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Abstract

This study examines everyday media practices in environmental movements, activism campaigns, claims to education, and their relation to subjectification through various contortions of the verb ‘fold.’ Thinking with different types of folds (e.g., pleats, inflections, twists), it proposes concepts for investigating subjectification as a series of shifting spatial and temporal arrangements between a) environmental non-governmental organizations’ (ENGOs) campaigns and their educational intentions, b) residents’ media practices in ecological conflicts, and c) more-than-human forces and events of the Anthropocene.

The project reconsiders media practices and environmental movement learning in ecologically perturbed times through the thought of Gilles Deleuze (1988, 1993), especially his concept of ‘the fold’ and its quadripartite architecture of subjectivity, comprising folds of knowledge, matter, force, and ‘the outside’ or death/extinction. I argue that subjectivity is produced through media and knowledge practices in ecological conflicts—not as a ‘being’ or the bounded contours of a human entity, but as an event and a process of folding inflected by more-than-human pleats. Situated within darker hues of ecological thought, this study engages with and problematizes the media practices of 24 residents in anti-oil pipeline movements in British Columbia, Canada (e.g., tracking online petitions, following (or not) ENGOs’ social media feeds, engaging in online news comments, photographing themselves at protests, writing letters to editors), and their ambivalent encounters with activism campaigns, digital strategies, and especially claims to knowledge and education made by six ENGOs in attempts to contrive ‘political subjects.’

The collection of chapters invites a textured and geometric reading, privileging proliferation over coherence. Subjectivity is folded and refolded in relation to media practices and
education through a *fieldwork in textures*: a) an approach to research for thinking and ‘experimenting’ with subjectivity as concomitantly folded in multiple ways, and b) a mode of inquiry that examines how concepts and fieldwork inflect each other. I develop ‘folded concepts’ emerging from methodological conundrums, mapping the limitations of human thought, conflicting claims to education, media practices, and the more-than-human forces that affect them. Moving away from effects or what campaigns represent, the study focuses on what campaigns and practices do and affect.
Lay Summary

This study proposes concepts to think about how subjectification functions in ecological politics and environmental movements, particularly in relation to media practices, campaigns, and claims to education. It does so by examining the media practices of 24 residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas in British Columbia, and six environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs), including their media activism campaigns, educational strategies, and claims to knowledge. The study proposes that subjectification is affected by ENGOs’ campaigns in relation to shifting arrangements of knowledge, geology, power, and anticipations of ecological futures. It offers a series of folded concepts (inflections, bends, twists, etc.) as spatial and temporal ways to think about how subjectivities are produced as more-than-human arrangements, beyond individuals’ experiences. It builds on Gilles Deleuze’s concept of ‘the fold,’ to propose a mode of inquiry called fieldwork in textures, which develops different types of folds as modes of inquiry into how subjectification functions.
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1. Introduction: Media Practices Amidst More-than-Human Pleats

Microplastics in drinking water, rising ocean temperatures, climate change, and oil spills comprise some of the most significant ecological threats to animal (including human) extinction. In *When the World Screamed* (1928), a short story by Arthur Conan Doyle extended by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987) in *A Thousand Plateaus*, protagonist George Edward Challenger becomes frustrated that Earth is only passingly aware of humans as though they were merely a fungus on its surface. Challenger devises an experiment and penetrates Earth’s sensory core with a shaft, to see whether he can draw attention to humankind. Earth, provoked, unfolds from its core and spews a dark purple, tar-like substance into the air. This uncontrollable eruption—an oil spill—incites ecological questions and politics surrounding oil, its erratic fallout, and human control. Oil has been a persistent concern to ecological sensibilities and has been significantly amplified in the past 90 years since Doyle wrote his story. As a recurring and expected event, oil affects a multitude of knowledge and media practices aimed at producing ‘political subjects’ who might avert oil pipeline development and contribute to mitigating an imminent crisis.

Ambivalent times, when humans are designated “at once victim, agent and redeemer” (Colebrook, 2016, p. 86) and “both agent of destruction and as endangered species” (p. 89), call for conceptions of subjectivity that surmount the clarity and telos with which environmental activists and environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs) narrate and visualize oil politics in their campaigns, and rationalize their media practices and attempts to educate and produce ‘political subjects.’

Although the Anthropocene (Crutzen & Stoermer,
2000) has been demarcated as an epoch in which Homo sapiens (with Challenger as an exemplar) directly intervened into geological strata and profoundly affected ecological systems, humans’ capacity to act, ‘manage,’ even ‘know’ and ostensibly respond to ecological chaos, is significantly in question. Ambivalent response-ability calls for renewed conceptions of subjectivity that take seriously the implications that ‘the human,’ ‘its’ agency, and its anthropocentric modes of thinking are not the only way to conceptualize how subjectivity is produced in ecological politics.

At a time when human/non-human relations are profoundly changing, there is a need to think about ‘the subject’ and how subjectification is, can be, and perhaps has always been, multiple, and arranged in ways that is itself ecological. In other words, subjectification has always been porous in relation to technological, geological, and temporal forces outside itself (Guattari, 1989/2000). Might antiquated but persistent (representative) conceptions of ‘the subject’ and subjectification actually contribute to and exacerbate the Anthropocene? As Deleuze (1990/1995) provoked, “subjectification isn’t even anything to do with a ‘person’” (pp. 98-99). One of the core concerns of my research is to examine the ontology of ‘subjectivity’ in relation to educational and media practices when engaged in various ecological politics. This dissertation reconceptualizes subjectivity in more-than-human ways by thinking with Gilles Deleuze’s (1988, 1993) concept of ‘the fold.’

---

2 I use the term Anthropocene knowing it has acquired multiple uses beyond that of its geological definition. Colebrook (2016b) highlights the multiple concurrent ways the ‘the Anthropocene’ has been used, arguing that, rather than see them as contradictions to be resolved, they are features of an ‘incompossible world’ (p. 444). The ‘Anthropocene’ evokes a retrospective perspective that there is a ‘unity of the human’ (Colebrook, 2016b, p. 441) that has affected geological changes, and a perspective that refuses the grouping of all humans into one attributive force, particularly as the Anthropocene is defined in relation to modernization, atomic fallout, and capitalism. The Anthropocene therefore animates thought about the stratifying human but also stratification of ‘the human’ (Colebrook, 2016b), or in other words, identifying the inclusions and exclusions of the grand narrative of ‘the human’ and its variations (Clark & Yusoff, 2017). The Anthropocene poses another incompossibility, namely that it functions as a mode of awareness of human extinction and imagination of Earth without human and many non-human species, i.e., “a world without bodies” (Colebrook, 2014, p. 28), and concurrently re-animates grand narratives and imaginaries of humanism, particularly through the call to revitalization of human agency.
Oil is a sticky, messy substance, and one of my aims with this work has been to think about and stay with the sticky and muddled situations it produces. This study examines the aporias, ambivalences, and indeterminacies within which subjectivity is produced in ecological conflicts, which I discuss in a few moments as the ‘darker hues’ of environmental education research. In addition, the study examines the contradictions that emerge within a complex and heterogenous media ecology that includes human technologies and a variety of materials such as oil, silicon, and carbon (Parikka, 2015). It does not attempt to exemplify successful campaigns, develop curricula for ‘better’ or ‘more effective’ activists, or capture the hope flowing through social media feeds and activism networks. In other words, this research avoids suggestions about how to best educate ‘political subjects.’ It examines the darker hues and sticky textures of ecological thought, rather than aims at coherence or viridescence. It is concerned methodologically with developing different conceptual openings as ways to consider subjectification within this less-than-gleeful mess and in relation to the failures of representational thinking.

