of scientific knowledge and to that which we will hopefully never know about the development of a child and learning (Reinertsen, 2020c). This is what I call *Digital Slow* but urgent through productive doubts and affect. See also Van den Berg, et al. (2018), Hartman and Darab (2012), and again Leibowitz and Bozalek (2018) for more on Slow. Stengers (2018) argues that researchers should stop seeing themselves as the 'thinking, rational brain of humanity' and refuse to allow their expertise to be used to shut down the concerns of the public, or to spread the belief that scientific progress is inevitable and will resolve all of society's problems. She writes:

It means, therefore, creating among us and with others the kind of relation that works for ... people who need each other in order to learn - with others, from others, thanks to others - what a life worth living demands, and the knowledge that are worth being cultivated. (Stengers, 2018: 82)

I speculate with the concepts of speed and force highlighting the entangled contours of knowledges, inequality, equality, and quality in education ultimately democracy and justice. I defend the critical thinking and subjective judgment of professional teachers; hence, this is indirectly a discussion about the side effects of the lifeless and draining political and centralised control and speed of our educational systems and institutions. This said, I appreciate that

systematisation and categorisation can contribute to fairness. Also, the new Norwegian Core curriculum – values and principles for primary and secondary education – represents a growing awareness of the importance of both cross- and trans-curricular work, source criticism, mental health issues, sustainability and democracy (Utdannings-direktorat, n.d.). However, like in any machine creating speed, there must be shifts that adjust actual resistance to available force, here thought of as a play with concepts, concepts as critical and methodological. Even if you drive an automatic car, you ought to know that shifts are there and what they do.

I therefore think we need to think and work with education in general and digitalisation specifically in a scientifically profound new way. Not as a civilisation critic of, let us say, Western philosophies and policies as such, but as a break with a view of education and science as goal oriented and purely teleological and also views of knowledge as representational and corresponding ways of telling stories of science and research as constant improvements, constant higher levels of rationality. Rather, focus is the becoming child infused with immanent life. Pragmatic work and pedagogics within different discourses through zetetic⁵ inquiry and affect. Learning ultimately seen as emergent and affective – I add *secularly just* – processes of *intrarelationality*. If I think of Piketty's (2014) law here (read below), the hardest nut to crack is probably (the) me. The/my Self being a flow of habits...

Liberal-illiberal bifurcations and habits

I visited a small-town high school to supervise some of my students from university during their obligatory teacher training practicum. One of the lessons that I attended was a social studies class in the school's health studies programme. There were 20 pupils present and, on this particular day, they worked, in groups, on the theme of poverty – absolute and relative – and the welfare state. As I also moved around, a pupil asked me if I could help her with answering one of the questions they were supposed to work with. The question was why and how the welfare system could compensate or work against poverty. Further, if the pupils had suggestions as to what was feasible measurements and interventions.

I started discussing the question with her and the rest of the group. Obviously, it was a very complex question demanding complex answers and we spent some time, about five minutes or so, on what I thought of as a discussion and hopefully, a dialogue. Suddenly the pupil who had approached me originally, exclaimed: 'I don't like this type of questions! I want concrete questions that I can answer with a simple yes or no!' I said: 'Oh, but is that possible in this case? Don't you think that wide and open questions like this allow you to construct your own answers and also give you substantial freedom both to choose how and what to answer such questions with?' Her eyes went black and I could see her anger, frustration, disappointment and rejection ... Her body jerked, signalling that she was not interested in continuing talking to me.

⁵ Zetesis, or in ancient Greek ζήτησις, means search, examination, or inquiry (www.merriam-webster.com)

It flew right in my face: All, everything already being classed, compartmentalised, gendered and racialised. My answer to her oozing of well-educated, well-intentioned, middleclass, political correctness, institutional authority. I left the table in inner turmoil of simultaneous feelings of resignation over myself, and hopelessness. Still however, smiling kindly, perhaps a bit pale, and told her - of course she could do this the way she wanted to.

I cannot guarantee that it will not happen again. Justice is a moving target and pedagogical phenomena, and I might not recognise it when it occurs. It is not naïve to hope⁶.

Humble processuality and zetetic wild science...

