Becoming-(a)-Paper, or an Article Undone: (Post-)Knowing and Writing (Again), Nomadic and so Messy
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Abstract

This article illustrates the becoming of one conference paper. The thought of Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) on rhizomes enables us to think of a paper, an article, of thinking and writing as always becoming, in the middle, in between, as an assemblage and a multiplicity. This article (undone) consists of three texts, the first being the paper read at the 7th International Congress on Qualitative Inquiry (ICQI), the second, the paper written before traveling to the conference, and the last, a text written after the conference. The texts show a work in the making (Lather, 2007), while revealing some (n-1, writing on multiple dimensions, though never on all) lines of reading, thinking, and writing. Also the author’s nomadic, questioning, and hesitant mode of proceeding with her research, coming to (not-)knowing, is exemplified and performed. Simultaneously, this writing also deconstructs (and goes beyond) certain traditional scholarly reading, citing, writing, and arguing practices.
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Reading Derrida (1972/2003), 2010

Kaikkialla ja aina kaiken/kaikki kielten läpi
Mahdollisuus nauruun ja tanssiin ja heideggerilaiseen toivoon, kutsuu Derridaa
Käyttää
Leikkaa
Muistaa jälki
Avata-Ja sulkea
Jättää kellumaan
Uskaltaa

Always and everywhere throughout language
The opportunity to laugh and dance, and for Heideggerian hope, invites Derrida
Using
Playing
Recognizing the thread
Opening—And closing
And leave floating
Having the courage

Presentation in Champaign-Urbana,
(2011, May 20)

“Flying in the Air”: For the Beginning/From the Middle

I have written this article many times and in many ways, starting from different places, always from the middle, trying each time to catch some of the threads of the rhizome, to tell some story (and simultaneously compelled not to tell others) . . . . This story, which I am now ending up telling/reading at this particular moment, started to come into being on the flight here, during reading of the program, and the abstracts as well as the articles for the workshop on collaborative writing. I mean especially the article titled “Deleuzian Thought and Collaborative Writing” (Wyatt, Gale, Gannon, & Davies, 2010). This is a movement toward a poem, toward writing, a draft written from emerging thoughts, a kind of collaborative writing with a multiplicity of texts, a stream meeting and joining other texts and writings. Along with the poetic and heterogeneous writing, I also follow some byways in the article, which I already wrote in Finland. So this speech (which is writing, which is speech; Derrida, 1967/2003) is seeking a way to present the relational, multiple, and nomadic, always unfinished and incomplete levels of the becoming of an article, becoming-thinking and writing (written on Wednesday and Thursday
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evening, just before the presentation, in my marvelous hotel room):

A kind of becoming-presentation (with a hyphen)
a becoming-paper, a becoming-poem
something unexpected to come, to open up
Also kind of becoming-English—“me,”
or movements towards English, speaking “me,” or with me
(as Rosi Braidotti [1994] wrote in Nomadic Subjects,
we don’t speak languages, but languages speak us)
I’m on the way to finding the English words,
which start to sing
like they sing in Finnish

In recent last weeks I have written plenty of movements towards a paper,
sent the final one to some friends
(not to be called colleagues)
who said that the paper was coherent and easy to follow,
but wished that the power of it,
the power of seeking for writing “otherwise,”
would not become lost in the hesitation,
or the stuttering every once in a while . . .

They gave me some running comments
in the thinness of this becoming-paper,
this becoming-presentation,
to enable the paper to change again and again
In the airplane I studied the program and the abstracts for this conference,

Going Down to the Article (Earth) Written in Finland

I started the paper with the questions
I had and have been asking throughout my doctoral studies
while doing empirical research, with empirical data:
How and what can I know?
How can I write about something without reducing the complexity and multidimensionality of a phenomenon?
Especially when/if I’m talking about others?
Even though I might talk about discourses?
How to write a word or a sentence
without constructing new (or old) categories by myself?

Or, while reading theorizations on subjectivity,
I was turning the gaze on myself and asking,
how is my subjectivity as a researcher constituted in
the rhetorics and practices of the research?