The research investigates how subjectification in ecological politics is, and has always been, produced through knowledge and media practices, and in ways that do not always map to heroic terms like ‘activism,’ ‘agency,’ and ‘political identity.’ The research considers how activities—such as setting up Google alerts on news stories, signing online petitions, subscribing (or not) to ENGOs’ social media feeds, taking selfies at anti-oil-pipeline protests,

---

3 I discuss this further, but for now, green has been the dominant colour of ecological thought in adult environmental movement education research. Cohen (2016) provides an expanded colour spectrum through which to engage with different and ‘darker’ hues of ecological thinking, including ideas about subjectification that inform environmental movement education. These darker hues; colours such as black, grey, and violet, offer approaches not currently encompassed within ‘green’ engagements with ecological thought, and are vital to thinking about volatility, uncertainty, hesitation, extinction, decay or epistemological failures. By situating my approach within somewhat ‘darker’ hues of Cohen’s prismatic ecology, I provide a different perspective to green readings of transformative learning and the work of environmental organizations found in adult environmental movement education literature.
and viewing online eco-documentaries—are manifest from the breakdowns in the (cruel) optimism that campaigns utilize to intervene in ecological change (Berlant, 2006), often in the hopeful registers of enlightened education. In other words, these overtly political activities are documented as something other than the effect of attempts by ENGOs to produce ‘political subjects’ through education.

Aims of the Study

I examined the relationships between education, media practices, and subjectification by focusing on an environmental movement aimed at stopping bitumen (unrefined oil) pipeline development in Western Canada. My aim was to understand the shifting ways that subjectivity was produced amongst a multitude of attempts to engage, mobilize, and teach people about the dangers of oil spills and the long-term impact of oil on climate change. These educative activities to engage people included: visual iconography, digital campaigns, marches and protests, educational workshops, online requests for donations, circulation of petitions via social media, and online videos.

These activities were imbued with various claims to ‘education,’ certainty in their assumed solutions, and the assumed telos of producing ‘political subjects.’ The campaigns left little room for ‘uncertainty,’ ‘the obscure,’ ‘not-yet-known,’ and ‘unknowable.’ The uncertainties of the Anthropocene were replaced in favour of a vision of what it means to be political produced in a recursive image of thought. Environmental campaigns foreclosed spaces of subjectivity, preferring an urgent telos of educational engagements with specific media practices assumed to be climate change ‘solutions.’ This assumed education did not reflect the
complex ways in which everyday knowledge and media practices were taken up in productions of subjectivity, shifting in relation to the chaos of the Anthropocene. In the end, I worried that such a telos only reproduced subjectivities that left little room for others.

I examined ways of thinking about subjectivity as something malleable, multiple, and constantly inflected differently—folded—through forces and events beyond the notions of an individual. Subjectivity within such liminal conditions could not be reduced to a humanist subject, its ‘voice’ and its ‘experience’ of everyday media practices. My aim was to show that normative ideas of education and politics practiced in ENGOs’ campaigns do not adequately grapple with how subjectification functions.

Accordingly, my methodological commitments engage with what Deleuze and Guattari (1994) called a pedagogy of the concept, or a way of conducting research aimed at concept development. A pedagogy of the concept explains the conditions for the emergence of concepts rather than representing findings through preconceived concepts (e.g., I will show how I developed concepts such as educational phantasms, fractal faciality enactments, and geomnemata). Additionally, my work engages with more-than-representational approaches that attune to the emergence, affects, and events of subjectification, rather than to static ideas of ‘beings’ (Thrift, 2008).

My engagement with oil and oil pipelines emerged from a concern about the impact these oil pipelines would have in the event of a spill, and from larger concerns about the increase in oil tanker traffic in the coastal areas of this region where I live, and climate change.

---

4 I faced a conundrum of how to tell the story of how ‘I’ became interested in this topic, as my belief is that our stories are not fully directed by us, something that will become more evident over the course of these chapters. I believe there are other forces—concepts, events, and ecological forces, amongst many others, that affect how we think and act. I therefore share why ‘I’ focused on subjectivity in relation to environmental movement education and media practices, knowing well that in doing so, I position myself within a performative contradiction.
in general. If modernity has been energized through coal and steel (Urry, 2014), oil has enabled the liquid, late 20th and early 21st centuries to take shape as they have, producing the petro-citizen as a critical marker of contemporary fluid existence (Cole, 2013).

Bauman (2000) described this fluid existence as liquid modernity, namely the use of consumer products to define ‘the self,’ the capacity for globetrotting, and digital self-expression, and how these have been facilitated through a culture of oil and through its alchemically transformed mode of plastic. As Barthes (1957/1972) warned, “the whole world can be plasticized, and even life itself” (p. 111). Meanwhile, consumer waste has generated abject spaces as urbanites reject/avoid facing the effects that their consumption of plastics has on landscapes (Parr, 2009). For example, the Pacific trash vortex has reached the size of 1.6 million square kilometres, and the desolate desert surface of Death Valley marked a dangerously new record for the highest average monthly temperature at 52.7°C (127°F) in 2018.

British Columbia (BC) has a long history of environmental activism, and recent anti-oil pipeline movements, which have focused on stopping the development of Enbridge’s Northern Gateway pipeline and expansion of Kinder Morgan’s Trans Mountain pipeline, are part of that history. These two pipeline projects aimed to increase the capacity to move crude oil from the Alberta tar sands to the coast of BC in order to export to other countries, most notably China, using large tankers. These pipelines, then, increase the risk of oil spills and hamper Canada’s commitment to transition towards renewable energy sources. I examined how the incessant swarm of ENGOs’ educational strategies and media campaigns about the dangers of oil pipelines—including calls to donate and crowdfund activism campaigns, to at-

---

5 A brief overview of the setting of the study can be found in Appendix C.
tend educational workshops and protests, and to engage with social media updates—projected preferred and recurring ideas of what ‘education’ and ‘knowledge’ were, and projected preferred productions of what ‘political subjectivity’ is or should be.

Ambivalence Amidst ‘Green’ and ‘Darker’ Hues of Environmental Education and Communication Research

This research was produced through my own ambivalence towards ENGOs’ media practices and claims to knowledge. Engaging in this work was a means to explore why I was concurrently drawn to and disaffected with ENGOs’ campaigns. I wanted to know why I was concomitantly weary of endless online posts and feeds to learn more about the issue of oil pipelines and get ‘active,’ and also concerned about the oil pipelines’ potentially detrimental effects and enamoured with how this event would unfold within BC’s fascinating history of activism and image politics (DeLuca, 1999).

individual’s potential, and is achieved through humanistic educational practices, often in response to practices of dehumanization, particularly those created through conditions of capitalism (Sonu & Snaza, 2015). There is an expectation that through development of critical consciousness people will become engaged in environmental issues and that these engagements will lead to political change (Clover, 2002; Kovan & Dirkx, 2003; Sterling, 2010; Walter, 2007).

Perhaps my ambivalence was related to ENGOs’ attempts and desires to contrive a ‘political subjectivity’ that relied on ideas of transformation, actualization and critical consciousness. This subject, one devoted to ‘protecting nature,’ appeared in many recursive ways and was expressed with infallible certainty amidst significant ecological protection setbacks and policy decelerations. The colour green characterizes approaches to environmental education that are incessantly hopeful, optimistic, and persistent (Wallin, 2015). Green approaches ‘fight for nature,’ premised on and transcending human-caused states of ecological destruction through humanist assumptions of self-transformation and critical reflexivity. These premises rest on related ideas about resisting capitalist forces, but ideas that also assume a separation between humans’ symbiosis with nature.