Piketty's law is that unregulated capitalism tends to increase inequalities. Differences between people grow. Put in a blunt way, the rich get richer and the poor poorer. Distances between increase. The same applies to- and with a view to the two first sociotechnical configurations and scenarios above of compliance or rejection, the field of science and education ultimately digitalisation. Not through not regulating the systems and lack of control, however. Rather, and with a view to brahmanisation again and rivalry between elites, the opposite being the case, reinforcing- through too many regulations and control, tendencies of inequalities; leaving the field de facto in stasis. It is how polarisation, dualisms, either or thinking work. Piketty's analyses thus shed light on both how and why e.g. the Norwegian school system supports social differences. Rapp (2018) shows - and supported by Pisa investigations⁷ - that in high-status living areas and schools, the focus on academic performance is higher than in low-status living areas and schools, where focus is more on security and social relations. The same research also shows that in order to compensate or "fix" things, the Norwegian school system and policies constantly introduce different programs and interventions expected to solve problems (Rapp, 2018). Introducing and participating in multiple programs *per se* is considered a success criterion when evaluating activities of schools and school leaders; it creates monuments. Schools in low-status areas introduce many programs to solve problems.

I therefore rhetorically add and ask: what? Is it really so that we are solving problems with the working/lower social class? What problem, why problem, whose problem? Is there a Brahman's blind spot here somewhere, and arrogance...? Well-meaning school owners both at the local and national levels offer a variety of programs to schools. However, these programs do not necessarily communicate and risk turning schools into fragmented structures, further turning into centralised and commercialised programs and discourses of knowledge creation (Bjordal, 2016) and/or raw power struggles not challenging doxa. Hence, discriminating patterns of inclusion and exclusion can continue⁸. I claim - and with particularly future scenario two above in mind - that it makes school an institution and education (in the current but traditional meaning

⁶ All data is anonymised and reproduced with all required permissions

⁷ See: <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/>

⁸ See: www.dagsavisen.no/oslo/slikformesskolen

of the word) uninteresting and even irrelevant for more and more young people. We see testimony of this in the dropout rates, which have been stable at about 30% over the last thirty years⁹ (Reinertsen, 2014).

Digitalisation and automation, read also computerisation, is moving faster and deeper into our institutions. It has the potential of contributing to increased knowledge creation, newness and efficiency, save time that I can use on expanding or rather 'quantify ... [my] ... writing' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a: 4) and competences for justice and change. For better or worse, we live in a time in which knowledge production no longer exclusively belongs to academic and formal scientific and educational institutions. This challenges opinions that isolate learning as something primarily academic and linguistic. There is, however, no potential and any news or justice in digitalisation in itself; through polarisation, digitalisation works as much against knowledges as for the opposite, and speeds up. Discursive production of policies preventing knowledges, justice and sometimes it seems- even thinking itself.

iHuman¹⁰ (Hessen Schei, 2019) is a documentary thriller that takes us on a journey into the 'invisible revolution' of artificial intelligence. The opportunities and challenges it brings and its impact on the global community. I think of its impact on education and learning, future scenarios and now the COVID-19 pandemic as amplifier if we do not do Slow.

Getting intense and wild

Guattari explains the difference between discursive productions and the procedural logics of intensities, what he calls the schizophrenic positivity of language:

While the logic of discursive sets endeavours to completely delimit its objects, the logic of intensities, or eco-logic, is concerned only with the movement and intensity of evolutive processes. Process, which I oppose to system or to structure, strives to capture existence in the very act of its constitution, definition and deterritorialisation. This process of "fixing-into-being" relates only to expressive subsets that have broken out of their totalising frame and have begun to work on their own account, overcoming their referential sets and manifesting themselves as their own existential indices, procedural lines of flights. (2008: 30)

Deleuze and Guattari forward a productive processuality as a machinic model of immanent becomings through desire. They claim that desire is not an imagined force based on e.g. lacks, wrongs or shortcomings, but a real and productive force. Productions through encounters between multiplicities ushering us towards experiences that more closely resembles the intensive level and desire it operates, activating the ethical task in education. Deleuze writes:

⁹ See also <https://utdanningsforbundet.no/var-politikk/utdanningsforbundet-mener/artikler/frafall/>.

