Feminist Ethics, the Environment, and Vital Respondings

With a global pandemic, the expansive bushfires in Australia, the polar ice caps melting at exponential rates, the Amazon rainforests being destroyed every day, and a range of other catastrophic events occurring almost simultaneously, it should come as no surprise that human relationships with the environment are among the most pressing issues facing society today. Climate change has resulted in a series of dangerous and long-lasting consequences impacting all human and nonhuman life on planet earth. Scientists claim that we have entered the Sixth Greatest Extinction described as a “biological annihilation” of wildlife (Carrington, 2017), with billions of populations of animals becoming extinct at a quicker rate than ever before. Over 97% of peer-reviewed journal articles on climate change argue that such changes are occurring primarily because of human activity, and particularly our increased use of fossil fuels, deforestation, and agriculture (Causes of Climate, no date). Recognizing the urgency of this situation, social scientists are increasingly questioning the role of western-based human-centred ideologies and how the anthropocentric attitude of many (not all) cultures has contributed to our current condition (Fox & Alldred, 2016b; Walker, 2005). Within this anthropocentric lens, human desires and needs have for too long been placed at the highest level.
of importance, with the environment seen as “conceptually subordinate to society” (Walker, 2005, p. 80). Prioritizing humans over multispecies and more-than-human understandings has played a major role in producing the dire situation facing life on planet earth.

In response to environmental threats and rising critique of anthropocentric views, various scholars are increasingly calling for research approaches that recognize the vital and entangled interconnections between humans, nonhumans, and the environment. Of course, these are arguments that have been posed by Indigenous scholars for decades (if not centuries), and more recently by ecofeminists and environmental humanities scholars. Building upon and extending such work, new materialist approaches not only emphasize relationality, but also see matter (and the environment) as agentic. Posthumanist approaches towards the environment reject “fantasies of human mastery,” instead affirming the “entanglement of humans with nonhuman animals, vegetables, and minerals” (Tompkins, 2016, p. 2).

Some argue that such understandings may contribute to revised environmental ethics and justice frameworks, and “aid in the expansion of care and concern beyond the human” (Tompkins, 2016, p. 2). For some, such concerns have led to new methodological approaches that seek to give voice to (or con-verse with) nonhuman subjects within research projects. For example, in imagining the possibilities of more-than-human participatory methods, Bastian (2017) argues that “issues like climate change, biodiversity loss and increasing rates of extinction” require us to critically and urgently explore “whether the injunctions of Western anthropocentrism might have unnecessarily restricted how participation is imagined,” and to seek new theories and methods that “enable researchers to ask ‘what matters’ to nonhumans” (p. 19).

In this chapter, we explore the potential of using new materialisms to think about the environment from a non-anthropocentric view. We begin by exploring some of the parallels and divergences of new materialist approaches to the environment with important contributions from Indigenous knowledges, environmental humanities, and feminist theory. This is followed by a review of research focused on sport and the environment. The second half of the chapter then explores the challenges of representation in new materialist scholarship. Here we provide an overview
of the important work being done by feminist and environmental new materialists in exploring ethical issues of representing nonhumans and advancing creative representational styles. We then offer two examples from our own new materialist-inspired collaborative writing experiment during the Australian bushfires and the global COVID-19 pandemic. In each case, our modes of ‘poetic inquiry’ enabled vital respondings to the entangled relationalities of moving bodies with the environment in times of crisis, and highlight the value in more-than-human research-creation practices for reenvisioning feminist ethics.

The Environment, New Materialisms, and Feminist Theory

Over recent decades, scholars working in (post)colonial settings have increasingly been calling for more-than-human and posthuman approaches to help shift the gaze beyond Anglo-European ways of knowing the world, including the complex and vital relationships between human and nonhuman agents and the environment. For some, new materialisms articulate with onto-epistemologies that “stand in opposition to mainstream Euro-Western philosophy and scholarship (specifically humanism and nature/culture dualism)” (Newman, Thorpe, & Andrews, 2020b, p. 14; also see Sundberg, 2014; Todd, 2016; Tompkins, 2016). Acknowledging that Indigenous communities, environmental humanities scholars, and feminist theorists have each advanced complex understandings of the relationships between humans and the natural environment, we begin this section with a brief overview of these important contributions explaining how new materialisms mirror and, in some cases, extend such lines of thought.

Indigenous Ways of Knowing

Scholars have noted the similarities between new materialisms with some First Nation and Indigenous knowledge traditions (Tompkins, 2016, see also Sundberg, 2014; Todd, 2016). Indeed, some of the “new” in new
materialisms is in fact well established in Indigenous knowledges across the globe, particularly regarding human relationships with the environment (Bignall, Hemming, & Rigney, 2016; Newman, Thorpe, & Andrews 2020b; Rosiek & Snyder, 2018; Rosiek, Snyder, & Pratt, 2020; Roy & Subramaniam, 2016; Pringle, 2020). There are many notable parallels: both Indigenous and new materialist and more-than-human approaches value the vitalism of nonhuman matter, privilege ecocentrism over anthropocentrism, and have worked to “challenge dualistic understandings of nature society relationships” (Thomas, 2015, p. 975). For those of us embarking on new materialisms, we must begin with a deep consideration of the Indigenous knowledges and anticolonial world views that came long before (Todd, 2016).

While some reject new materialisms for its lack of acknowledgement of “vitalist Indigenous cosmologies,” others see opportunities for more-than-human theorists “to work in solidarity with Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to support and extend political spaces for relational ethics with nonhumans” (Thomas, 2015, p. 976). For example, working in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, Thomas (2015) advocates Indigenous more-than-human (MTH) approaches that examine the “considerable synergies” between more-than-human theorists’ and Indigenous understandings of nonhuman agency and kinship. She examines how Ngāi Tahu (a Māori tribe) advocated for the Hurunui River as lively and agentic, thus successfully expanding their catchment to include the river. In her observations of this process, she concludes that “there are generative possibilities for MTH theorists to work alongside Indigenous communities and carve political space for more people to advocate for a relational ethics” (Thomas, 2015, p. 974).