In “the political need to represent and find meaning”
(Pillow, 2003, p. 192)?
In education as an industry in commodification (see Trifonas, 2009),
where the standards of evaluation have not left any room for hesitation . . .

I had gathered a huge amount of data,
named under the umbrella of ethnography,
from the craft education lessons in two schools,
in order to figure out the practices and discourses producing and reproducing the fairly gender-based choices of textile or technical crafts.

I told, and wrote, to myself and others,
that the epistemological framework of my study was feminist and cultural, even poststructuralist,
and methods of analysis would be a kind of discourse analytic.

I had already found Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre’s (1997) notions on transgressive data
and Rosi Braidotti’s (1994) nomadic inquiry and nomadic subjectivity,
but I was still asking whether it really would be possible to
tell about the dead-ends in a reliable research project,
with the prevailing standards of making things relevant and inspiring confidence . . .

(especially in the Finnish research community or how I experienced it. . . .)
But, simultaneously, as a humbling act,
I experimented with writing poems
in order to get in touch with the dozens of hours of videotaped craft education lessons
(because making The Analysis, you know)
the funny thing is that I wrote the first ones in English,
for a Nordic conference
(I was not on my own ground, you know. . . .)
Here I read one of them. This poem is written about the feel of the lessons on technical work and the videos taped of them. I could hardly hear anything during the replaying, because the noise from sawing and sanding was so terribly loud. This poem is divided into paragraphs, the poem on the left side and the noise visualized or audio-lized (embodied) on the right.
What is technical work like?

Learning to use tools
Sawing, sanding, polishing
Being exact and active
Right grip, Right place, Right direction, Right position

Working
Plugging away
Being able
Putting one’s shoulder to the wheel

“Teacher, is this enough now?”
If it takes too long, Teacher finishes
with a machine, quickly, (in a minute)
and perfectly (no lumps)
“here you are”

What is professional? What is scientific?
Where are the limits?

Starting to Climb Into the Air

Then, ah,
I attended the Summer Institute in Qualitative Research
Putting Theory to Work
in Manchester in the summer of 2010,
and devoured the book of Ian Stronach and Maggie MacLure
Educational Research Undone, (1997),
which brought me up finally to read the original
and the Finnish translations of texts by Deleuze (and Derrida
and Foucault) (some of them)

That really was a turning point
I could immediately resonate with Deleuze
and his collaborative writers such as (Guattari and Parnet)
and adopted the rhizomes, pure difference,
difference in every particular moment, human, animal,
and nomadic subjectivity/self, writing out of love,
writing in order to liberate life where it has been
captured or closed off . . .
(And I’ve only just started with Deleuze,
only read just a tiny little bit, though, but put it to use)
(I had already “met” him and them in the texts, etc.
of Lather, Braidotti, St. Pierre, Davies,
but I would not have been able to understand him by heart yet)

With Stronach and MacLure (1997), I started to vibrate
while understanding what kinds of “other” writings
these theories could really enable:
To cross boundaries and dichotomous concepts
to refrain from sureness and producing freezing
metaphors, for example,
to be surely unsure

a certain kind of dying for/of my stable subjectivity,
my being a “woman,” “educator,” “researcher,” “feminist,”
the categories in which I could be captured (from the outside)
throwing this being-researcher away,
opening up to becoming-writer

And joyfully I recognized the poems I had written
as having the deconstructive, evocative voice,
the personal, becoming voice without clear interpretations,
without fixed categories, fixed results, fixed outcomes