I focused on media practices because they are a predominant modality that ENGOs use to communicate with their audience/public. Media practices also enact or put in motion forces of subjectification through which they take active efforts to get people to engage in political self-transformation and enact their educational intentions. Such personal self-transformation is also associated with a belief that more and better media exposure to environmental issues and specific media practices are vital to educate ‘the public’ and facilitate such a transformation, without an understanding of how people engage in media practices and are enfolded in processes of subjectification in relation to oil, geology, and climate change.
There has been an increase in calls to ‘donate now,’ protest, sign online petitions, and express oneself in this conflict through various media, including: blogs, selfies, documentary films, letters to editors, and in the recent decade, through social media. An incessant rhetoric and sense of ‘hope’ as both a mode, and a goal of becoming political permeates the conflict.

These approaches suggest that individuals are laden with the potential to become ‘political subjects.’ Environmental activism is informed by environmental communication practices that take a vital interest in activating and fulfilling that potential, positioning subjectivity in problem/solution architectures. Lack of appropriate responses on the part of individuals’ trajectories to becoming ‘political subjects’ are positioned as deficits in morals (Dannenberger, Hausman, Lawrence & Powell, 2012; Nisbet, Markowitz & Kotcher, 2012), emotions (Cox & Schwarze, 2015; Schwarze, 2006; Searles, 2010) and identity (Carvalho, 2010; Cox, 2010), which trigger questions for an origin or cause of such mobilization problems in the form of failures of representation. There is a perception that representational analysis matters more than ever, because choices about how to present ecological issues have the potential to make the environment meaningful and “elicit an appropriate response” (Andersson, 2017, p. 263). Environmentally concerned ‘audiences’ might hence be thought of as, and through, problematizations (Foucault, 1984). As a problematization, ‘audiences’ emerge for environmental educators, communicators, and researchers as objects of thought, targets to have an effect on, and through a problem/solution binary in their relationship to media, educational texts, representations, and practices. As Bacchi (2012) argues, all practices rely on particular problematizations, which do not exist prior to practices, including the production, rationalization, and maintenance of enduring problematizations.6 Problem/solution architectures neglect to acknowledge the prospect of aporias, indeterminacies and contingencies in

6 I discuss how these problematizations are rationalized in Chapter Seven, in terms of phantasms.
favour of certainty and solutions (Webb, 2014), or engage frequently enough with the very possibility of these architectures’ breakdown.

I was interested in the disjunctions between normative uses of media practices that made claims to education and subjectification, and how these uses may be re-thought in terms of knowledge (Chapter 3), matter (Chapter 4), force (Chapter 5), and time or death (Chapter 6). I examined how normative political media practices could be conceptualized along lines of thought other than mobilization, transformation, normative political subjectification, and activism, and how these alternative conceptualizations of subjectivity produced other (i.e., alternatives) lines of thought.

*Amor Fati: Subjectivity Amidst ‘Darker’ Ecological Thought*

Guattari (2000) argued that subjectivity is produced in relation to ecological conflicts, and in recursive ways that entwine mental, social, and environmental ecologies. My premise was that subjectivity was produced in ways that I believed did not map to such overtly political activities practiced by ENGOs. My work distinguished between the terms ‘political subjectivity’ (in quotation marks) and subject, subjectivity, and subjectification. The first term highlights the formulation of subjects as ‘political’ within the humanist formulation of an individuated ‘agent.’ This individual is taken up in environmental movement education and environmental communication that emphasizes temporal ideas of potential, transformation, and its actualization. In contrast, the subsequent terms depict subjectivity as an ongoing and morphing process animated by (often) more-than-human folds, a process that is innately political.

The Anthropocene accentuates the limitations of representational ways of thinking, evading human attempts to construct viable narratives about how to survive climate change
and/or death and extinction in the Anthropocene (Colebrook, 2016). This threat to the representational capacity to narrate and maintain control over nature has activated a host of pragmatic activities that in turn more fiercely aim to mobilize the human spirit, rationality and discourses of hope to maintain ‘life’—perhaps contributing, in the worst irony possible, to producing what it desires to stop. In other words, claims to knowledge and a belief in devising ‘better’ or more frequent representations of ‘political subjects’ through media practices, as means to produce ‘political subjects,’ may also inadvertently be driving people away from ecological politics and/or inadvertently producing more and more human certainty, like Challenger.

My research lies within the darker hues of ecological thought, which suspends certainty within projects of critical transformation found in ‘green’ environmental education initiatives and problem/solution architectures. Darker hues of ecology (Morton, 2007) move a little slower, do not quite know what to do, avoid claims to solutions, and most of all, focus research on hesitations that environmental education and its related communication and media practices produce and produce within themselves (i.e., micropolitics). Darker hues, which Morton (2007, 2016) refers to as ‘dark ecology’ identify the strange, complicated, uncomfortable, and perhaps less-than-hopeful situation that requires attuning to tensions, contradictions, indeterminacies, difficulties, and ontological mutations occurring during the Anthropocene.

Deleuze’s (1988, 1993) idea of the fold is particularly suited to examine such liminalities addressed through dark ecology, which include colours such as black and grey: “a polychrome hue of the in-between and the uncertain, a miscellaneous zone [that] is not easily circumscribed” (Cohen, 2013, p. 271). Darker hues of media theory also accentuate disconnections and non-communicative aspects of media practices, rather than their connections
(Thacker, 2014), querying joyful theorizations of the revolutionary opportunities of digital and networked contemporary activism campaigns. If the darker hue of this research appears pessimistic, it does so, as Wallin (2015) argued, by “mobiliz[ing] pessimism as an ethical force for warding against the false optimism of transcendence” (p. 142). I discuss this idea of ethics in the next chapter.

Perhaps most importantly, dark ecological thought questions humans as the sources of ‘their’ knowledge, and their capacity to ‘know’ the entirety of ecological and political events. MacCormack (2009) discussed human certainty as a necrophilosophy, an approach that refuses to let go of humanist ideals and seeks to “reterritorialize ‘life’ within the ambit of human thought” (Wallin, 2017, p. 1102). Necrophilosophy reluctantly mourns subjectivity’s transformation and makes “everything dead only to be alive in pre-formed concepts” (MacCormack, 2009, p. 74). The finitude of human’s capacity to narrate ecological transformation coupled with anticipations of an Earth without human life has created new types of folds and ways of folding subjects, some that are distinctly more-than-human. Part of my attention then, consists in developing concepts that demonstrate how subjectivity in environmental movements is produced through different types of folds, and not only in the ways defined through pre-existing concepts.

A key point in dark ecology, as taken up in this dissertation, is its aim to “stick around with the sticky mess that we’re in and that we are” (Morton, 2007, p. 188). This amor fati (Nietzsche, 1882/2001, 1908/2004) or ‘love of what is’ and of ‘what is to come,’ engages with diagramming subjectification as emergent and continuously refolding multiplicities that are indeterminate, aporetic, or ambiguous. It does not focus on subjectivity as something that exists as a possibility that can be fulfilled, and a ‘being’ that can be actual-
ized. As Nietzsche (1908/2004) argued, *amor fati* is an approach to life, and perhaps to research, to “not only to endure what is necessary, still less to conceal it…but to love it” (p. 39). New and reworked concepts of subjectivity that depart from transcendence and mobilization or behavioural change create space and time to attune to different, including ambiguous politics, to those of transformation.

**Thinking/Doing Folds: Theory-Method**

Subjectivities and how they are produced through everyday media practices are, I argue, turbulently bent and folded. These folds do not align with enduring concepts through which ‘political subjectivity’ is often discussed, such as agency, individual transformation, activism, or through methodologies that try to grasp subjectivities through a focus on individuals’ ‘lived experience.’ The focus on lived experience frequently presupposes subjects that determine their own actions and access, account for, and make meaning of its experience, including a world outside itself. Terms such as individual, agent, social actor, and subject tend to be used interchangeably. However, my use of ‘the subject’ is ontologically different to approaches marked by distinctions between subjects and objects, between insides and outsides, and between an individual and the world around it.