In a different context, Kim TallBear (2018), a Dakota social scientist working in the biosciences, brings together feminist, queer, and Indigenous approaches to understanding technoscience and the environment. In so doing, however, she acknowledges that bringing such worldviews together and working across disciplines requires deep consideration into what is similar and different, as well as whose voices are being prioritized in such entanglements: “The academy is now being infiltrated by non-Indigenous voices articulating the idea that life/not life is too binary and restrictive. This indicates greater scope at this moment in history for
bringing Indigenous voices to the conversational table” (p. 5). We strongly concur, and recognize that new materialist and more-than-human theory not only needs to acknowledge the pre-colonial genealogies of some of its key tenets, but also to work to ensure Indigenous and queer voices are amplified in such discussions.

**Environmental Humanities**

In contrast to pre-colonial Indigenous ways of knowing the environment, the field of environmental humanities is a more recent development emerging in the past decade as more scholars are recognizing the human influence on environmental degradation (increasing carbon dioxide levels, biodiversity loss, ocean acidity) and the desperate need to develop policies, ideas, and values to reduce environmental harm (Sörlin, 2012). The impact of the human on the environment has some scholars arguing for the “need to re-frame global environmental change issues fundamentally as social and human challenges, rather than just environmental issues” (Jäger et al., 2011, p. 5). Very broadly, environmental humanities are defined as a multidisciplinary field and a collection of “multifaceted scholarly approaches that understand environmental challenges as inextricable from social, cultural, and human factors” (Neimanis, Åsberg, & Hedrén, 2015, p. 70). Scholars working within the environmental humanities stem from philosophy, literature, anthropology, geography, feminist, eco-cultural studies, and many more humanities-based disciplines (Alaimo, 2010b; Heise, 2017; Neimanis, 2017; Yusoff & Jennifer, 2011). Of central concern for environmental humanities scholars is the belief that ideologies, values, and meanings, both shape and are shaped by the environment (Neimanis et al., 2015).

The work in this field increasingly echoes and overlaps with new materialist theory. For example, in a paper mapping the developments and innovations in environmental humanities, Bergthaller et al. (2014) advocate new materialist and material feminist approaches to bodies, things, animality, and agency:
New materialists enrich the environmental justice framework by questioning the tendency to gloss over the agency of matter in our everyday lives. While the ethical and political consequences of acknowledging the agency of things (Styrofoam cups, birch trees, coal dust) remain to be spelled out (and are unlikely to be comforting), such a view clearly posits new forms of analysis and enables new ways of narrating environmental history, especially the history of environmental injustice (p. 271).

The recent *Routledge Companion to the Environmental Humanities* also includes a series of works on posthumanism and multispecies communities (Heise, Christensen, & Niemann, 2017). Similarly, environmental education researchers are increasingly exploring the potential of new materialist and posthuman approaches. For example, writing with her undergraduate social science class, Verlie identifies the value in Barad’s concept of intra-action for encouraging both teachers and students to develop “less anthropocentric and more relationally attuned climate change ‘response-abilities’” (Verlie & CCR 15, 2018, p. 1). Offering a series of empirical examples resulting from her efforts to decentre the human from climate pedagogies, the authors show that ‘climate intra-actions’ can “enable us to attend to how human and more-than-human identities change through engagement with climate change; how our human capacities to affect climate emerge through acting-with more-than-human entanglements; and thus how unanticipated, different actions can emerge in climate change education” (p. 1).

With the development of posthumanist strands of thought in the humanities and social sciences over the last few decades, the environmental humanities continue to be “defined by productive conceptual tension between humans’ agency as a species and the inequalities that shape and constrain the agencies of different kinds of humans, on one hand, and between human and nonhuman forms of agency, on the other” (Heise, 2017, p. 6). Within the environmental humanities, feminists have played an important role in navigating these tensions by pursuing new lines of questioning, modes of analysis and representation styles, and ethical and
political considerations for more just and sustainable futures (Sandilands, 2017).

**Feminist Theory and the Environment: Debates and Divergences**

For decades, ecofeminists and environmental feminists have insisted that feminism needs to take seriously the materiality of the more-than-human world. Ecofeminists recognize the strong connections and systems of domination and oppression between women, humanity, and the environment. They stress the need to reorient away from primarily humanist systems of domination over the environment, and to see the ways in which this domineering ontology translates into other factions of social life (Phillips & Rumens, 2016). Recently, feminist environmental scholars have turned to exploring extreme events (i.e., droughts, bush fires) and “questionable human practices” as “environmentally legible symptoms of bigger and deeper socio-political structures and ongoing processes: colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchy, amongst them” (Hamilton & Neimanis, 2020, p. 386). In their special issue focused on the project of feminist environmental humanities, Hamilton and Neimanis (2020) make a case that feminists are well positioned to address the challenges facing the environment, particularly with our foundation in understandings of inequality, justice, and difference. For them, feminist environmental humanities research must begin with “the inextricability of these propositions, both nature and culture and feminism and environmental humanities,” and be attentive to the “intersectional materialisations of power and privilege” that are central to “understanding current species privilege and environmental exploitation” (p. 387). Similarly, Cielemęcka and Åsberg (2019) and contributors to their special issue on toxic embodiment and feminist environmental humanities examine “variously situated bodies, land- and waterscapes and their naturalcultural interactions with toxicity” (p. 101). The collection is focused on exploring the “ways toxic embodiment disturbs or aligns with multiple boundaries of sexes, generations, races, geographies, nationstates, and species” (p. 103).
Contemporary approaches to feminist environmental humanities are also increasingly located at the intersection of feminist and Indigenous knowledges. For example, at an Australian feminist festival held in 2019, Aboriginal scholar of the Goenpul tribe (part of the Quandamooka nation on Stradbroke Island in Queensland) and activist for Indigenous rights, Aileen Moreton-Robinson reiterated the importance of using Indigenous ways of knowing: “We will not survive while we continually think we are worth more than every other living thing. Lots of different cultures have relationships with non-human others. The Earth is not an inert thing. Once you have a concept of that, everything is alive” (Gorman & Delaney, 2019). She concluded by urging audiences to draw from Indigenous ways of knowing as they live with nature. Among feminists and Indigenous scholars alike, there seems to be a growing recognition that “nature can no longer be imagined as a pliable resource for industrial production or social construction,” but rather “nature is agentic… it acts and those actions have consequences for both the human and nonhuman world” (Alaimo & Hekman, 2008b, p. 4). It is here that new materialisms offer a valuable contribution to such pressing discussions, debates, ethical actions, and political activism.