So, I continued letting this/my way of writing become:
Writing more poems, writing “found poems” (see Leavy, 2009)
assemblages with the texts of others,
with the texts I love,
direct quotes here and there, bits and pieces
(in Finnish, “language/me-becoming-me/language”)
writing poems like this,
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(towards a text in a thesis),
writing poems about the specific moment of writing a writing,
Writing and representing (without representing) in a poetic form,
leaving spaces, the lines of flight in between the words, the thoughts to emerge,
as a response or alternative to
“interpretive mastery, narrative coherence and rhetorical closure” (MacLure, 2010, p. 280)
as a theoretical example, without being elitist, or difficult
In pursuit of wonder,
with some certain “baroque affect,” like MacLure (2010, p. 284) is calling for,
in pursuit of in-between-ness and at the bliss of writing
(to borrow Barthesian [1973/1990] vocabulary too)
Writing around and within the affects and emotions
(not always needing to be named),
to deconstruct the domination of reason and rationality in
Western thinking and writing
“Discarding the self-conscious ‘I’ and writing on an immanent plane of composition,” as Bronwyn Davies (2009, p. 198) writes,
writing as “me” as “a series of processes, as a place, where thought can emerge,”
opening “myself” “to becoming what is not yet known and to what can never be contained in words, or known completely” (Davies, 2009, p. 198)
(opening myself to the difference and the movement of language, voice, and “subjectivity”)

Flying, Singing, Finding (the Voice), Loving

Toward or at “the point where it is no longer of any importance whether one says I.
We are no longer ourselves.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 3)
And no longer alone,
but working in a group, an unlimited one,
I mean, loving and writing with Gilles, Felix, Jacques, Bronwyn, Elizabeth, Norman, Ken, Jonathan, Susanne, Patti, Maggie, Ian, Peter, Roland, Italo (oh yes, I loved the book Six Memos for the Next Millennium too)
and my dear Finnish friends and colleagues
Still a little bit of wondering what to do
with the texts, articles, books, “theories” I’ve read,
how to write about them, without tedious, too much work . . .
(or could I just write after them, put them to work?)
Like Susanne, “I have [a] notebook[s] of half written pieces” (Wyatt et al., 2010, p. 736),
or half written articles/papers,
and I’m dreaming about writing

“nothing but poems, or movements towards poems”
(again Susanne in Wyatt et al., 2010, p. 736),
dreaming about launching into the flow of writing with them/you all
(Someone in Finland told me first to write the ordinary, conventional dissertation,
and experimental after that only . . .
but reading and starting to live with Deleuze and you/them all,
it changes everything, as Elizabeth (St. Pierre, 2004) writes,
there is no way back)
I’m asking and dreaming about what becomes possible to come and become after coding
or after high-value theorizing?
I mean, is it possible just to write?
Voice and interpretation, writes Norman Denzin (2010) in Qualitative Manifesto
I’m also dreaming about an “article undone”
how would it look, just writing towards it?
Writing towards a writing
writing towards (a) poem(s)
not in a vacuum, not alone, but with and through other writers, other texts, feelings, affects, artifacts . . .
collaboratively
both silence—(not-saying the last word?)
and arguing for ethics and academic responsibility for not saying any truths?
(But)
what for, you may ask—
For social justice,
for freedom, less regulated,
more open, messier,
for pure differences to become,
not so that we immediately know and categorize in similarities,
For playing, flying, singing (in the rain, of critics, which may come)
Post-knowing
was the other theme in the title of my presentation,
could post-knowing, not-knowing, be something like:
“arriving where we started and knowing the place for the first the time”
(T. S. Elliot, No. 4 of Four Quartets, 1943; QI 2012 motto)
Nomadic, messy, and totally incomplete,
and loving the incompleteness,
getting lost as the way of knowing (Lather, 2010) or post-methodology (Lather, 2007) or methodology-to-come (St. Pierre, 2009).
To write.
And live.
And love.
And play.
I write, therefore I am/become
(a researcher/writer)
be-ing
be-coming m ^kG
ko o 6& JHÖ

Plus the last words written by hand on the printed paper:5
I've crafted this,
I'm guilty, I really am!
As Patti said this morning:
“The mess is the message!”