¹⁰ See: <https://tv.nrk.no/program/KOID75003817>

A life contains only virtuals. It is made up of virtuals, events, singularities. What we call virtual is not something that lacks reality but something that is engaged in a process of actualisation following the plane that gives it its particular reality. The immanent event is actualised in a state of things and of the lived that make it happen. (2005: 31)

Further, the unconscious of thought- as the yet unthought-of at the cognitive level – is considered to be just as profound as the unknown in the body, at the level of affects and encounters, generating identity – (Deleuze, 1994) but never conceptualised as fixed. Even as a concept inhabits our experience in its as yet unconscious or virtual form, the ethical task remains 'to set up ... to extract' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 160) the very "'sense' of this empirical event as the newly created concept in our actual practice (Semetsky, 2020: 6). Only, however, to do it again. Sensed democracy, democracy sensed as ethics and the words working, working words...

For Deleuze and Guattari (1994) all concepts are *living* concepts, therefore never representationally applied or applicable onto neither subjects nor objects. Rather, potentialities are engendered through decentered identities and becomings, sciences and research *with* concepts to meet with expanded digitalised realities and requirements. Tapping into the virtual and immanent processes of machinic becomings is equivalent to affectivity. 'The processes of becomings are filled with affect, desire, love, and Eros' (Semetsky, 2020: 6). Deleuze continues:

The plane of immanence is itself actualised in an object and a subject to which it attributes itself. But however inseparable an object and a subject may be from their actualisation, the plane of immanence is itself virtual, so long as the event that populate it are virtualities. Events or singularities give to the plane all their virtuality, just as the plane of immanence gives virtual events their full reality. The event considered as non-actualised (indefinite) is lacking in nothing. (2005: 31)

For Deleuze and Guattari (2004b) process is at least three different things. First, process is production, or everything is production, since the recording processes are immediately consumed, immediately consummated, and these consumptions directly reproduced. It implies 'incorporating recording and consumption within production itself, thus making them the productions of one and the same process' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 4). Second, man and nature are not like two opposite terms confronting each other – not even in the sense of bipolar opposites within a relationship of causation, ideation, or expression (cause and effect, subject and object, etc.); rather, they are one and the same essential reality, the producer-product. Production as process overtakes all idealistic categories and constitutes a cycle whose relationship to desire is that of an immanent principle. That is why desiring-production is the principal concern of a materialist psychiatry, which conceives of and deals with the schizo as 'Homo natura' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 5). Third, process must not be viewed as a goal or an end in itself, nor must it be confused with an infinite perpetuation of itself. Putting an end to the process or prolonging it indefinitely – which, strictly speaking, is tantamount to ending it abruptly and prematurely – is

what creates the artificial schizophrenic found in mental institutions: 'a limp rag forced into autistic behavio[u]r, produced as an entirely separate and independent entity' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 5).

It 'possibilises' or potentialise another form of kindness and care, creatively iterative or an eternal cautiousness perhaps. There is something urging me to proceed by inquiry. I suggest a zetetic or a sort of sceptic digital exploration produced through affected curiosity. A cautiousness that is imperceptible, humble, Slow but forcefully active and/as a sort of constantly working engagement:

A more gentle deterritorialisation ... might enable the assemblages to evolve in a constructive, processual fashion. At the heart of all ecological praxes there is an a-signifying rupture, in which the catalyst of existential change are close at hand, but lack expressive support from the assemblage of enunciation; they therefor remain passive and are in danger of losing their consistency – here are to be found the roots of anxiety, guilt and more generally, psychopathological repetitions (réitérations). In the scenario of processual assemblages, the expressive a-signifying rupture summons forth a creative repetition that forges incorporeal objects, abstract machines and Universes of value that make their presence felt as though they had been always "already there", although they are entirely dependent on the existential event that brings them into play. (Guattari, 2008: 30-31)

Referring to Stengers again. She argues that in order to do Slow, I add escape brahmanisation, science must engage openly and honestly with an intelligent public and be clear about the kind of knowledge it is capable of producing:

It should involve an active taking into account of the plurality of the sciences, in dialogue with a plural, negotiated and pragmatic (that is, evaluated on its effects) definition of the modes of evaluation and valorisation relevant to different types of research. (2018: 52)

Kindness and care, eternal cautiousness, democracy sensed...

-and where the speed and creative forces reside

At the heart of, and to elaborate a bit more on the critique of discursive production of (digital and educational) policies, is the power knowledge relation. While Michel Foucault (1972) examines which knowledge practices (economic, political, moral, religious, judicial, technical ...) make the establishment of knowledge possible, such that knowledge and power constitute each other, Deleuze and Guattari, separately and together, work with the concept of power, as we already have seen, as immanent productions of force through desire or *desiring-machines* and as something – bodies of water – always already there (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a: 562). The way I see this, it opens up and brings me closer to the 'becoming child'. Deleuze writes; 'small children,

through all their sufferings and weaknesses, are infused with an immanent life that is pure power and even bliss' (2005: 30).