**New Materialisms, Feminist Theory, and the Environment**

Today, a growing number of new materialist scholars are providing theoretical tools and ideas for how to think about the environment through a posthumanist lens. In so doing, they are building upon a long lineage of Indigenous ways of knowing, environmental humanities, and ecofeminism (Alaimo, 2016; Bennett, 2010b; Casselot, 2016; Gough & Whitehouse, 2018; Mickey & Vakoch, 2018; Schmidt, 2013; Sonu & Snaza, 2015). While there are a host of influential theorists within new materialisms, Donna Haraway, Rosi Braidotti and Stacy Alaimo have been particularly instrumental in advancing our thinking about human-environment relations. Feminist biologist and social theorist Donna Haraway has been arguing for different conceptualizations of the nature/
culture relationship since the 1980s. Noting that humans too often reinforce the binary between nature and culture where nature becomes the “Other”, she writes that we need to “find another relationship to nature besides reification, possession, appropriation and nostalgia” (Haraway, 1992, p. 65). Throughout Haraway’s work she emphasizes the need to transgress boundaries between nature/culture, human/’Other’ and recognize that humans and the environment are “inextricably coterminous in all bodies” (Fox & Alldred, 2019, p. 2). Haraway’s early work has been highly influential not only for the development of new materialist theory, but also rethinking human relationships with the environment.

Feminist philosopher, Rosi Braidotti (2013) builds upon Haraway to develop a posthumanist approach to environmentalism that seeks to deconstruct “species supremacy” (p. 51). In so doing, she “inflicts a blow to any notion of human nature, anthropos and bios, as categorically distinct from the life of animals and non-humans” (p. 51). Braidotti’s posthumanism rests on a sense of “inter-connection between self and others, including the non-human or ‘earth’ others, by removing the obstacle of self-centered individualism” (Fullagar, 2017, p. 39). Within posthumanism, there is the recognition of the “affirmative bond that locates the subject in all flow of relations with multiple others” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 39). Decentring individual experience and humanism creates space to recognize nonhuman matter and understand it as “lively, intelligent and self-organizing, not opposed to culture but continuous with it” (Fox & Alldred, 2018a, p. 8). Braidotti’s posthumanist approach has been crucial to scholars looking for ways to account for humanity that do not privilege humanist ways of knowing or reinforce anthropocentric views.

Inspired by the writings of new materialist and posthuman theorists such as Donna Haraway and Rosi Braidotti, there have been a handful of scholars who have written explicitly about the potential of using new materialisms for reimagining ways of knowing and thinking about the environment (Bauman, 2015; Casselot, 2016; Gough & Whitehouse, 2018). Arguably one of the most prominent scholars working at the crossroads of materialism, environmentalism, and feminism, is American environmental humanities professor, Stacy Alaimo (1994, 2010a, 2016,
Working from a primarily theoretical standpoint, her work echoes other scholars with an emphasis on the need to explore “the material interconnections of human corporeality with the more-than-human world, and at the same time, acknowledging that material agency necessitates more capacious epistemologies” (Alaimo, 2010a, p. 2).

While writing about the interconnection between humans, feminism, and the environment, she has also addressed the colonialist and imperialist notions embedded within some feminist environmental humanities (Alaimo, 2019). In discussions and discourses around the impact of the “human” on climate change, Alaimo (2019) identifies the need to rethink “Who is the human here?” (p. 3). She is rightly concerned that using a generic “we” or “humanity,” homogenizes the human race and fails to account for the ways in which economic disparities, colonialism, privilege, and nationality play a role in the destruction of the planet and ignores the very unequal effects climate change will have on different people. The questioning of “humanity” coupled with an emphasis on the vitality and agentic capacities of nature have direct implications for how we conceive of environmental ethics and justice.

Building upon the work of Catriona Sandilands (1999) and other feminist environmental philosophers, Alaimo (2008) argues that understanding the “ongoing interactions of the body and its environment” (Gatens, 1996, p. 57) demands ethical knowledge practices that “emerge from the multiple entanglements of inter- and intra-connected being/doing/knowings” (p. 26).

Others also see the potential in new materialist theory, more-than-human, and multispecies approaches for revisioning environmental justice. Responding to the devastation of the recent Australian bushfires, Celermajer and colleagues (2020) engage in a critical dialogue to consider “the puzzle of who or what, within this ‘multispecies world’—animals, microorganisms, forests, rivers, soils, and more—ought to fall within the ambit of justice” (p. 4). Spurred by feminist, antiracist, and anticolonial critiques of humanism, the group explores a series of ethical and philosophical questions as to the very (im)possibilities of a multispecies justice. In so doing, they acknowledge that “who has personhood, and even who is alive” are understood in many different ways within different human groups and within different life-worlds, and while “we (in
the full multispecies interpellation of this pronoun) are both all in this
together and we are all in this together in very different ways” (Celermajer
et al., 2020, p. 26; Braidotti, 2019b; Neimanis, 2017). With an emphasis
on relationality and connection, agency and assemblages, and difference,
new materialist theory can contribute to ways of knowing that de-
privilege the human, creating space for nonhuman matter and multispe-
cies, and thus alternative political and ethical orientations.

Sport, the Environment, and New Materialisms

Similar to other fields, scholars working within sport and physical cultural
studies have explored the overlap between moving bodies and the
environment using an array of theoretical and methodological approaches
(Bunds & Casper, 2018; Karamichas, 2013; Lenskyj, 1998; McCullough
& Kellison, 2017; Rolando, Caprio, Rinaldi, & Ellena, 2006; Schaffner,
2009; Wheeler & Nauright, 2006). More recently, scholars have begun
using new materialist ontological principles to explore the intra-actions
between sport and the environment (Evers, 2019a; King, 2020;
McDonald & Sterling, 2020; Millington & Wilson, 2017; Tuana, 2008).
In this section, we briefly review some of the most common approaches
to study the relationship between sport and environment, before explor-
ing how some are turning to new materialisms to build upon and extend
this body of literature (see Thorpe, Brice, & Clark, 2020).

There is not enough space in this chapter to acknowledge the large
body of work that has examined the relationship between sport and the
environment. However, one popular area of research has been on the
destructive impact of mega-sporting events (and event structures) on the
environment. Scholars have looked at the ways events destroy ecosystems
by examining the harmful impact of increased tourism (i.e., more waste
and transportation needs), the increased carbon footprint of events, and
other long-lasting environmental impacts (Ahmed & Pretorius, 2010;
Collins, Jones, & Munday, 2009; Hayes & Karamichas, 2012;
Karamichas, 2013; Lesjø & Gulbrandsen, 2017). Other scholars come to
the topic from a sports policy perspective, examining the ways sporting
organizations and departments have developed (and often failed) to
implement environmental sustainability policies (Casper & Pfahl, 2015; Collins & Flynn, 2008; Trendafilova, Babiak, & Heinze, 2013).