Article Written in Finland
Before Flying to Chicago
Some Disentangling Thoughts, for the Beginning

Oh, writing this paper has been such a mess. I’ve experimented with different ways of writing this and envisioned many different themes to touch on, or fumble with, in deconstructing or interfering in the traditional way of having a paper/a presentation. (Very often the presentations are in some way consistent: They suggest something and then argue for it, or even more often, especially in the case of empirical studies, they start from the theoretical background, the data and methodology, and then continue with the “new” findings or results or other relevant remarks.) I wanted to do otherwise, but/and nevertheless to “argue.” And still, this paper also tries to convince though. To do or not to do?

In this presentation, which I have ended up performing here, I would like to reveal, or make visible, the genesis (or parts of it) of my thinking. Of how the thought can emerge. From asking peculiar questions and gingerly trying something “new” (for myself/this place), like a small trickle, meeting up with other trickles and even “bigger” flows and so becoming vivacious and running. So in this article I would like you to perceive the nomadic quality of it: The straying and the humbling becoming sure in the unassurance; the anxiety and the confessional reflexivity becoming free in its/this haecceity, in the solitariness and the playfulness. To open to the uniqueness of every human being, every event, without the need primarily to comprehend or interpret or to click on foreseen and already named places. The playfulness of this article also happens in the numbering: of my Argument-arguments, which in fact cannot be differentiated or put in numerical order.

Openings, Where the Article “First” Began
Throughout my doctoral studies I have been asking about the possibilities to “know,” to “theorize,” or even to represent, in parallel to “knowing” myself as diverse, inconsistent, and dynamic. How could I do justice to my data, my interviewees? How can I write about something without reducing the complexity and multidimensionality of the phenomena I study? Or how to code, put events in categories, cut the “surface of life” in “limited and measured things” (Deleuze, 2004; MacLure, 2011)? Also, while reading feminist poststructuralist theorizations of agency, subjectivity, and discourses (Butler, 1999, 2005) and seeing them used as methodological or analytical tools in advanced, empirical studies, I could not stop asking what these theorizations mean to me, a researcher, on this specific occasion of writing research. How is my subjectivity or agency as/of the researcher constituted in the rhetoric and practice of this specific research (writing)? How could I write about gender in craft education (my theme6) without producing new imperatives (for example, gender-neutral crafts)? Still I also recognize(d) the “political need to represent and find meaning,” while at the same time challenging the representations, as the often quoted Wanda Pillow (2003) writes. I felt the reflexivity of discomfort in asking about how to write a word, a sentence, constructing the fewest possible new categories or reconstructing “old” or “obvious” ones. Still I could also not take flight into innocence or transparency either.

Education has been described, as Hodgson and Standish (2009) argue for example, as a field of expertise with a policy imperative of the usefulness of the research. Empirical research with clear outcomes is favoured, to make recommendations for educational practices. Peter Trifonas (2009) states that research has become an industry in commodification, and the results are to be used by the state apparatus or private interests. Especially in Finland educational research is also highly structured with clear distinctions between theory, methodology, and data. Deconstruction, for example, is hardly seen as a method to be applied to advanced studies, where “the justification of existence” is portrayed as “greatly depending on “properly applied methods”” and the particularity of the particular science is seen as a methodological difference relative to other sciences (Naskali, 2003).

At two schools in Helsinki, I had gathered and produced a huge amount of ethnographic data. I even had dozens of hours of videotaped lessons (plus documentary data and other cultural texts). Yet I was confused by it. How could I put it in categories, or even represent it to the audience, without constituting while describing and representing? How could I bring the multiplicity of the data to the reader? In order to capture or get a grip on the multifaceted data (not only words, but also noises, smells, movements) I experimented with writing poems. I wrote three poems, first in English, for a Nordic conference.

I (already) demonstrated one of them (earlier). That poem was written about the feel from the lessons on technical work and the videos I taped of them. I could hardly hear anything while replaying them, because the noise from sawing and sanding was so terribly loud. And as MacLure (2011) notes, the data that lay at the boundary of language and the body do not fall easily into codification, especially when we
are so focused on the authentic voice of the participants (St. Pierre, 2009). Even more the data on the boundary of the body and artifacts stay outside easy coding.