Subjectivity, as conceptualized in this work, espouses thresholds where distinctions between inside/outside are less clear, indeterminate, or even obliterated. This is pertinent because a multitude of factors, entities, and events affect the relationship between subjectivity, knowledge practices, and media activism, in concurrent and incongruous ways. In other

---

7 Lived experiences are typically approached through ethnography (e.g., Bird, 2013; Ellcesor, 2017; Pink, Sumartojo, Lupton, Heyes La Bond, 2017; Postill & Pink, 2012; Richardson & Hjorth, 2017) or phenomenology (e.g., Christensen & Jansson, 2015; Poyntz & Kennelly, 2015), or more frequently simply through ‘interviews’ as a method through which to understand media practices (e.g., Gabriel, 2016; Penney & Dadas, 2014).
words, subjectivity may be better thought of as a constellation or arrangement of different forces and events produced under shifting geological, temporal, and power conditions / forces that have little to do with a specific individual and the enduring concept of ‘its’ agency. Additionally, subjectification as process never stops as these conditions contiguously morph. Distinctions between a subject and the world around it, or an individual and an ‘outside,’ are difficult to uphold under these conditions. Subjectivity may better be thought of as a configuration that describes how various forces and events inflect each other.8

This work offers four different ways of thinking and inquiring about subjectification in relation to ENGOs’ campaigns and claims to education amongst more-than-human pleats. I propose topological folds, evental folds, fractal folds, and intervallic folds. These folds are ways of refolding the relations across the chapters, showing how the research was already folded in multiple ways, and in relation to specific problematizations, which I explain further in the next chapter. I developed these concepts building on Gilles Deleuze’s (1988, 1993) concept of the fold, which proliferates ambiguous thresholds of subjectivity and how subjects are produced.

The fold is a particularly generative concept for thinking beyond inside/outside and subject/object dualisms as folds depict in-betweens, liminalities, and intervals. To fold is to bend and crease, troubling the distinction between an inside and an outside. Its spatial motion defies historical ontological contours of bounded objects and distinctions between nature/culture, abstract/specific, desire/resistance, subject/object, the human/non-human, medium/content, empirical/philosophical, and thinking/doing, and in doing so troubles ontology, epistemology, and methodology along the way. Deleuze (1988) defined subjectivity as a

8 ‘This is not to say that I focused on how an ‘outside’ has an effect on a person’s subjectivity, as might be done in environmental psychology or ‘effects’ research. Rather, I examined how such boundaries are themselves indeterminate. Accordingly, I will often refer to ‘more-than-human’ conceptions of subjectivity, to highlight this collapsed distinction between an ‘inside’ and an ‘outside’ of subjectivity.
process, or event “created by folding” (Deleuze, 1988 p. 104), and also a space that emerges from the curvature of a moving or twisting surface.

Folds inflect, stretch, twist, or pleat. They bring into proximity inexplicable differences that would otherwise not be there and that are often not known or intuited, for example the topologically ontological continuity between geology and subjectivity, which I discuss in Chapter Four. For Deleuze, the fold is a perpetual threshold and process, rather than an essence or actualization of a ‘being.’ Hence, subjectivity might best be described as a continuous process of folding. Deleuze’s fold functions as a spatial—geometric—way to think about the chaotic swarm of forces that arrange a temporary, more-than-human and transient subject and ‘its’ sense of interiority. Rather than assume that ‘a subject’ exists, the fold is a way, a ‘mode of inquiry,’ to understand how subjectivity relates to a world outside of itself, or outside a self by way of folds and folding.

As part of his thinking about, and alongside, folds, Gilles Deleuze (1988) proposed that subjectification occurs through four folds, namely folds of power, knowledge, matter, and ‘the outside’ or anticipations of the future, especially death and extinction. Deleuze (1988) presented these four folds, though certainly there are many more, and they inevitably work in different ways—sometimes in congruence, sometimes in conflict, sometimes both. I detail Deleuze’s (1988) folds in Chapter Two.

Thinking/doing folds produced new concepts and helped explain the conditions within which they emerge. In other words, I treat folding as a mode of inquiry for engaging in concept development, and do not treat ‘the fold’ as a representational concept through which to ‘interpret’ my fieldwork. I do not engage in concept work as ‘repair work’ aimed at resuscitation of humanist subjects. Rather, I engage with concept work to think about breakdowns in education, communication, and representation.
Exploring subjectification as ‘folding’ re/frames subjectivity as processes of difference, multiplicity, thresholds and indeterminacies. In this work, I often refer to ‘subjectification,’ rather ‘the subject,’ because I was interested in subjectivity conceptualized as a process and not a ‘being.’ This focus on subjectification as process rather than a ‘being’ emerges from my earlier interests in process ontology, and particularly the work of Henri Bergson. It is through Bergson, his method of intuition, and the focus on matter and movement, that I first encountered Gilles Deleuze. Bergson was interested in becoming, affect, movement, and emergence, rather than ‘beings’ with ontological boundaries, rationality, and agency. Rosi Braidotti (2006) defines process-ontology as a mode of inquiry that focuses more on “the primacy of relations over substances” (p. 199), on becomings, rather than ‘beings.’ Repositioning the subject as a process-ontology (Braidotti, 2006) focuses on its ever-changing movements, relations, and more generally, on ‘becoming’ rather than ‘being’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). The fold undulates between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside,’ treating each as part of the same indistinguishable surface, and crafting an inflection that emerges as a twist, a pleat, or a momentary intensity—‘a subject’—that is not a ‘being’ but a space formed from an expansive, continuous, and modulating topological fabric of the world.

I hence proceeded to develop concepts that could encompass processes of subjectification as continuously emergent. This reframing, I argue, is significant at a time when we do not yet know what figurations of subjectivity will emerge under changing material, ecological, psychological, and digital conditions, including relations to ways of knowing these ‘environments’ (i.e., in their multiple and shifting definitions as nature, resource, the outside, ecology, Gaia, and threat, etc.). These changing circumstances are affected by the unknown, perhaps never known, challenges of the Anthropocene. However, it is these circumstances and challenges that are intuited, sensed, or anticipated.
These challenges correspond not only to accelerating ecological devastation. They also correspond to concepts and conceptual work, which test the limits of thought and thinking. As such these conceptual contours (Mazzei, 2017) informed my research questions. For instance, (a) how to think about everyday media practices and pleasures of ‘knowing’ oil; (b) how to think with (personal) data proliferation in efforts to ‘grasp’ the chaotic force of oil, which test the limits of thought and thinking; (c) how to relate to ‘knowledge’ and ‘experts’ and the relevance of enduring legacies of environmental politics; (d) how to understand education as productive of thought amidst shifting sensations of time and humankind’s prospects for extinction and death—when education is practiced in a thought-time marked as morose, horrific, and at times accented by jouissance; (e) how to think about environmental media archives, and the melancholia and nostalgia that perpetuates historical environmental activism; and finally, (f) how to think about epistemology and ontology when researching the ambivalences of the Anthropocene as “both agent of destruction and as endangered species” (Coblebrook, 2006, p. 89).