In a different vein, various researchers have discussed the close relationship outdoor, lifestyle, and action sport participants have with the natural environment and how it can lead to heightened ‘ecological sensibilities’ (Olive, 2016) or ‘ecocentricity’ (Brymer & Gray, 2010; see also Booth, 2020a; Humberstone, 2011; Stoddart, 2012; Wheaton 2020). Some are extending such research by prioritising Indigenous relationships with oceans, mountains, and other natural environments, and critiquing the longstanding and ongoing damage caused by settler colonialism and contemporary western-derived recreation and tourism practices (Laurendeau, 2020; Olive, 2019; Waiti & Awatere, 2019; Wheaton, Waiti, Cosgriff & Burrows, 2019).

Although sport scholars are increasingly recognizing the importance of studying the impact of sports (i.e., recreational participation, mass events, mega events) on the environment, they typically maintain a binary between nature and culture, with the environment seen primarily as a backdrop of human activity. With the growth of environmental humanities and more-than-human theories, however, some sport scholars are exploring more relational understandings of humans and nature as inextricably connected.

Offering a refreshing extension from literature exploring the connection between the environment and mega-events, McDonald and Sterling (2020) use new materialisms to rethink the ideas around athletes, the environment, and the “troubled” waterways (beaches, lagoons, bays) of the 2016 Rio de Janeiro Olympic games in Brazil. During the 2016 games, there was a great amount of news coverage about the polluted waterways of Brazil and the impact this would have on athletes, tourists, and the games, more broadly. While acknowledging this important coverage, McDonald and Sterling (2020) argue that it comes from a purely anthropocentric viewpoint. They instead focus on the intra-actions of water with both humans and nonhumans (marine life, pollutants, bacteria). Taking inspiration from feminist new materialist scholarship, they explore the polluted waters of the games as “an ongoing, interconnected, ethical, and onto-epistemological process,” within which “human bodies are entangled with multiple non- and more-than human bodies”
In a similar vein to McDonald and Sterling (2020), Millington and Wilson (2017) discuss the development of the Trump Golf Course in Scotland with a focus on sand dunes. Challenging the anthropocentrism of sporting practices and much critical sport scholarship, they ask readers to consider sand dunes as active players alongside people such as Donald Trump and sporting organizations.

Other scholars have also focused on nonhuman matter as a way to think differently about the impact of sporting participation and consumption practices on and with animals (King, 2020; Atkinson, 2014). In so doing, some sport scholars are engaging with inter- and multi-species approaches to explore human-animal relationships in sport, including horses (e.g., Dashper, 2017; Linghede, 2019) and canines (e.g., Merchant, 2020). Adopting a different approach, King (2020) conducts a new materialist, posthumanist exploration into the environmental impact of the increased animal protein powder consumption by fitness enthusiasts. Beginning with an understanding of animal protein as a “dynamic and lively material-discursive subject” (p. 202), King (2020) became increasingly interested in what it “does to humans and other life forms as it circulates in and through diffuse assemblage of bodies and environments” (p. 202). Therefore, she traced the development and entanglements of protein powder showcasing the harmful environmental impact of this increasingly popular fitness practice. In proposing a multi-species analysis of (non)human actors in contemporary dietary and exercise-based regimes, she offers a highly original and important account of the “complex and dispersed forms and trajectories of more-than-human physical culture” (King, 2020, p. 204; also see King and Weedon, 2020a, 2020b).

In his chapter in the same anthology, Booth (2020b) explores the potential in new materialist approaches for understanding beaches. He argues that social constructionist approaches are typically silent about the ways in which we understand and interact with the material dimensions of beaches—sand, ocean, surf, weather, climate, geomorphology, geology. He begins by posing the question as to whether an “interactionist ontology that underscores the entanglement of corporeal and geomatter [can] give new meaning to physical cultures such as surfbathing and
surfing?” (p. 261). He then proceeds to use the case study of Bondi Beach, one of Australia’s best-known playgrounds, to reconceptualize the material realities of the beach. He concludes by arguing that such thinking may foster a new, more productive politics of physical and cultural pursuits in environmentally vulnerable spaces. For Booth, such optimism and new ethics of care are timely and much needed as “concoctions of corporeal and manufactured waste, including heavy metals and pesticides, and biomatter such as bacteria and viruses” (p. 261) increasingly flow into bays and harbours around the world, polluting human and nonhuman bodies and destroying ecosystems.

Similar to Booth (2020), cultural studies scholar, Evers (2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2019d) has written about the connection between surfing, the environment, and new materialisms. Along with writing for various academic journals and surfing media, Evers embraces creative experimental methods and performance art to think through the various connections and assemblages between the environment and leisure activities, particularly surfing and pollution. In an effort to disseminate such ideas more widely, Evers and colleagues have developed a project titled Polluted Leisure (see www.pollutedleisure.com) with an aim to explore “how we can better understand and respond to assemblages of pollution and leisure?” (n.p.). Through films, art exhibitions, journal articles, book chapters, and online blogs, Evers argues that we need to take a posthumanist, material-social approach to recognize how humans intra-act with more-than-human worlds—pollution, capitalism, and environmental crises. In line with other new materialist scholars, Evers confronts the climate crisis in a manner that emphasizes the dynamism of nonhuman matter (waterways) and a need to move away from anthropocentric ways of understanding the world. However, unlike many other sport scholars, he teases at the boundaries of presentation using innovative methodologies (i.e., wet ethnography) and creative performative dissemination styles (i.e., art exhibitions). Taking inspiration from this long line of environmental thinking and activism, and looking towards more creative approaches to “represent” ways of knowing, in the remainder of the chapter we offer examples from our own new materialist-inspired performative collaborative writing experiment.
New Materialisms, Representation, and Ethics: Moving Bodies and Environmental Entanglements