Even though I had the feeling that by writing poems I could focus on things other than just words and write from my own perspective, without trying to be innocent, and even though I already had found many texts calling for robust, embodied, and situated (Denzin, 2000; Foley, 2002) or evocative (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) texts, I still had the structures and guidelines for “Research” or “Analysis” in my head and had a deep feeling of failure. I identified the poems as just different kind of (weak) representations of the research field, but no analysis, nothing explicit.

A Long Silence, Being Stuck, Not-Knowing How to Continue, Until

As Hodgson and Standish (2009) write, this kind of difficulty, the unsettling nature of doing poststructuralist research and the self-doubt, is, in the mass of educational research method guides, “reduced to being part of the linear process” and the place from where, after distilling poststructuralist thought into operationalizable concepts, the research can go on to fit in with the dominant research framework. I just could not do it.

For me, the reading of the original and the Finnish translations of texts by Foucault (1966/2010, 1969/2005), Alhanen (2007), Derrida (1986/2003; 1972/1988), and Deleuze (1986/1992; 1968/2004), Deleuze and Guattari, 1991/1993; also Vanhanen (2010a, 2010b) was a turning point. I attended the Summer Institute in Qualitative Research in Manchester in 2010, entitled “Putting Theory to Work,” and read the book, Educational Research Undone, by Ian Stronach and Maggie MacLure (1997). And I started to find more and more texts, and read the old ones more carefully. I echo Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (2004), when she says that reading and living, especially with the concepts of Deleuze, changes everything—everything, which has to do with subjectivity, such as education, science, and life. Ah, these readings got me more and more enthusiastic, and so the writing could start again.

I found the deconstruction of the prevailing practices, appreciations, and norms from Derrida (1986/2003), and Stronach and MacLure (1997). With Deleuze I started to savor the pure difference in everything, and the subjectivity (and research, and life) as nomadic, rhizomatic and dynamic (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987; Vanhanen, 2010a, 2010b), or the subject undone (St. Pierre, 2004). From Foucault I adopted the idea of thinking experiments (Alhanen, 2007). With Stronach and MacLure (1997) I fell in love with educational research undone and started to tingle while understanding what kinds of “other” writings these theories could make possible. To cross boundaries and dichotomous concepts, and to refrain from sureness and producing freezing metaphors. For example, to be surely unsure. And, that it is important/significant/even reasonable to write from this partial, nomadic place, where I am and where I travel, still not meaning I have to write an autobiography, but just to take this place and stop thinking about whether this specific writing is this or that in some preexisting category. On my reading paths I have also read some verses and chapters from Helene Cixous (1991, 1993) and acquired some specific kind of dying, dying for/ of my stable subjectivity and agency, my being of a “woman,” “educator,” “researcher,” “feminist,” you know, the categories, in which I can be captured. Dying for the “Hanna Guttorm,” throwing this being-a-researcher: “me” away . . .

And, uppermost, in my mind, I reread the poems and recognized them as having a deconstructive, evocative voice, a voice without clear interpretations, a voice from this place. (And I started to write more of them, (about) the research writing itself, too.)

Meditations

So, what I want to “argue” for now, to speak for in and beside this article (in addition to or alongside with that which I disentangled in the beginning) is that the research writing within poststructuralist “theories” and “methodologies” can vary from the traditional form of writing research. It can break the form and structure and change the way of writing. The forms in which my writing, in this particular difference-without-identity (Deleuze, 1968/2004), vary and will vary are kind of meditatively performed here:

1. Poetic writing, writing, and representing (without representing) in the form of poetry, as a response, or alternative, to “interpretative mastery, narrative coherence and rhetorical closure,” as Maggie MacLure (2010) put it, in pursuit of wonder, some certain “baroque affect: A vertiginous sensation of vibration at the point of indiscernibility, to borrow a Deleuzian vocabulary, between past and future, science and religion, near and far, mastery and surrender” (MacLure, 2010). In pursuit of in between-ness, or the bliss of writing, to borrow Barthesian (1973/1990) vocabulary. As a theoretical example without being elitist, or difficult, for which the theoretical/poststructuralist texts are often reproached. A kind of intensification (MacLure, 2010; Safford, 2004). Looking for “anti- or cross-disciplinary, inter- or cross-discursive understanding of writing” with Jonathan Monroe (1996). In writing poems I also see an opportunity to step outside or on the border of the traditional way (not only the scientific way) of producing a text as
a signifying practice (Kristeva, 1974/1984). In writing poems, or in a simple, everyday kind of way, both the semiotic and the symbolic get off the ground, don’t they?