Research Questions and Contributions

While the preceding questions informed my research questions, two primary concerns motivated this dissertation: how subjectification in ecological politics functions through environmental education and media practices (including conflicting claims to knowledge), and how to examine subjectification and its relation to media practices and environmental education. These concerns were inflected by the understanding that subjectification is a process—one that is more-than-human, and broader than something related to individuals’ experiences and ‘their’ stories—perhaps not “even anything to do with a ‘person’” (Deleuze, 1990/1995, pp. 89-99). The methodological focus on how to inquire into the ontology of the subject, when
subjectivity is conceptualized not as a being but as continuous becoming, is therefore inseparable from *how* subjectivity can be *understood* (i.e., subjectification as emergent, multiple, and discordant entanglements of ontology and methodology). My research questions were:

1. *How does subjectification function in environmental movements in relation to (a) media practices, and (b) encounters with, and sensations of, ENGOs’ environmental campaigns as claims to education?*

2. *How does thinking/doing with ‘folds’ and ‘folding’ affect and inflect processes of inquiry into subjectivity and subjectification, particularly in relation to ecological conflicts?*

The interplay of these two questions characterizes a specific texture to this work. The research enacts the tangles between concepts and methods, philosophy and fieldwork, and between subjectivity and the folds that (re) comprise it. In this sense, my research might be understood as a type of ‘fieldwork in philosophy’ (Bourdieu, 1990; Heimans, 2016; Lather, 2014; Mol, 2002; Rabinow, 2003; Rabinow & Rose, 1994; Roy, 2003), which is an examination of modes of thinking in relation to challenges that emerge during fieldwork (which I elaborate in the next chapter). The study contributes to the field of research methodologies through an effort to think with and through folds, not only as a concept, but also how concepts fold modes of inquiry. The study is framed around ideas of concepts, particularly to use ‘concept as method’ (Lenz Taguchi, 2016), Rabinow’s (2003, 2008) ‘concept work,’ and what Deleuze and Guattari (1994) called ‘a pedagogy of the concept.’ In other words, concept as method ceases to treat a concept as a signifier of meaning—one that I and participants
remain exterior to—and, rather, uses it as a verb, that is, to fold. The study contributes to research methodologies by developing a series of folded concepts and diagrams through which to inquiry/think about subjectification in ecological conflicts. These methodological concepts are introduced in the next chapter and explicated throughout the dissertation. This study argues that subjectivity emerges when everyday media and knowledge practices of residents involved in ecological politics encountered environmental campaigns, visual culture, and digital practices in ways that were contradictory, hesitant, and less than symbiotic. I show that such inflections emerge through the challenges of how knowledge, the chaos of geology, force, and time—conditions that continuously change—affect these encounters.

This research also makes a contribution to the fields of a) environmental education and b) environmental communication and media activism. The research contributes to the field of environmental education by examining assumptions and justifications of knowledge practices in environmental movements. I demonstrate how ENGOs conceptualize their work as ‘education’ and the ambiguous ways in which such claims are encountered by residents living in oil conflict areas. I offer a different perspective on ‘transformation’ in the field of adult environmental movement education, which is usually conceptualized as the process of self-work and critical consciousness, suggesting that transformation might be rethought as the capacity of folds to take on new shapes. Finally, I show how ‘thought’ and ‘thinking’ are affected by a multitude of forces outside ‘the self,’ and that ‘not knowing’ animates ideas about what education is or should achieve.

The research contributes to environmental communication scholarship, and particularly environmental media activism, through an empirical study of ENGOs’ campaign strategies in anti-oil pipeline movements and the everyday media practices of residents encountering these campaigns. Informed by the work of Gilles Deleuze, it advances research on the relations
between media practices and production of subjectification in environmental movements. Rather than focus on how media activism affects the production of ‘political subjects’ in/with/through instrumentalist perspectives, I show how media practices are inflected by non-human forces. I develop concepts to examine such inflections without prioritizing accounts of individuals’ lived experiences, and I develop an approach to studying environmental media practices as part of broader relations between subjectification and knowledge, power, temporality, and materiality. The study contributes to a decentred media analysis (Tosoni & Ridell, 2016) that focuses on the affective productions and enactments of subjectivity that emerge relationally between media users/audiences, and campaigners’ and corporate advertisers’ messages. By focusing on anticipations, sensations, speculations, etc. the research also draws attention to the ‘sensed’ and more-than-conscious ways in which environmental communication operates.

**Research Sites**

The fieldwork focused on Enbridge’s Northern Gateway oil pipeline and the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain oil pipeline conflicts in British Columbia, Canada. I examined ENGO campaigns, pro-oil pipeline advertising from the two companies and other pro-oil lobby groups. I spoke with a total of 30 people working and living in the conflict areas. These conversations included six communication directors and/or campaigners working or volunteering for ENGOs, and with 24 residents living in these conflict areas, especially in the terminus areas of these pipelines. One conversation was with a communication strategist at one of the oil pipeline companies. I conducted semi-structured interviews in Northern British Columbia, in the towns and municipalities of Kitimat, Terrace, New Hazelton, and Smithers in the terminus region of the proposed Northern Gateway oil pipeline, and in Southern British Columbia in
the Metro Vancouver Area, where the Trans Mountain oil pipeline proposed for expansion currently ends.

I spoke with people who were aware of, interested in, and concerned about, though not always clearly opposed to the oil pipelines, as it turned out. I inquired into how residents sensed ENGO campaigns and oil advertising, and discuss these as encounters that aim to produce or generate ‘political subjectivities’ through media practices designed as political attempts. I examined their diverse everyday media practices (uses of websites, selfies at protest, donating online, following social media feeds and news, etc.) and how they used these to think through how such practices inflect and are a part of the folds of subjectivity. Conversely, I also inquired into how those responsible for communication at ENGOs (directors of communication, communication strategists, and campaigners) engaged in communication activities, and how they thought about knowledge practices and their own work in relation to education in ecological conflicts.

**Study Approaches**

While this dissertation involved research with participants, it is not empirical in the conventional qualitative sense. It is not concerned with representing research findings in a qualitative paradigm that treats the empirical as laden with meaning to interpret (e.g., themes). Generating and interpreting data and its meaning is only one approach to qualitative research. Instead, my research used participant talk to engage with the limits and problematics of ‘data’ for the purpose of developing concepts related to proliferating understandings of subjectification.

For instance, one problematic area in conventional qualitative studies are the numerous claims that data ‘speak for themselves’ or have some intrinsic value that lie outside or in
relation to some ‘correct’ relationship to theory. My emphasis, however, is that data do not have intrinsic meaning and are never removed from the ideological, cultural, and historical conditions that generate them (St. Pierre, 2011). It is these very conditions that produce (in my case, fold) data that my research is designed to understand.

Moreover, my use of theory is not designed to shape, frame, or interpret data derived from practices of qualitative coding. Research coding attempts to interpret what has already been determined to be meaningful (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014); utilizes representational grammars to generate meaning (MacLure, 2013); and remains contradictorily trapped in the logics and ontologies of logical positivism (Jackson & Mazzei, 2017). In this sense, the work is not framed around inductive logics that traditional qualitative research assumes. Instead, the work might be said to take what Brinkman (2014) refers to as an abductive approach, one “that is concerned with the relationship between a situation and inquiry. It is neither data-driven nor theory-driven, but breakdown-driven,” or in other words, driven by what “occurs in situations of breakdown, surprise, bewilderment, or wonder” (p. 722).

Concept work (Rabinow, 2003; 2008) is consistent with a trajectory of research that focuses on theory development. For instance, Snow, Morrill, and Anderson (2003) argued for an ‘analytic ethnography’ that aims to contribute to theory development through concept refinement and extension. They argue that analytic ethnography differs from ethnographies that are predominantly interested in interpreting and understanding participants’ viewpoints, experiences and worldviews. Instead, analytic ethnography is more broadly reflective of the approach of generalization to theory or theoretical generalizations that Firestone (1993) and Eisenhart (2009) suggest are equally valid approaches to working with qualitative data. Theoretical generalizations do not aim at interpretations nor derive meaning about participants’
experiences. Firestone (1993) noted that generalizing to theory involves “specifying the conditions under which a theory holds” (p. 19).

While I do not specifically engage with generalizations or experiments to ‘test’ theory, I do situate my work within this trajectory of research that recognizes alternative uses and definitions of ‘data’ beyond their representation or interpretation, and which focuses on explaining the conditions—and playing with or probing such conditions—that generate data. For example, in Chapter Two, I define ‘data’ as that which is produced through fieldwork. Methodological conundrums, or ‘breakdowns,’ themselves become ‘data’ to work with and through, and are generative for concept work.