Foucault (1972) ascertains that all knowledgeproduction stage knowledge practices. His knowledge archaeology describes how different sciences incorporate, reactivate, and create a network of different strategies. When knowledge and power is seen as constituting each other, knowledge about e.g. an individual person can only be generated through a set of power-mechanisms: discipline, monitoring, examining, registration, classification, and hierarchisation. Individualised knowledge is therefore built on procedures of power forwarding knowledge about an individual. Knowledge acquisition is seen as conditioned through exercise of power.

Foucault denies that a piece of knowledge represents an independent reality. He wanted to break with a view of science as teleological and corresponding ways of telling stories of science and research as constant improvements, constantly higher levels of rationality. Rather, a 'discourse is the historical, social and cultural conditions "possibilising" that an utterance or action is considered as natural or acceptable' (cited in Hammer, 2019). Foucault's historical work shows how new epistemic grows forward often in processes comprised of diverse fields of theories and practices, gradually melting together. In accordance with Foucault, I think that the normative or critical significance of knowledge is irrelevant. What is interesting is that which discursively is accepted as knowledge in a society but in order only to activate it and getting it moving. In the words of Deleuze and Guattari again: 'To overturn the theatre of representation into the order of desiring-production: this is the whole task of schizoanalysis' (2004b: 294).

Movements for co-creation of new and other relations to technology and cosmos. Another *fuzzytechie* (Reinertsen, 2020a) cosmology, a real virtual thinking *with* technology DreamTank. Another cosmology of different temporalities of things. Experiencing Slow. Experiencing fast. Time activist experiments and the different temporal capital of different people. Force, information, data, pictures, texts playing with each other. Relational activism_s, activism_s in multiplicity and pluri-temporalities. PolyPluriCriticality ... Becomings through absolute incompetence ... My real dreamtank ... Furthermore, how to construe a research apparatus to explore such cosmos? How to embody observations in a way that engender simultaneously movement and phenomenon? What roles do lines and points acquire in such movements? What kind of thinking does digitalisation require? How does doubts and algorithms go together? Do they? What about dirty algorithms, and what is the social in digitalisation? How to produce productive collective designs? I turn to Deleuze and Guattari's image and concept of the nomad. With a view to scenario two above, this is decisive:

The nomad distributes himself in a smooth space; he occupies, inhabits, holds that space; that is his territorial principle. ... Of course, the nomad moves, but while seated, and he is only seated while moving. ... The nomad knows how to wait, he has infinite patience. Immobility and speed, catatonia and rush, a "stationary process", station as process ... It is thus necessary to make a distinction between *speed and movement*: A movement might be very fast, but that does not give it speed; a speed may be very slow, or even immobile,

yet it is still speed. Movement is extensive; speed is intensive. Movement designates the relative character of a body considered as “one”, and which goes from point to point; *speed, on the contrary, constitutes the absolute character of a body whose irreducible parts (atoms) occupy or fill a smooth space in a manner of a vortex, with the possibility of springing up at any point.* (2004a: 420-421, italics in the original)

It a forceful dwelling in immanence, a persistence within immanence and digital Slow nomadology. Affect in-act and a being alert to the potentiality in/of the moment. Activism_s in multiplicity giving a micro-political force to the energetic life of affective relationality, and a nomadic showing waiting (Reinertsen, 2020c). Productions of subjectivity through folding and unfolding, connections between external realisations and inner actualisations of subjectivity: an understanding of individuation and subjectivity related to a collective molecular diffractive and refractive learning and expanded societal understanding. It is a science and action simultaneously speeding up and slowing down. Speed and creative forces simultaneously residing in immanence.

I speak of other than digital judgement and advocate creation of new affects that have a potential to change the flows and cadences of present configurations of digitalisation and education. Creating and investing in amplifying affects that contribute to or engender a sensitivity to the immanent intensive and affective processes that condition thought. It implies experimenting with and explorations of our epistemic understandings of e.g. subject matter and curriculum and the ontological models that we have brought to bear, and to potentialise the shaping of other configurations of- and models for knowledge production, digital teaching and learning. Mapping out alternative modes of experimentation on the level of sensation, perception and affects.