2. Emotional, or affective writing, as a response to the domination of reason and rationality in Western thinking and writing (Derrida, 1972/1988). I want to write about the books I love, about the books that make me write lovingly, and I also want to make the intuitiveness and affectivity of the research process visible. To deconstruct, or go beyond, the privilege of rationality and the pure logical arguments.

3. No two points without a third: . . . If I continue the “list,” one more point could be the privilege of the singular, or, my/this place/voice, as Derrida says that “deconstruction,” “you know, the kind of thing Derrida does,” should or could start from performing something new, “in your own language, in your own singular situation, with your own signature, to invent the possible and to break with the application, in the technical, neutral sense of the world” (Derrida, 1996; MacLure, 2004). But simultaneously, like Bronwyn Davies’ (2009) two principles, drawn from the text of Deleuze (2004), for writing: “discarding the self-conscious ‘I’ and writing on an immanent plane of composition.” Deleuze conceptualizes the subject “as a series of processes, as a place where thought can emerge” (Davies, 2009). In these processes the actual things, thoughts, and sensations are connected to the pure intensities and ideas implied by them (Davies, 2009; Williams, 2003). So the “I” who writes here is not an isolated object with a specific identity to reveal, but just a place in which the writing can emerge through and in the thoughts (the books) “I” have been reading. So, the most interesting is not, or must not be, to prove that “I” have “understood” or read the books and theories “right,” but how “I” in this nomadic and dynamic place put them to work in this/my writing. Writing is inquiry, as Richardson and St. Pierre wrote (2005), and thinking happens during the writing, although not self-consciously. Or as Davies (2009) writes, “The writing itself thus opens the writer to becoming what is not yet known and to what can never be contained in words, or known completely.” Through this kind of writing the process of opening oneself to difference and to the movement of language, voice, and subjectivity towards the as-yet-unknown becomes possible.

Peters and Burbules (2004, p. 4) describe poststructuralism as being fiercely antifoundational and adopting an anti- or postepistemological, and antirealist, standpoint. Poststructuralist studies call into question the naturalness of the disciplines, emphasizing that disciplines are historical formations. And that the borders between different disciplines or even writing areas, such as philosophy and literature, are historical and social formations too. That’s why poststructuralism provides new practices of both reading and writing. (Peters & Burbules, 2004, pp. 4-5.)

So, above were some of the terms, concepts, words, that invited me to write. Some of the texts I’ve read lovingly and saying “yes, exactly.” One kind of writing, inspired by those readings. Having the need to write. I write, therefore I become (a writer/researcher).
The Derridean call, according to Trifonas (2009), is to awaken or resituate a new academic responsibility for research. Stronach and MacLure (1997), referring to Clark (1992) suggest a meditation on the conditions of the genesis of a text, toward a *heteronomy*, an incompletion, and a renewed questioning of its interpreters and norms of interpretation. Trifonas (2009) quotes Derrida (1983) and calls academic responsibility “a double gesture that bridges the ungrounded space of knowledge production and the conditions of possibility over which positions on ethics and responsibility, reason and rationality are thought-out and taken as praxis” (p. 302).

Trifonas (2009) continues:

The symbolic interground of any and all potential articulations of academic responsibility is, for an irreducible dimension of “thought” and “thinking” analogous with the poststructuralist metacriticality of deconstruction. It is an intellectual *practice* of grafting, confrontation and productive interference that transgresses the fixed borders of “the arts” and “the sciences” for the transformative redistribution of knowledge values and the founding of new fields of research in the “interspaces” of philosophy and science (p. 306).