In the remainder of this chapter we explore creative, ‘postpresentational’ performative writing styles to think about our human and nonhuman environmental entanglements and ideas around bodily boundaries in times of environmental crisis. In the final months of writing this book, we experienced the Australian bush fires of early 2020, closely followed by the global COVID-19 pandemic. Somewhat inevitably given our deep immersion in new materialisms, our individual and collective ways of knowing and experiencing these events were shaped by the theories and concepts we had been reading, writing, and living with for many months prior. But like any social theory, engaging with new materialisms did not explicitly or immediately yield clear answers or solutions as to how to make meaning of these complex and deeply unsettling events, or how to respond. Like millions of others living through these times, we experienced many encounters of frustration, struggle, anxiety, and fear (Braidotti, 2020). Given the deep entanglement between the personal and professional, we wondered what thinking with new materialisms might offer at this time, how it might enable new ways of responding to the world around us. Thus, we found ourselves exploring the creative possibilities of postqualitative-inspired ‘poetic inquiry’ to support our meaning making (Lupton, 2019b, 2020; St. Pierre 2011, 2015). In particular, we took seriously new materialist critiques of representation and MacLure’s (2013a) call for approaches that involve creative “research practices capable of engaging the materiality of language itself” (p. 658). We begin by signposting important questions, tensions, and developments in feminist new materialist approaches to representation, including those focused on bodies and health, as well as those exploring the (im)possibilities of representing nature.

New Materialisms and the Ethics of Representation

New materialist scholars are increasingly considering the challenges of representation that go beyond text, language, and the human. In so
doing, many are experimenting with different ways to represent their research that accounts for the materiality of the phenomenon under investigation (MacLure, 2013a, 2013b; Dierckx, Hannes, & Zaman 2020; Fullagar, 2020; Hickey-Moody, Palmer, and Sayers, 2016; McKnight, 2016; also see Chap. 2). One approach has been the use of poetry and creative writing that disrupts traditional linguistic representational patterns and “bring[s] into view the non-human and human entanglement of agency” (Fullagar, 2020, p. 181).

We appreciate the creative efforts of feminist and new materialist scholars who are embracing performative writing styles to offer alternative representations of their research ‘findings.’ For example, drawing upon the work of St. Pierre (2011) and Jackson and Mazzei (2013), Fullagar (2020) “pursued the analytic possibilities informed by postqualitative inquiry” (p. 180) in her research on the materiality of movement in women’s accounts of recovery from depression. After organizing data from interviews with 80 Australian women about their experiences of depression, she then turned to a new materialist-inspired “postpresentational approach” using poetry that “attends to the forces of affect, as they are entangled with recognized emotions, to identify what they ‘do’ through particular intra-active relations of embodied movement” (p. 180). Focusing on the narrative of one participant (Anna), she adopted a “critical-creative analytic” that helped her pay attention to the complex relations of embodied movement within this participant’s experiences of depression, anxiety, and her process of recovery. In a second account, she then works through a different analytic device “diffracted through a new materialist emphasis to displace the speaking ‘I’ as a way of opening up questions about distributed agency and embodied transformations” (p. 183). In so doing, she makes visible the “human and nonhuman relations, the visceral responses and normative modes of feminine subjectivity that are entangled with different affects” (p. 183). Similarly, Lupton (2020) uses materials generated in a story completion project to “create poetic representations” of understandings of health. Combining the arts-based methods of story completion and poetic inquiry, Lupton (2020) identifies “the affordances, affective forces and relational connections in the human-nonhuman assemblages” (p. 1). Fullagar (2020) and Lupton (2019b, 2020) are among a growing number of feminist scholars
engaging with new materialist theory who are using poetry (and other creative arts-based methods) to represent previously gathered data. In so doing, they are building upon and extending a long lineage of scholars exploring the potential in creative arts and alternative representational styles for new ways of knowing, including the innovative use of poetry for representing sporting and moving bodies (see, for example, Popovic, 2012).

In a different vein, Heddon (2017) utilizes a performative writing style in an effort to pay closer attention to the importance of listening to both humans and nonhumans (animals, insects, plants, and elements). Engaging with participatory forms of theatre-making, she proposed “a form of co-authorship and collaboration that focuses on what can be made with others, through openness and acceptance,” thus prompting the questions: “How might we avoid ‘compelling the other to talk’? How might we avoid hearing only what we already know?” (p. 13). Returning again and again to a ‘failed conversation’ in a forest clearing, she recognizes the challenges (if not impossibility) of giving voice to nonhuman subjects and to nature. In the words of feminist environmental philosopher Catriona Sandilands (1999), “human language about nonhuman nature can never be complete, only by acknowledging its limits is the space opened for otherworldy conversations” (p. 185; cited in Heddon, 2017, p. 205). In her effort to open up such “otherworldy conversations,” Heddon (2017) then proceeds to (conceptually) bring a range of environmental and feminist philosophers (i.e., Val Plumwood, Donna Haraway, Catriona Sandilands) into the forest clearing, to reach the conclusion that “we need to be much better at listening to others—human and nonhuman—to different forms of speech, including the con-verse, a versing with” (p. 206).

Also exploring the ethics of voice and representing nature in her brilliant work *Bodies of Water*, Neimanis (2017) develops a posthuman feminist phenomenology that “understands our bodies as being fundamentally part of the natural world and not separate from or privileged to it” (backpage). While we cannot do justice to her work here, we acknowledge it as an important contribution to “ideas of embodiment and ecological ethics in the posthuman critical moment” (backpage). In a chapter building upon this work, Neimanis (2018) joins new materialist environmental scholars who are embracing creative writing and representational styles, or what she refers to as “representation without representationalism” (p. 181). Such approaches are not without debate,
however, with questions about the possibility (and ethics) of ever trying to represent, or give ‘voice’, to nature (Neimanis, 2018). The task of representing other-than-human beings is hotly contested:

even if we pass the hurdles involved in deciding which beings ought to be represented, by whom, with how much weight and how, we face further challenges. These include: apprehending what their interests are and interpreting their communications without assimilating them into our own forms of understanding and being – which would undermine the possibility of accurate representation, and commit the further injustice of misrecognition and domination (Celermajer et al., 2020, p. 7; also see Gray and Curry, 2020).

These are questions that have been similarly raised by Alaimo, Sandilands, Haraway and Barad in terms of the ethics of representing matter and nonhuman subjects, and there are no easy answers.

Whereas some new materialist scholars call for modes of representation that go beyond language and writing, others are revisiting the process of writing as a means of attending to, and conversing and becoming with, other human and nonhuman bodies. In dialogue with new materialist-inspired questions around representation, Neimanis (2018) begins by asking the following critical questions:

Is there a way to hold on to representation, but as a posthuman representation without representationalism? That is, a representation that recognizes the political necessity of this endeavour, but in a way that rejects a privileging of either ‘things’ or ‘words’, that refuses the ontological split between ‘reality’ and ‘re-presentation’, and even more importantly, leaves behind the nature/culture divide altogether?