Before I go on writing, and to highlight the urgency of this digital Slow nomadology, I want to comment on the concepts of doxa and discourse again. Subsequently on immanence, the real, nomadic movement, and digital potentialities. Ultimately, the way I see this, the paradoxical foundation of justice and democracy. I claim that experience trumps knowledge. I rhetorically and in a traditional language of pedagogics ask; what kind of experience do we facilitate for a child within doxa?

In his *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Pierre Bourdieu (1977[1972]) used the term *doxa* to denote what is taken for granted in any particular society. The *doxa*, in his view, is the experience by which the natural and social world appears as self-evident. It encompasses what falls within the limits of the thinkable and the sayable, and in accordance with Foucault the way I read him, that which falls within the universe of possible discourse, that which goes without saying because it comes without saying. According to Bourdieu, doxa therefore sets limits on social mobility within the social space through limits imposed on the characteristic consumption of each social individual. Certain cultural artefacts are recognised by *doxa* as being inappropriate to actual social position; hence *doxa* helps to petrify social limits, the ‘sense of one’s place’, and one’s sense of belonging, which is closely connected with the idea that ‘this is not for us’. Thus, individuals become voluntary subjects of those incorporated mental structures that deprive them of

consumption that is more deliberate. The meritocratic structure of our education systems is a reinforcing power. Doxa and opinion denote, respectively, a society's taken-for-granted, unquestioned truths, and the sphere of that which may be openly contested and discussed. We have known this for years...

Bourdieu (1977[1972]), however, believes that doxa is more than common belief. It also has the potential to give rise to common action and democracy as the manifestation of public opinion. While doxa is used as a tool for the formation of argument, it is also formed by argument. The former can be understood rhetorically or rather that rhetoric creates 'truth' that is useful for the moment out of doxa, or the opinions of the people, through the process of argument and counterargument. The latter, however, is dependent upon, and therefore constrained by, the same (discursive) limits imposed upon the individuals responsible for its establishment. Doxa is therefore pliable and imperfect - the outcome of an ongoing power struggle between clashing 'truths'. While Bourdieu thinks such power struggles are essential to a democracy- I add knowledge creation, I think it limits agency (*agencement*) and subjectivity and calls to attention that the notion of *the real* as social order 'naturally' occurring is limiting and misperceived. Not only disregarding its creation by political argumentation but failing to expand and explore *the real* as potentialities, virtual, cosmic always more and other. I want to write a love story about education, digitalisation, democracy and even about capitalism ...

The real is not impossible; on the contrary, within the real everything is possible, everything becomes possible. Desire does not express a molar lack within the subject; rather, the molar organisation deprives desire of its objective being. Revolutionaries, artists and seers are content to be objective, merely objective: they know that desire claps life in its powerfully productive embrace, and reproduces it in a way that is all the more intense because it has few needs. (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 29)

Stares

Today I am practicing animal stares. I bounce back and forth between *hunting lion* and *regretful dog* before I decide on *sheep in the rain*. Contrary to public opinion, I don't think the stare is difficult. The stare is easy, a feather dancing in the wind. A way of looking at life. The difficult part is to imagine a life other than this. A life without trickling rain and wet wool. Dry days. The bumpy ride to the slaughterhouse (Straumsvåg, 2006: 29)

Literature and genres writing love stories...

Capitalism institutes or restores all sorts of residual and artificial, imaginary, or symbolic territorialities, thereby attempting, as best it can, to recode, to rechannel persons who have been defined in terms of abstract quantities. Everything returns or recurs: States nations, families. That is what makes the ideology of capitalism "a motley painting of everything that has ever been believed". The real is not impossible; it is simply more and more artificial. (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 37)

Piketty's law does not imply any type of economic or historical coercion. On the contrary, history shows that it is possible to create egalitarian societies but conditioned by a will and effort to redistribute wealth. If one lets private capital work free without progressive taxation, inequalities will gradually increase, unnoticeable in the short run, but over a generation or two the concentration of fortune and income thus power and political influence will be dramatic. One moves towards a type of society which Piketty describes through thought-provoking analyses of the novels of Jane Austen and Honoré Balzac:

Both novelists were intimately acquainted with the hierarchy of wealth in their respective societies. They grasped the hidden contours of wealth and its inevitable implications for the lives of men and women, including their martial strategies and personal hopes and disappointments. These and other novelists depicted the effects of inequality with a verisimilitude and evocative power that no statistical or theoretical analysis can match. (Piketty, 2014: 2)

I think of speed and force, I think of my car and its automatic shifts but not. I think of this 'limp rag forced into autistic behavior' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004: 5). Ultimately, I think of novels and literature, reading and writing breaking through doxa and discourses offering other experiences and notions of reality. Nomadic patience, upbeat but Slow science and pedagogics. It is another science both absolute and relative, infinite, and finite. Infinite through its surveys and finite through its movements that traces the contours of its components. A sciencing up and strengthening of the scientific and theoretical basis we think *with*. A view of (digital) education and research as a constant hunt for other subjects. Processes of inquiring into own knowledges, experiences and sensations connecting it to a wider natural, cultural, material, political, systemic, research and social context. Opening up nuances and principle dilemmas and paradoxes, which contributes to the development of a more distinct knowledge base and plateaus. Simultaneously opening a wider domain through processual onto-epistemological readings, of responsibility, social contracts and mandates. Openings toward expanded meaning fields. Truth and justice are in the potentials. It is a wild science and research deeply intertwined with broader social interests, which means that science cannot race ahead in isolation but must learn instead to slow down:

Slowing down means becoming capable of learning again, becoming acquainted with things again, reweaving the bounds of interdependency. It means thinking and imagining, and in the process creating relationships with others that are not those of capture. (Stengers, 2018: 82)

It is a science and writing able to purport concepts beyond time, place, and the logics of simplistic causality. Concepts in motion. Through curiosity and doubts. It includes future studies and the power of imagination, learning and perception, expectation and prediction, foresight and

preconception, integrated spiralling meta-looping through constantly plugging in knowledges at multiple levels.

Kindness and care, eternal cautiousness, democracy sensed...

Krysset lounge chair

Krysset, (cross, junction, intersection) is a Norwegian design icon with a distinguished cross-legged expression. Fredrik A. Kayser (1924-1968) designed Krysset in 1955. The crossed legs shape the overall structure of the chair with darker wooden nails in the joints enhancing the crafted beauty. The backrest is stretched out like a sail by a piece of leather sewn to the frame (<https://www.eikund.com/our-products/krysset-lounge-chair/>).



In 2017 the novelist Anders Malm (born 1980) wrote *Krysset*, a book about a man who does not identify himself through or within any social system, but as an object among other objects, in a hierarchy of things. From the cover of the book we can read that after having directed three successful viral commercials for Norwegian design classics, the man, Bas, decides to realise himself through his things. In the elaborate world of furniture design, he finds peace and quiet. He reads journals in Hans Bratterud's (1933-2017) *Scandia* chair; he makes love with his girlfriend in in a Børge Mogensen (1914-1972) sofa, but nothing compares with the feelings *Krysset* gives him... At one point, his world comes apart. The relationship to his girlfriend slips. The body decays. The things make themselves strange to him. Bas loses himself and must start construction of another I. Living with things is no longer enough. The next stage is symbioses ...

In his last book, *The Swarm* (2019), Malm asks if algorithms can set us free. Four young boys, A, B, C and D, resist living as individuals and seek a new form of existence: the swarm. Again, taken from the cover of the book: through a rigid code of honour based on homemade algorithms, they try to rid themselves of the burden of individualism and demand for exceptionality. They try to melt together into one. When they find a collection of designer clothes, left behind from one of the boys' mother, the parent generations' worshipping of individualism wraps itself into the collective project of the boys. I think of the scenarios again and politics that we shape today ...

Kindness and care, eternal cautiousness, democracy sensed ...

I cross my heart as change ...

Thinking stuff and possibilising technologies

The more the capitalist machine deterritorialises, decoding and axiomatising flows in order to extract surplus value from them, the more its ancillary apparatuses, such as government bureaucracies and the forces of law and order, do their utmost to reterritorialise, absorbing in the process a larger and larger share of the surplus value. (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b: 37)