Concept work (Rabinow, 2003; 2008) is productive because it seeks to diagnose how data, including data produced as a result of limits of thought and existing methodologies, are already coded within particular understandings. Concept work identifies how concepts structure practices, and under what conditions alternative understandings can be developed to expand difference by refining and extending data and theory (Colebrook, 2002). For instance, the purpose of problematizing subjectification as a set of external forces produces alternative understandings of subjects and extends possibilities to diagnose the preponderance of scholarship that espouses logics of problem/solution to environmental conflicts and education.

Alternatively, my research is directed towards an ethos of not-knowing, ambivalences, critiques of hope, and the ways events are materially distributed. On the one hand, then, concept work enacts the production of new concepts to engage with what has been neglected, something Snow, Morrill, and Anderson (2003) refer to as analytic neglect. On the other hand, concept work is designed to understand how particular ‘problems’ and ‘solutions’ have “...been gradually assembled, and partially put into practice...” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 12). As such, my purposes in pursuing concept work is to illustrate “the relations, connections,
and disjunctions apparent and available to oneself and to others, that is to say, to make those relations part of the inquiry itself” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 12).

Because I draw on ideas about subjectivity as more-than-human, my conversations with residents were not intended to derive accounts of ‘their’ experiences of activism or ‘their’ agency or subjectification. However, I was interested in the different ways their actions and practices inflected the way subjectification processes were continuously moved and rearranged. The ongoing event of subjectification operated as a collection of forces, rather than bound to an entity. Moreover, as I will demonstrate in more detail in Chapter Two and in the rest of the dissertation, subjectification did not belong to, or represent the journey of a human ‘subject’ or that person’s experience and ‘its’ capacity to ‘know itself’ and express itself through language. I take up a more-than-human understanding of subjectivity, which tries to disrupt the centrality of human agency, and the human as the originator of its thought and action, as a focus of analysis within the Anthropocene.

**Proliferating Folds: Overview of the Chapters**

I have been challenged in organizing this work. Given the multiple storylines and threads that traverse through this research—literatures, theories, and methodology—conventional markers of a dissertation—fold and blend into one another. As I elaborate in the next chapter, Deleuze (1988) suggested that subjectification operates through four folds: 1) knowledge, 2) materiality, 3) force, and 4) anticipation/the outside. I initiated my research by thinking with this architecture and use them loosely to structure Chapters Three through Six. However, as my thinking and doing with ‘the fold’ evolved, this architecture served purely for structure, and is not intended to represent the way Deleuze thought about these four folds. In
other words, ‘the fold’ guides the research and functions to inflect other concepts, but it does not represent the entire theoretical framework.

The chapters unfold in a way that discuss different bifurcations that *the fold* took on, proliferating and transforming how I thought and how others might think with the concept. The aim of this ‘concept work’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994; Rabinow, 2008) was to proliferate difference and create concepts that demonstrate the multiplicity of subjectification. I was particularly attuned to the inflections produced through media practices and more-than-human forces, rather than arrive at any kind of agreement about what ‘subjectivity’ *is*. Except for Chapter Two, which explains my conceptual framework and methods and modes of inquiry, I have decided to arrange the dissertation as a series of folds. The collection of chapters does not engage in perspectivism that might describe ‘subjectivity’ from various angles, but rather, in an attempt at deliberate pluralism. Each chapter, while quite different in some cases, is part of the event of subjectification, and an event in itself. Hence, Chapters Three to Six can be read separately and in any order, despite there being linkages between them, which I note.

I have included a performative aspect to my writing where each chapter unfolds concepts throughout the chapter, rather than states a thesis up front and argues for it in numerous ways. As I noted earlier, readers may also find that subjectification appears to be approached very differently in each chapter, and that is one of the outcomes of what I am calling a textur-ology, borrowing from Deleuze (1993)—that which can be folded in many ways. While the concepts resonate, the goal is that each fold rearranges and provides new concepts for how to think about ontology, education, subjectivity, and media practices in environmental movements.
Borrowing from Paul Rabinow’s (2003) discussion of how to do and represent qualitative research differently, I have drawn on his aesthetics for organizing chapters. For Rabinow (2008), this took the shape of chapters, “as a toolkit of concepts for conducting inquiry into the contemporary world in its actuality” (p. 12). In my dissertation, the four analysis chapters on topologies, events, fractals, and intervals, are presented as four very different approaches to thinking about subjectivity and education in environmental movements (and not as a sequence or as developmental ways to think about subjectivity).

**Chapter Two** outlines my conceptual framework and mode of inquiry as a single chapter. Ontology and epistemology, or, *what* subjectification is all about, and *how* I went about approaching this topic, are inseparable. I begin with an introduction of ‘concept work’ and introduce the research in terms of a pedagogy of the concept (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). I present Deleuze’s (1988, 1993) concept of *le pli* or ‘the fold,’ his quadripartite non-Euclidean architecture for thinking about subjectification, and how I engaged with ‘the fold’ to produce my own concepts to map the ways in which subjectivity was multiple. Deleuze (1993) noted that multiple folds—for example twists, bends, and pleats—might be called ‘texture.’ Chapter Two presents my mode of inquiry as a *fieldwork in texture*—mode of inquiry to think about how concepts and methodology fold and implicate each other.

**Chapter Three** proposes two concepts: *aporetic topologies*, and *un*(knowing) *folds*. I discuss the ambivalent sensations through which environmental campaigns were often encountered through media practices. Decelerations in problem/solution logics position environmental education and corresponding research as responses to the speed of the ecological crises. I note how chronopolitics position environmental campaigns and various media practices in ecological conflicts within topological time, space, movement, and speed. I present a topological analysis as inseparable from an analysis of chronopolitics and a grey ecology
(Virilio, 2009). I discuss the speeds at which scholarship moves towards ‘truth,’ ‘certainty,’ and ‘solutions’ found in instrumentalist research.

**Chapter Four** situates the role of ‘matter’ in subjectification and presents a *geology of the subject*. I discuss material folds of subjectification as ‘events.’ I show how the dark matter of oil is expressed in a polyhedron of intelligibility of media practices (tracking one’s own digital petitions, data production for citizen science, filmmaking, writing letters and blogs, creating online news sites). I discuss these events as ways people try to engage with the chaotic matter of oil. This chapter shows how the chaotic oil-event is expressed in the figure of ‘a subject’ in relation toprehensions and problematizations in thought and thinking.

**Chapter Five** examines subjectification as a state or condition that is acquired, sustained and lost through *fractal faciality enactments*. I discuss these enactments in relation to different image relationships that work in relation to *hypocrisy micropolitics*. I show that the preoccupation with political authenticity amongst campaigners are attempts to constitute real or genuine ‘political subjects.’ These preoccupations, I argue, function as technologies of subjectification and as a mode of education that folds force on the inside.