What would/could research be like? What are the boundaries of research? In this article too much said, or not enough? Or how is it possible to write, if not (but still) conventionally convincing? If not criticizing? If not interpreting? An article undone?

Post Article and Presentation, Written in Finland After ICQI 2011

Going to Write More

This has been a play. A play with words and in between(s), with flights and reassurances, with entanglements and disentanglements, with crafting and unstitching. A movement toward postscience and post art, a movement, which can be “both ‘both and’ and ‘either or’” (Lather, 2011). Both (post-) theoretical and (post-)simple. Relational—revealing the texts, which have been read last, or nearest, or smiling with the texts, which made a difference—“self as the becoming that is apparent in the degrees and intensities that connect and multiply in relation to others” (Wyatt et al., 2010). Multiple in both semiotic and symbolic ways. Nomadic and embedded in revealing the paths (both “authentic” and edited) and phases of one becoming-an-article, becoming-a-presentation, an article undone. Taking risks (Derrida, 1983), oh, how I worry about it! Dying for convincing about the competence(s) of “mine.” Dying for making sense and loving it. And still making sense. A (different) “sense of logic,” perhaps—starting to ask, what was it, what Deleuze wrote about it (I have not yet read it, but I would love to). Letting be.

Now I know how to write my thesis. Love letters. Writing out of love. Still having the “ironist” in me, too, but not wanting to write against someone. Writing after feeling myself uncomfortable in designations such as “expert,” “academic,” “theoretical.” Still not asking every researcher to write a/theoretical or postdeconstructive. This is (and is not) my way of getting lost (Lather, 2007).