Through her close examination of the creative works of Irland (2011) and other water and ice artist-scholars, Neimanis (2018) recognizes the complexities of representing nature, and concludes that we need to rethink some of our previous assumptions of what ‘representation’ might look, sound, and feel like. Speaking directly to the challenges of representation within new materialisms, Neimanis (2018) calls for a reimagining of writing as an ethical practice and entangled process of becoming with the world. In the final pages of this book, we take up these new materialist
challenges of representation and understandings of ethics in our attempts to creatively write through our entangled relations with the environment. In this way, our collaborative modes of poetic inquiry become an ethical practice of coming together and becoming through relationality.

Collaborative Creative Writing: Body-Environment Entanglements

Many environmental scholars, activists, and artists have long embraced creative writing and performative arts-based methods to engage and affect readers. In so doing, their words, stories, narratives, poetry, dance, and other artistic and creative performances are political in their potential to engage readers to feel and do more (e.g., Chen, MacLeod & Neimanis, 2013; Gabrys, 2018; Meyers, 2017; see Chap. 2). In our collaborative writing experiment, we find much inspiration in the creative approaches developed by environmental artists, as well as feminist new materialists focused on health and the body (i.e., Fullagar, 2020; Lupton, 2019b, 2020), and the environment (i.e., Heddon, 2017; Neimanis, 2017, 2018), for listening to (or conversing with) the multiplicities of human and non-human agents in our material-discursive entanglements. In the remainder of this chapter, we share two examples of our experimental collaborative writing, drawing encouragement from those exploring alternative writing styles both within and outside of new materialisms. Importantly, our process was never about creating beautiful poetry, representing nature, or offering alternative accounts of themes emerging from an empirical data set (Fullagar, 2020; Jeffrey, 2020; Lupton, 2019b, 2020). Rather we set out with an openness to engage in a collaborative theoretically informed digital exchange during the Australian bushfires using whatever forms of expression were prompted in response to the rapidly unfolding and stressful conditions. As circumstances continued to change unexpectedly and quickly, we continued this practice during COVID-19 as a way to share our new materialist-informed noticings of the various human and non-human intra-actions occurring across spacetimetype mattering, and, as a practice of care. We explored the multiple and varied ways that the physical, social, cultural, and political environment “got under
our skin” (Ahmed, 2010, p. 216), or more specifically, into our lungs, bloodstream, corporeal and moving bodies.

Our process of writing together followed Heddon’s (2017) suggestions for a poetry of more than two, an “improvisational dance of unsettledness, uncertainty, provisionality and creativity, arising from the taking turns and turning-with-turning-with” one another (p. 206). We also took inspiration from Fullagar’s (2020) feminist new materialist “orientation of listening through the body as a multiplicity rather than privileging a notion of individuated agency, meaning, or corporeality that emerges through binary thinking” (p. 180). In our collaborative approach, this meant the material-discursive formations through which our individual bodies and lived experiences of environmental and health crises were “co-implicated in the [co]production of meaning” (Fullagar, 2020, p. 180, emphasis added). Our voices blurred and became intertwined within our “embodied reading-writing”—writing alone and together—from different places in the world and locations in the crisis. We crafted the following pieces with the hope that they will ‘show rather than tell’ some of our new materialist-inspired noticings of bodies—human and more-than-human—as always entangled with the environment during times of environmental and health crisis. Our writing in part emerges from a diffractive reading of new materialist scholarship, as well as media releases, scientific reports, public commentaries, hundreds of social media posts and comments, and always with and through our own embodied experiences of our (im)mobile bodies.

**Writing-Feeling Together: Part 1**

The Australian bushfires of late 2019 and early 2020 had a devastating effect on communities across Australia, killing and injuring many from both flames and smoke pollution. The fires destroyed almost 10,000 buildings (homes and outbuildings), burned more than 10 million hectares (100,000 square km or 24.7 million acres) of bushland, and killed over a billion individual animals (Celermajer et al., 2020). Colloquially known as the “Black Summer,” images of the fires were reported in newspapers and social media across the world. The imagery that garnered the
most attention was the extreme loss of flora and fauna, charred landscapes and animal carcasses, shocking domestic and international viewers alike. The smoke from the fires travelled widely, filling the skies across many parts of Australia and some parts of Aotearoa New Zealand. Living across two countries at the time, we could write-feel the vitalities of ash as it moved with the wind, over oceans, blanketing communities (ours and others), blocking the sun, and prompting great uncertainty about the future of the planet and our roles and responsibilities in this environmental and ecological crisis (Chao, 2020). Such reflections also raised new questions about moving bodies, inhaling and exhaling the charred environment while walking, running, or biking for transport, work, exercise, or leisure. While often considered ‘healthy’ activities, these movements matter differently in these particular socio-material moments.

During this time we engaged deeply with feminist and Indigenous critiques, while also reading scientific studies of the intra-actions of the complex chemical makeup of ash (and particulate matter, PM) in throats, lungs, and eyes. We felt the effects in our own bodies. Throughout these noticings and respondings, we paid attention to the many nonhuman objects that intra-acted with human bodies in ways previously not considered; masks rubbing on faces while walking to work, the daily data on newly downloaded air pollution apps, wind and weather patterns carrying poisonous pollutants, the ashy-irritation in throats and eyes felt so differently depending on exposure, sensitivities, and health conditions. Writing-feeling this environmental and health crisis together back-and-forth across the Tasman ocean, was a “feminist project of belonging for the Anthropocene” (Gibson-Graham, 2011, p. 1) in that we were writing to find new ways of listening, wondering, enquiring, and collectively caring, “becoming-with, instead of writing against” the environment (Heddon, 2017, p. 195).