**Chapter Six** considers how subjectification in environmental movements is produced in relation to folds of time and temporal registers associated with ‘waiting’ and anticipation. This chapter focuses on the types of media and education practices that are taken up while waiting for oil pipeline decisions and protracted anticipations of an ecological apocalypse. I work with Deleuze’s (1969/1990) concepts of the *phantasm* and *sense* to argue that waiting produces *phantasms of the apocalypse* that justify *educational phantasms*, or ideas about what education and communication campaigns might achieve and technologies of occupying time that are used to implement these phantasms.
Chapter Seven closes this work by weaving together the pedagogies and proliferations of the concept that emerged in the process of writing this dissertation, particularly as they relate to fieldwork in textures. The chapter is conceived not necessarily as an end, but as an intermezzo for what thinking with folds might offer for inquiry, environmental education, and environmental communication research.
2. Pedagogy of the Concept: Folding as a Mode of Inquiry

The geometric method (...) is a method of invention that will proceed by intervals and leaps, hiatuses and contractions, somewhat like a dog searching rather than a reasonable man explaining. Perhaps it surpasses all demonstration in as much as it operates in the ‘undecidable.’ (Deleuze, 1993/1997, p. 149)

In this chapter I present my mode of inquiry and conceptual framework together. I explain subjectification and ontology as topics of research and as issues of epistemology within fieldwork. In other words, Chapter Two does the cartographic work to map out where and how I think with concepts and/as methodology in the rest of the dissertation. I first present my approach to concept work, and subsequently introduce Deleuze’s concept of the fold and how I went about thinking with this concept. This chapter also presents my approach to ethics, as taken up through a more-than-human and non-representational approach, and concept work. This chapter is therefore relatively long because I am working with contemporary discussions of methodology that require explication as they differ from traditional qualitative approaches.

Fieldwork in Textures

I have opted to call my mode of inquiry a fieldwork in textures, which might be conceptualized as a specific type of ‘fieldwork in philosophy.’ Fieldwork in textures is a mode of inquiry concerned with events that thinking with ‘folds’ proliferates, including how fieldwork inflects, twists, folds and refolds concepts, and how concepts and fieldwork (e.g., methodological decisions) fold and implicate each other. It is a practice of thinking/doing with folds. My use of the term ‘fieldwork’ builds on how Pierre Bourdieu (1990) used ‘fieldwork in phi-
losophy’ to describe his own work in the 90s, reacting to traditional divergences between sociological methods that did not extend into philosophical concept development, and philosophy that remained distinct from empirical fieldwork, beyond the conventional approach to the ‘application’ of already pre-formulated concepts. Fieldwork in philosophy is an approach to research that considers fieldwork to be a site of philosophical concept development, rather than their recognition, interpretation, or application. In this chapter I spend some time explaining why concept creation is important to my work, and how I proceeded to engage in it.

Fieldwork in philosophy troubles the traditional dualism between the practice of fieldwork and the practice of philosophy, as concept work and fieldwork continuously inflect each other (Heimans, 2016). Fieldwork in philosophy also treats concept development as fieldwork, something Paul Rabinow (2008) called ‘concept work.’ Concept work becomes both a mode and aim of research. As an approach to research, fieldwork in philosophy accentuates how concepts inform the epistemological decisions related to how researchers construct and engage with the objects of their inquiry. Finally, fieldwork in philosophy is also concerned with empirical work focused on practices of thought and thinking, and in the case of my research, with how knowledge practices, such as claims about what can be known, and what is done in the absence of knowledge, are used to attempt to ‘fold’ subjectivity within environmental movements.

In devising a fieldwork in textures as a mode of inquiry, I wanted to utilize the geometry of non-Euclidian folds to engage in the creation of a series of ‘folded concepts’ that are inflected through, and inflect, research. In other words, a fieldwork in textures enacts a type of fieldwork in philosophy that examines how fieldwork and a philosophy of folds inflect and bend—fold—each other. Deleuze (1993) argued that texture indicates style, or the mode through which something is folded into being:
The way a material is folded is what constitutes its *texture*. It is defined less by its heterogenous and really distinct parts than by the style by which they become inseparable by virtue of particular folds. (p. 41, emphasis added)

Deleuze noted that the world comprises a continuous undulating surface that was better analyzed in terms of its capacity to contain multiple and often disharmonious folds, and the relations that show how it was folded together, rather than its fractures, silos, and beings as self-contained ontologies.

I was specifically interested in *how* folds are folded. Beyond the quadripartite architecture of folds that Deleuze (1988) describes, which I explain further in this chapter, Deleuze did not say much about how these folds were folded or the different textures of these folds. I presumed that the folds of subjectification would have different textures (be folded tightly, closer or further together, or in different arrangements, etc.), under different conditions. My fieldwork in textures is concerned with subtle inflections, and the strange temporal and spatial directionalities which stretch, or become intense or recursive. I proceeded to experiment in thinking with ‘folds,’ and how folding can re-orient how to think and inquire about subjectification as something multiple (i.e., continuously refolded).

Borrowing from Rabinow (2003), my fieldwork in textures used folds as a mode of thinking/doing in ways that did not produce coherence (or, for example, themes). In fact, my methodological approach sought difference, discordancy, contradictions, and indeterminacies. I refolded ‘subjectification’ across this work in relation to methodological conundrums, without seeking out coherence of what this concept ‘means.’ In other words, this approach did not attempt to develop concepts to represent ‘the subject’ or ‘findings’ resulting from fieldwork (as might be expected of grounded theory), but to develop concepts to elucidate how something can be concurrently folded in multiple ways, through conundrums that emerge during fieldwork. The ambiguities of the Anthropocene demand more concepts that
stay open to the ability of subjectivity to remain, as Deleuze notes in the quotation that begins this chapter: ‘undecidable.’

**A Pedagogy of Concepts**

My approach to developing a series of folded concepts used what Deleuze and Guattari (1994) call a “pedagogy of the concept” (p. 12). They argued that the key task of a ‘pedagogy of the concept’ is to “analyze the conditions of creation as factors of always singular moments” (p. 12). A pedagogy of the concept develops concepts and does not posit concepts and witness their e/affects. It does not try to recognize how ‘data’ resembles concepts nor demonstrates how they emerge precisely out of difficulties in research that challenge ontology and epistemology. These challenges usually result from “badly posed” problems (Ibid, p. 16) that concepts force us to think through.

Gane (2009) argued that for Deleuze and Guattari concepts emerge from the events of research and the “intensities that condense around problems empirical data pose to the apparent certainties of thought” (p. 87). A pedagogy of a concept relates directly to darker hues of uncertainty engendered in dark ecology by staying with and doing concept work in the muddled situation emerging from limits to thought and thinking. Concepts do not function as ‘solutions.’ Rather, they are propositions for thought that are introduced into, and emerge out of, the object/field of study. Concepts reside alongside other concepts, theories, works, and empiricisms/ontologies that were laid out as part of the ‘canvas’—something which Deleuze and Guattari (1994) call the ‘plane of immanence’—with which the philosopher/researcher creates.
I develop and explain the conditions of my concepts to avoid ontological reduction of the object of research (i.e., subjectification) to pre-formulated concepts. The aim was to develop many different ways to think about subjectification as a multiplicity, or as folded in multiple ways. Additionally, the research devised concepts to remain open to the yet unmapped aspects of the object of research—what Deleuze and Guattari might call the ‘virtual’ aspect of the object of concern—its capacity to be many things. The concept’s pedagogy challenged me to develop additional concepts to engage with the way in which the folds of subjectification were already in themselves multiple, as encountered through fieldwork. Additionally, the pragmatics of fieldwork, including the bottlenecks of working with subjectification as a process, also invited ‘the fold’ to proliferate. In other words, ‘the fold’ and ‘to fold’ functioned as subject and object, noun and verb, or as a focus of the study as well as a mode of thinking/doing.

A ‘pedagogy of the concept’ works like an ‘ontogenetic’ device (de Freitas & Sinclair, 2014, p. 53) because its process comprises “changing the nature of the objects involved” (p. 223). In other words, conceptual development meant that the study would often shift, take on a new texture, and was produced anew. For me, this shift consisted of no longer being primarily focusing on ‘finding out’ how subjectivity functioned, was produced, was represented through media practices and public pedagogies, or was enacted by people living in oil pipeline conflict regions. The pedagogy of the concept focused my thinking on how ‘the fold’ produced concepts for thinking about subjectivity in environmental movement education and environmental communication.