Now you might ask where the technology is. Where are the presentations and discussions about teachers' and students' digital competences and literacy, ICT and blended learning, approaches to teaching and learning programming, ICTMOOC development and use and so on. Productive 3.0, 4.0 ... First, and returning to and commenting on difference, the Same and Other again: there is no need for those presentations and discussions here. Digitalisation is on the one hand the same and does not deviate per se from other teaching and learning situation and pedagogics. The importance of an affective component in teaching and learning, applies regardless of any type of technology, teaching, and learning. Second, this is not about digitalisation. Rather, digital Slow is about other and indirect. It is about how to broaden our pedagogical perspectives not opposed to but collaborative and co-constructed. *Becoming* as a becoming of practices that holds the limits of knowing as a good thing and practices of loving not knowing and the promise of doing and thinking other is what you love – always. Meaning making through meaning nothing. Learning and knowledge production growing out of a type of un/certainty or rigour as a force that is something other than securing or revising claims or reasserting critical or interpretive mastery, rather teachers, students and researchers trying to keep the concept of digitalisation through working hard not to conceptualise, or understand what digitalisation is. Digitalising not, digitalisation without digitalisation, weak digitalisation, 'digitalisation': never to be found, always to come. Concept not realised but put to work simultaneously kept.

Sublimation

Scientifically speaking sublimation is, under certain compression and temperature conditions, the direct transition from solid form to gas without going through a liquid state. That is why the pile of ice on the pavement slowly shrinks little by little every day despite the fact that temperature does not rise above zero. Something similar happens every time I put a check into my bank account. The capital never reaches the liquid state. It is the same thing when you after thirty years visit your childhood home. It is much smaller than you remember. People are older and smaller. Everybody notices when something dramatic happens; a car crash, a tree that falls.

They whine about the drive-in cinema being closed down. Still, the sly process of sublimation continues without pause, almost imperceptible. That which was continues to be, in the form of a

molecule or atom or something, not more accessible now than what it was then. (Jenkins,2007: 64, my translation)

Third, digitalisation requires more and wild. What is urgent therefore is the thinking stuff of this inclusive between/s and that it challenges us/me all the time. With reference to the corona situation again, I elsewhere ask: 'How to continue not knowing what is right or wrong even in times of crisis?' (Reinertsen, 2020b). I remember the first time I came across the Derridean concept of- and awareness in the original violence of *arche-writing* (1976[1967]: 140), the violent instituting moment of any institution or concept; in awareness thus also of the nonethical opening of the ethics, *arche – writing* therefore both *as the origin of morality as of immorality* (Ibid: 140). Me violent! No way! Me a Brahman! 'The stare is easy, a feather dancing in the wind. A way of looking at life. The difficult part is to imagine a life other than this'.

Kindness and care, eternal cautiousness, democracy sensed,
a fluid state...
a learning culture like/of floating water...
I zweifel
try to redesign the designer clothes
together...

Ask why and when I/we work with and use digital tools? Let me launch a minimum demand: A policy for digital justice must at least not make peoples' possibilities for success more unequal than they are today. Defensive, but critical, I am afraid.

Author Biography

Anne B. Reinertsen is professor in philosophy of education, qualitative research methodologies, knowledges of practice and evaluation research. She has worked as teacher, teacher educator and leader. Her research interests are subjective professionalism, leadership, materiality of language, new configurations of research methodologies and slow scholarship. She has been visiting scholar at Stanford University and University of Illinois. Her publications include national and international books, journals, and book chapters

References

- Bourdieu, P. 1977 [1972]. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Volume 16. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Bjordal, I. 2016. Markedsretting i en urban norsk skolekontekst - Et sosialt rettferdighetsperspektiv/Market Orientation in an Urban Norwegian School Context: A Social Perspective on Justice. Unpublished PhD diss., Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway.