**Under Red Skies**

Guilt, breath, and sepia-toned atmospheres
What have we done?
What have I done?
What happens now?
It is mid-afternoon and we are on holiday, but what kind of holiday is this when the future seems so bleak
It is the peak of the summer heat and we are inside
Doors and windows closed
Sweat gathers and runs down their small tanned limbs
The sky filled with cloud and smoke, an eerie red tinge to the dull light
The birds and the farm animals confused, not sure what to do
I too am unsure how to make sense of this new reality

It has been a privilege, I suppose, to not know what a P2 mask is
To not have understood the specificities of the type and size of particulate with which the human body can effectively cope. Or how to limit the entry of these particles into

our throats
our lungs
our futures

Particles from so very far away carried by the wind and currents fill our air
My heart arches for the loss being experienced by our Australian neighbors
But I realize it is our loss too
And as the ash dulls our skies, I worry for my scarred lungs… reminded of the chronic disease with every scratchy breath

Now, unzipping my backpack, I fish my P2 mask out and fit it carefully over my face. (I made sure to study the instructions closely last night) I continue walking home from work. I am worried about my baby
As I walk I try not to breathe too deeply, short breaths, light headed
Men at the construction site see me go by. I wonder how they feel about working.
Food delivery workers pedal past on their e-bikes. The gig economy doesn’t stop gigging, even when bodies, lungs, and lives are in peril

The newly downloaded App tells me the risk is low, and yet I choose not to go for my daily run, to draw the particles deeper into the bloodstream
I tell the children they can’t go to the beach this afternoon. They moan for a few minutes, and then run off to play with their Pokémon cards, their sweet naivety only possible for so long. These are difficult conversations to have with a five year old.
Inhalation
Exhalation
Damp breath creating
Condensation
with nowhere to go

I am left to feel the scratch in my throat, agitation in my eyes, and pulling on each inhale
The PM2.5 particles are higher than usual here today, but they are at dangerous levels in some parts of Australia
I imagine their terror
The images of flora and fauna burned and charred, thousands of residents fleeing or stuck on beaches, in communities
Twitter explodes with anger at governments, politicians, and calls for a return to Indigenous knowledges and practices

I live here now in this new country
Their history is not mine, but I am implicated, we all are

So far from the scene, who am I to feel this pain?
And yet, my lungs scratch and bleed with the ash and debris of their lost lands
Past-present-future felt in my own body, trapped inside, terrified for the future that awaits my children, their children, our children.

And in the dialogue, across the seas, we share
A humbling acknowledgement that we have been complicit in this destruction
And in the diminishment of knowledges and practices that might have allowed ‘us’ to better care for the land
We want to hope, but the available narratives feel empty
What can we do now but to feel this through the body—the heart, the lungs, with each breath
Futures need to be imagined and created a new, starting in the everyday
Time to lean in and feel it all
Breathing deep, death and hope.
Writing-Feeling Together: Part 2

The conditions of COVID-19 ushered in an unexpected continuance of crisis. We extended our collaborative writing practice as the ash settled and a new less-visible threat emerged, carried by moving bodies and transferred via human and nonhuman objects in the immediate environment. Writing-feeling together was part of an imperfect but vital effort to make sense of a dramatically altered world and to think what possible or appropriate responses might be. As we were writing back-and-forward, the context was changing quickly and the pace of our writing seemed to respond to these temporal developments. In the second piece presented below, we explore these spacetimematterings as a ‘bad flu’ became Coronavirus, became COVID-19, became global pandemic, became months of isolation, becoming again, differently across the world.

Over these days, weeks, months, time seemed to blur, but the internet continued to churn, unleashing new information at an impossible pace and dripping with affect—fear, anger, frustration, despair, and eventually, hope (Braidotti, 2020). Domestic and international policies were moving just as fast, and scientific studies communicated by both mainstream and social media seemed to offer a whirlwind of contradictory evidence. Not dissimilar to Fullagar and Pavlidis (2020), we turned to feminist new materialisms to help us “attune to what is happening, what remains unspoken and to pay attention to ‘the little things’ that may be lost in a big crisis” (n.p.). As feminist scholars of the moving body, we paid particular attention to discussions of bodily secretions (i.e., sweat) and aerosol particles (i.e., breath) connecting, intra-acting, with the environment (i.e., air, wind, water). We also reflected on the new understandings of bodily boundaries prompted in pandemic times (Thorpe, Brice & Clark, 2021). Throughout the COVID-19 crisis, the risks of the moving body have been widely discussed and debated. Running and cycling bodies were said to pose additional risk as aerosols were more widely dispersed (Scanlan, 2020; Thoelen, 2020). In our own communities—in our homes too—we witnessed much debate and contestation over policies (unevenly) restricting outdoor recreation. As we wrote back-and-forward, we came to new noticings, vital respondings, and ethical considerations of bodily boundaries in times of pandemic where the body—any and every body—was a site of possible contagion.
Vital Respondings in Pandemic Times

Masks, breath, and uncertain futures
So many parallels and continuities
From just months ago
But it is different now

They say
The virus persists
Alive
On surfaces and in the air
And this time,
Masks may not help
The danger too diffuse
The body too porous
The virus too determined

A tickle in my throat, a stuffy nose
A sense of panic begins to creep
Scanning the Internet, symptoms don’t match
A sigh of relief, but doubts linger
Much is uncertain right now

Instructing my regular class warm-up
My body hypervisible at the front of the studio
Within minutes a need to wipe my nose
I feel their eyes, burning, wondering
“Does she have it?”
I anticipate their accusations
“You were abroad?”
Ashamed and nervous, am I doing the right thing?
Ethics
Old and new
Reconfigured and re-thought
In times of pandemic

Data dominates, filling our screens
New scientific language, the discourse of the day
A virus spreading
Near and far
Fear mounts, scratching at every thought
I breathe deeply and exhale
Seeking to still the anxious tremor that haunts my chest
Not knowing what lingers in the air
Or what I may ingest
Intimacy as contagion
These are wild times

Labeled ‘high risk’, we were early responders
After days with the children home
Out of school, our limbs twitching
Walking down the beach path
Mid-week, low risk, the sand is bare
Glad for the space to run, to play, without worry
Catching a glimpse of a couple walking towards us
Accents in the breeze
Pre thought, moving closer to my children
Edging us to the side of the path
Creating space between bodies
Holding my breath while children chatter
As they pass, I breathe again
But my nostrils fill with perfume
Not mine
The trail of others bodies, new noticings

Muscles craving movement
Pulling on my shoes, running for the trees
In the cool shade of the forest
Away from the phone
The computer
The screens that relegate with regular alerts, news
And public announcements
Leaping over tree roots and breathing deeply
Fresh forest air

Borders closed now
Families displaced, separated by
the power of the state
Time seems to warp, speeding up, stretching
Bewildering our bodies, our hearts
People dying, getting sick, filling wards
Communities unraveling and
coming together in new ways
For how long will this last?