And More: Here One More Stanza After an Open Peer-Review

You, Norman, asked me to write one more stanza on social justice. Social justice, solidarity, starting from here and near, not only going there and far, making space for differences to come and become, here, in writing, performing, showing research and the researcher/me/you as a living-living with uncertainties, different affects and feelings, fears and passions, struggling against the forms of norms, becoming a stranger from (t)here on towards an expanding solidarity between/around the multiplicity of all unique differences: gender (so simple, so troubled) class (not every privileged recognize the privilege we/they have) race (who is washing our toilets and why he/she/not-me?) ethnicity (just thinking about the Romanian Gypsy beggars on my way to work, I haven’t given them any money—yet?) religion (this is a complicated one, one mystery coming sometimes later perhaps) sexual orientation (putting this together with the previous one and thinking about my dear old relatives—falling silent again) physical or mental state (all the time more and more specified categories and namings) plus some tiny little, not-easily-defined differences, like social competence, courage, happiness, openness, even critical consciousness, aren’t they (or the lack of them) sometimes difficult to love?
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Notes
1. I could recognize the speaking and writing in an academic way, which Susanne (Wyatt et al., 2010) was describing as starting to write about “colleagues,” even though knowing them by heart, where the more “real” way to describe them would be to talk about friends.
2. Even though I became excited with this “new” movement toward a paper, and again wrote too many words and lines . . .
3. Ken narrates Deleuze’s notion of haecceity very well (Wyatt et al., 2010).
4. I wrote these additions after a plenary session titled “Qualitative Data Analysis after Coding,” with Patti Lather, Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre, Sharon Murphy Augustine, and Teri Holbrook, earlier on the same day this presentation was given.
5. I’ve come to these questions through (willing/failing to) investigating the gender contract of Finnish craft education. Even though the pupils are “free” to choose either textile or technical crafts in schools, they often make fairly gender-based choices.
6. Craft education in Finnish comprehensive schools is obligatory for every pupil during the first seven years of school. Craft education is divided into technical and textile work, and after general craft studies, the pupils in most schools are allowed to choose one or the other to emphasize. These choices, however, are fairly gender divided, despite 40 years of curriculum and educational policy work towards gender equality (Guttorm, 2006; Kokko, 2009). I went to two schools as an ethnographer and wanted to understand what kind of practices and discourses reproduce and endorse this gender-based division.
7. What is “analysis”? This really should be deconstructed too . . . Or did Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (2009) already write about “analysis”? She writes, “We might just stop doing it—qualitative research” (cursive in the original, p. 229), and she ends the chapter this way (and I love to quote it all):
     “The rigor of qualitative inquiry has been questioned for some time, often by positivists and neopositivists, but I question its rigor for different reasons: (a) its obsession with the voices of participants as the primary, most authentic data (evidence), which results in (b) the eclipse and disappearance of other data (evidence) that is surely acknowledged and unaccounted for in a study, and thus (c) weak analysis and the recycling of old ideas. Thinking with Derrida, I look forward to an overturning of the hegemony of presence, of voice, in qualitative inquiry—to what Lather (2007) might call a ‘post-methodology’ (p. 70), a methodology-to-come in which we begin to do it radically differently wherever we are in our projects. Whether we will call this work ‘qualitative’ remains to be seen.” (St. Pierre, 2009).
8. I read admiringly Alhanen’s Finnish description of Foucault’s original French text (Dits et écrits IV), in which Foucault says that he purposefully writes unsystematically and does not make any theory or extensive concept classification. “I write only because I don’t know yet exactly what to think about the thing I want to think about. I am an experimenter, not a theorist. I write in order to change myself and not to think the same way as before” (Foucault, 1980, quoted in Alhanen, 2007, p. 14) That’s why Foucault also did not like to be asked to explain why earlier he wrote this or that and now is writing like this. The process of thinking was going on and not in order to construct an all-inclusive theory.
9. What to call this after deconstruction . . .?
     “Or there’s the other way: you see the book as a little non-signifying machine, and the only question is ‘Does it work, and how does it work?’ How does it work for you? If it doesn’t work, if nothing comes through, you try another book. This second way of reading’s intensive: Something comes through or it does not. There’s nothing to explain, nothing to understand, nothing to interpret . . . This intensive way of reading . . . is reading with love.” (pp. 7-9)
11. That’s a place in which somehow I recognized my middle name, Ellen, as a very Deleuzian one: In Finnish, “Ellen” means “if I am not,” or “if I do not.”
12. Oh, I would like to read more thoroughly her book Revolution in Poetic Language. So much to read; indeed, I wish I were quicker in reading in English.
13. I especially have this feeling of everyday writing, even banal writing, when writing in English. I cannot achieve the writing of sophisticated and literate English . . . I flirt with the idea of asking what scientific writing would be after avoiding making sense or relevance . . . Or after making/producing a difference to nonsophisticated readers or writers? How is it possible to think and write, anyway? (Is it possible go “beyond”?)
14. “Either too much is said, or not enough: Too much, because the search for a ground forms the essential step of a ‘critique’ which should inspire in us new ways of thinking; not enough, because so long as the ground remains larger than the grounded, this critique serves only to justify traditional ways of thinking” (Deleuze, 2004, p. 192).
15. This piece of text is having its genesis through the multilevel conditions of the academic culture and practices: The value and status of human sciences enable us researchers/“academics” to take our time theorizing, analyzing, and writing. And we even can
travel around the world to share our thoughts and ideas with other researchers. It is fun, to be sure, fun, but/and fairly advantaged.

16. “Not enough”—noticing that so many quotations I wanted or planned are missing in this article. Struggling with just writing (dreaming about writing totally without citations, like Hakala, 2007 tells she had been dreaming about, too) and convincing with and through significant others. . . .

17. Nevertheless, I also love the way Kelly Clark/Keefe (2010) writes about meeting the qualifications of an “ironist” (Richard Rorty, 1989). She has the courage to write critically and ironically about and around the texts of other researchers, something that I (at least until now) only do in the safety of face-to-face conversations.

18. “The intellectual’s role is no longer to place himself ‘some-what ahead and to the side’ in order to express the stifled truth of the collectivity; rather, it is to struggle against the forms of power that transform him into its object and instrument in the sphere of ‘knowledge,’ ‘truth,’ ‘consciousness,’ and ‘dis-" (Foucault in Foucault & Deleuze, 1972).
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