- Braidotti, R. 2019. The critical Posthumanities. Keynote 10. New Materialisms Conference: New Materialist Reconfigurations of Higher Education. University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa. 2-4 December 2019.
- Deleure, G. 1988. *Foucault*, trans. S. Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. 1989. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. H. Tomlinson & R. Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. 2012. *Pure Immanence. Essays on a Life*. New York: Zone Books
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. 1994. *What is Philosophy?*, trans. H. Tomlinson & G. Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. 2004a. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. 2004b. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York: Continuum.
- Derrida, J. 1976 [1967]. *Of Grammatology*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge
- Guattari, F. 2008. *The Three Ecologies*. New York: Continuum.
- Hammer, S. 2019. Michel Foucault. *Store Norske Leksikon*, 28 November. Available at: https://snl.no/Michel_Foucault (accessed 14 September 2020).
- Hartman, Y. & Darab, S. 2012. A call for slow scholarship: A case study on the intensification of academic life and its implications for pedagogy. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 34(1-2): 49-60.
- Jakobsen, K. A. 2019. Ulikhetenes verdenshistorie. Thomas Pikettys «Capital et idéologie» forklart. *Agenda Magasin*, 13 December. Available at: <https://agendamagasin.no/artikler/ulikhetenes-verdenshistorie-thomas-pikettys-capital-ideologie-forklart/> (accessed 23 February 2020).
- Jenkins, L. 2007. *Fisk på tørt land/Fish on dry land*. Trondheim: Pir Forlag
- Leibowitz, B. & Bozalek, V. 2018. Towards a Slow scholarship of teaching and learning in the South. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(8): 981-994.
- Malm, A. 2017. *Krysset*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Malm, A. 2019. *Svermen*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Macgilchrist, F., Allert, H. & Bruch, A. 2020. Students and society in the 2020s. Three future 'histories' of education and technology. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(1): 76-89.
- Ording, O. 2020. Elevens tilbakemelding om hlemmeskole: Vanskelig å finne motivasjon. *VG*, 22 April. Available at: <https://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/i/0nyzLG/elevens-tilbakemelding-om-hjemmeskole-vanskelig-aa-finne-motivasjon> (accessed 10 August 2020).
- Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, trans. A. Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T. 2019. *Capital et Idéologie*. Paris: Seuil.

- Rapp, A. C. 2018. Organisering av social ojämlikhet i skolan: En studie av barnskolors institutionella utformning och praktik i två nordiska kommuner/Organizing social inequality in schools: A study of primary schools' institutional form and practice in two communities. Unpublished PhD diss., Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway.
- Ramberg, L. 2005. Palast des Zweiffels. Available at: <http://www.larsramberg.de/1/viewentry/3890> (accessed 11 August 2020).
- Reinertsen, A. B. 2014. Kjære Ronja: Om poststrukturell og posthuman hypertext lesing av lovgivning om Oppfølgingstjenesten som ledd i Ny Giv i Norge/ Dear Ronja: on poststructural and posthuman hypertext reading of (the program is called Ny Giv). *Nordic Studies in Education*, 34: 265-278.
- Reinertsen, A. B. 2020a. Fuzzytechie languaging and consilience: Dataphilosophy and transdisciplinary digital force for justice. *Policy Futures in Education* DOI: 10.1177/1478210319900599
- Reinertsen, A. B. 2020b. How to continue not knowing what is right or wrong even in times of crisis? *Knowledge Cultures* 8(2): 96-99.
- Reinertsen, A. B. 2020c. Barnehagepedagogikk og politikk som det å vise nomadisk venting/ Early Years Pedagogies and Policy as Showing Nomadic Waiting. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 40(3): 1-19.
- Semetsky, I. (2020). Exploring the future form of pedagogy. Education and eros. In Trifonas, P.P. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research in Cultural Studies and Education*. Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Spurkland, S. & Blikstad-Balas, M. 2016. De største utfordringene ved digitalisering av skolen. *Utdanningsnytt*, 14 July. Available at: <https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/skoleutvikling-teknologi/de-storste-utfordringene-ved-digitalisering-av-skolen/144714> (accessed 10 August 2020).
- Stenger, I. 2018. *Another Science is Possible. A Manifesto for Slow Science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Straumsvåg, D. T. 2006. *A Bumpy Ride to the Slaughterhouse. Prose Poems*, trans. L. Jenkins. USA BookMobile: Red Dragonfly Press.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. N.d. Core curriculum – values and principles for primary and secondary education. Available at: <https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/?lang=eng> (accessed 11 August 2020).
- Van der Tuin, I. 2019. On research 'worthy of the present'. *Simon Fraser University Educational Review*, 12(1): 8-20.
- Van den Berg, C. L., Verster, B. & Collett, K. S. 2018. Flipped out in the blended classroom, the good, the bad and the ugly: when academics become students: action research. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 32(6): 440-459.
- Wikipedia. 2020a. The treachery of images. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Treachery_of_Images retrieved (accessed 9 August 2020).

Wikipedia. 2020b. Doxa. Available at: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doxa> (accessed 15 March 2020).

Wikipedia. 2020c. Assemblages (philosophy). Available at: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assemblage_\(philosophy\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assemblage_(philosophy)) retrieved (accessed 7 June 2020).