But for now
In this moment
Many of us enclosed in our homes
Privileged, ‘safe’ within our bubble
Others, fighting differently
We collectively know
Everything has changed

Weeks in isolation
Agitations and tensions building
Queer intimacies
Familiar spaces and people,
made strange
Digital workouts, not quite the same
Children climbing walls, literally
Knocking on the door, pushing
boundaries

Collectively, flattening the curve
Medical experts, politicians,
scientists
Yielding new powers
Hard to believe, but into
data we lean
Back to ‘normal’ soon, perhaps,
they tease
But doubts linger
The potential of contagion
persists
Yet hope builds that this
will change
Everything
Final Thoughts: New Materialisms and Feminist Respondings for Vital Futures

Feminist new materialist understandings of the environment draw upon and extend decades of important scholarship by Indigenous scholars, environmental humanities, and ecofeminists. While there are many parallels, we suggest that feminist new materialisms make at least two valuable offerings to these important and timely fields of scholarship. Firstly, in acknowledging the agency of the more-than-human world, feminist new materialisms encourages us to rethink environmental ethics (Alaimo, 2008). Secondly, new materialist and postqualitative experiments in creative writing and performative representational approaches may facilitate new modes of listening to (or conversing with) the multiplicities of human and nonhuman agents in our material-discursive entanglements (Heddon, 2017; Neimanis, 2017, 2018). Such experimental and creative writing (or representational) practices with our human and nonhuman collaborators may enable new ways of understanding (and imagining) entangled relations of moving bodies and the environment of past-present-future.

Our collaborative poetic inquiry was triggered by new and urgent concerns as to how we might know recent tragic and troubling events differently. As feminists desiring a better world for all human and nonhuman species, we recognized the immediate need for new ways of responding. From the initial germination of this collaborative project, our ‘creative-research’ writing practices helped us make meaning of new human and nonhuman relations during environmental-health crises. In
so doing, our feminist new materialist-inspired collaborative writing experiment prompted vital respondings to our always entangled becoming with the environment and other human and nonhuman agents. Working outside of the confines of the familiar, linear modes of writing, we found alternative spaces for new thoughts and affects that contributed to the messy, entangled, continuously unfolding processes of meaning making. In this way, our theoretically informed writing practices prompted new understandings of feminist ethics. Our collaborative writing experiment brought to the fore the Baradian understanding of ethics and respond-ability in which we are all (humans and nonhumans) already responsible “to the others with whom or which we are entangled” (Neimanis, 2018, p. 393). In this way, our writing practices were the beginning of a process of becoming worldly with (Haraway, 2008). As we move towards more relational ways of knowing, new materialist ethics of becoming-with other humans, nonhumans, and the environment are ignited. As feminist scholars of moving bodies living and writing in times of environmental crisis and pandemic, such conceptualizations of ethics seem more urgent than ever.

* * *

In the final days of writing this book our screens are once again filled with mask-wearing bodies, moving in the streets. But this time, they are joining together to protest racial inequities and injustices, and the deeply entrenched systemic exploitation that is being further amplified in times of environmental and health crises. We notice now more than ever the ways human health, environmental health, and social justice are entangled. The year of 2020 has been a time of remarkable global challenge, and the systems of patriarchy, capitalism, colonialism are being questioned to new extents. We are in a new Zeitgeist—the feeling of the times is changing quickly with populations around the world increasingly relating and connecting through their discontent with systems of oppression that prioritize profit over human, environmental, and nonhuman health and wellbeing. The time for new knowledges and interventions is now. New materialist theories and feminist relational and affirmative ethics
have encouraged us to explore new ways of knowing our positionalities, relationships, and responsibilities. We take seriously the call of Braidotti (2019b) for “affirmative ethics” that invigorate our “desire to become otherwise and the desire for other ways of living and dying” (p. 181). As feminist scholars of moving bodies, we continue to explore the theoretical, methodological, and embodied possibilities of re-imagined activisms, and the ethical imperative “to get going” (Braidotti, 2019b, p. 181). We recognize we have more work to do to put feminist new materialist knowledge into action in our everyday lives as scholars, teachers, mentors, and community members, and we remain committed to this practice. This book offers readers a set of tools that we hope they will take up in their own projects to continue the imperative work of creating more just and equitable futures for humans and nonhumans alike.

**Pedagogical Possibilities**

New materialisms, more-than-human, and postqualitative modes of inquiry offer unlimited creative opportunities to encourage and prompt students to rethink their relationships with the environment. Below we offer some examples that could be modified for a range of different contexts. Each of these activities should provide opportunities to discuss the challenges and opportunities of representing nature and the ethical considerations in doing so:

1. Ask your students to write a poem (or any creative writing style) that reveals their relationship with a sporting, fitness, or health ‘environment’ that they participate in. This could be a built (e.g., a gym, stadium, skatepark, walking paths) or natural (e.g., beach, mountain, river) environment. Encourage them to write-feel some of the different humans and nonhumans that contribute to their entangled experiences in/with this environment. The students should experiment with how/when they write with ‘I’ in this piece.

2. Ask your students to write about the same environment, but this time in the ‘voice’ of a nonhuman agent in this environment. This could be
the water in the river, the dirt on a running trail, the sand on a beach, the snow on a mountain, the grass on a golf course, or a tree at their favourite stadium or skatepark. The options are endless and students should be encouraged to brainstorm a range of possibilities before choosing the one to focus on in their creative writing piece. In so doing, they should consider the cultural significance of this nonhuman agent. For example, is it an object with great meaning attached to it either in the past or in the present, or is it rarely noticed by humans in this environment? Also, to consider: what ‘message’ this nonhuman agent might want to communicate and why? Encourage students to experiment with the ‘voice’ of this nonhuman agent, and try to reassure them that there is no ‘right’ style of representation here; it is about experimenting with the materiality of language.

3. In a third experiment of creatively representing the sporting, fitness, or health environment, you might encourage each student to collaborate with a fellow student, co-writing about their bodily entanglements with other human and nonhuman agents within a particular environment.

4. Another option is to encourage students to explore visual arts methods (e.g., photography, sculpture, collage) to represent the human and nonhuman intra-actions within a sporting, fitness, or health environment. Again, encourage them to consider what the ‘political’ or ‘ethical’ message in this creative piece might be and whose ‘message’ this is.