These shifts consisted of unfolding the predominant concept of ‘political subjectification’ and its preoccupations with teleological orientation aimed at activism, transformational
learning, the ‘effects’ of critical and public pedagogy and communication practices, and discourses of self-actualization and agency. Additionally, refolding subjectivity produced multiple concepts and often produced conflicts and tensions. Reformulated concepts of subjectivity functioned as potential sites of new micropolitics; challenges to representation and ‘voice’; and as thresholds and indeterminacies between insides/outsides, data/theory, object/subject, and nature/culture.

The fabulative aspect within a pedagogy of the concept required constructing concepts that stay open to empirical experimentation, rather than as representational theories (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). There was always a risk that a new concept might not ‘work.’ However, that was not the objective, as long as it offered something that can produce an encounter to proliferating thoughts about subjectification. The following chapters therefore do not claim to ‘know’ or answer questions about subjectification in environmental movements and the role of education and communication. Rather, they do offer a few concepts for how one might think or go about thinking about subjectivity in relation to ecology, media, and education and political activities during the Anthropocene.

**In the Pleats of a Folded Ontology**

That’s what subjectification is about: bringing a curve into the line. (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 113)

Foucault’s (1984/1985) genealogical investigations in his *The Use of Pleasure* examined the Greek’s concern over the body as ethical substance, its modes of subjectification, as well as a concern for the function of knowledge in subjectification. Foucault developed the idea of the ‘double’ that accounted for how subjectification bent back on itself in different configurations of knowledge. Deleuze’s (1988) book *Foucault* extended Michel Foucault’s concern
with these doubles or ‘folds’ enacted by the Greeks in relation to self-governance and sexuality. Deleuze (1988) sought to diagram ‘folding’ more generally in relation to how materiality, force, knowledge, and anticipation fold subjects differently, at different times and in different spaces. Deleuze’s non-Euclidean geometric imagination presents a compelling concept of ‘the fold’ through which to think about political subjectivity not as a property of ip-seity, but a process of curving lines.

To fold is the subjunctive state of ‘the subject,’ constituting its ontology as an event-like, continuous and morphing multifold (or manifold). Here, the subject continuously emerges from within this wave-like expansion and intensification of forces that constantly rearrange it through changes in space, time and speed. As will become evident in this study, subjectivity continuously emerges in relation to the expansions and contractions of how ‘knowledge’ and ‘education’ collapse space and reduce speed at which they tend when ‘knowing’ and finding ‘solutions.’ Subjectivity therefore strays from traditional markers of a representational ontology, defined through discourse of identity, agency, intentionality, and, actualization. These constitute a subject of a Euclidean geometry as a specific person or individual whose ‘own’ determinations designate their relation to themselves and others (learner, adult, environmentalist, audience, member of the public, reader, user) within demarcated spaces of environmental education and communication discourse. Instead, Deleuze (1993) argues for pre-personal intensities and forces that fold to produce singularization, and which are separate from speaking/seeing beings and ‘their’ intentionality (Conley, 2011).

Deleuze (1998) presented four folds of subjectivity: namely materiality, force, knowledge, and anticipation. I introduce Deleuze’s (1988) four folds here, as they become entry-points into my fieldwork in textures. I explain each fold in more detail in subsequent
chapters, and in relation to a pedagogy of the concept that proliferates them in new directions, some quite different from each other and from the original posited by Deleuze (1988). Nevertheless, these four folds demand a turn away from ideas that subjectivity might emerge through external causality, such as from a particular campaigns and ‘representation work,’ or from internal causality, such as ‘inner work’ or ‘moral work’ associated with environmental movement education described in Chapter One. Merging binary notions of inside/outside, the four folds produce texture, complexity, and thresholds.

**Fold of knowledge**

The first fold identified by Deleuze (1988) is the fold of knowledge, which concerns itself with “truth in so far as it constitutes the relation of truth to our being” (p. 104). The fold of knowledge deals with how discourses about knowledge, knowledge practices, assumptions about what is knowable, and claims about what constitutes ‘knowing’ fold, are folded and unfolded, or implied in subjectification. The fold of knowledge includes the different intentions that are folded into knowledge practices, as well as the way in which different knowledge practices function ‘in tension’ or become intense, stressful, or swarming. I treat the twisting, stretching, and pleating of knowledge, particularly in environmental debates as a topological space, working with the ‘contours’ of ‘the fold’ in the next chapter.

The pedagogy of ‘the fold’ that I advance in Chapter Three emerges from my conundrums about how to think about concurrent, divergent, and ambivalent conceptions of knowledge. Campaigns and various attempts to engage people in media practices (i.e., to know more about the oil-pipeline issues, to learn to become politically involved, etc.) were encountered as simultaneously desired and resisted, future-oriented and mnemonic, solution-
oriented and chaotic. The idea that knowledge was pliable, divergent, recursive, and chronologically arranged (i.e., future-oriented) became important as this study progressed. As I grappled with the multiple and diverging tendencies in my fieldwork, the pliability of ecological and environmental knowledge required new analytic concepts. For instance, the idea that subjects’ ontological relations to knowledge were folded topologically, rather than in terms of what knowledge leads to critical consciousness, produced disjunctures between epistemological certainty and uncertainty.

Fold of matter

“Plastic forces of matter” (p. 12) constitute the second fold in Deleuze’s (1988) architecture of subjectification. The second fold conjures new ways of thinking ‘matter’ with profound implications for the ontological boundaries between expressions of/as/in subjectification and materiality in the Anthropocene. By highlighting material folds, Deleuze (1993) presents a vision of a material and empirical world consisting of elastic pliability and machinic plastic forces of matter working in piston-like continuum: folding, unfolding, refolding. Deleuze (1988) argues that this second fold is related to subjectification as it “concerns the material part of ourselves which is to be surrounded and enfolded” (p. 104).

I focus on material folds in Chapter Four by thinking about them in terms of events (Deleuze, 1993). Thinking about oil and subjectification as a material event, I show how the large and overarching chaotic oil-event (e.g., including fossilization, urbanization, climate change, petroculture, sustainability practices, animal extinction, peak oil, etc.), and its various expression in subjectification as taken up through media practices that try to make sense of this chaos, are part of the same event and the same material ontology. In other words, material folds highlight ontological fluidity between the materiality of oil as a fabric of the
world, and its various expressions in subjectification as taken up through media practices that try to make sense of this chaos. Material folds bend and twist matter as it becomes intense in a ‘subject’ and its expression through media practices, particularly as attempts to be enunciated as a subject in light of the chaotic character of the world.

**Fold of force**

The third fold is “the fold of relation between forces” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 104), or as Deleuze (1990/1995) puts differently, “the folding of a force impinging on itself rather than other forces” (p. 112). Force doubles on itself (Malins, 2004), or starts to affect itself, in relation to other forces arranging or attempting to fold or enunciate a subject. This fold accounts for conceptions of force that twist, fold, or ‘double,’ producing a space that attains a sensation of ‘self.’ The subject/self does not emanate from an agentic being, but rather, from arrangements of force, especially ones that are ‘machinic,’ which are focused on the production of ‘subjects’ by accelerating and cutting off affective investments.

In Chapter Five, I discuss the arrangements of forces—folded and doubled, fractal and machinic—by examining how ENGOs try to enact an ‘authentic’ environmentalism and ‘political subjectivity’ in relation to how they are folded or characterized as complicit and hypocritical. This ‘hypocrisy micropolitics’ is illustrated through various enactments of activism selfies and different negotiations during media engagements. I show how such folds ‘double’ yet again, when people living in oil-pipeline areas fold ‘authenticity’ as a relation they should attain with themselves based on their encounters with such ENGO’s practices. I discuss the continuously shifting ‘authentic subject’ that is a product of tightening folds that operate in a fractal-like pattern.
Fold of ‘the outside,’ death, and expectation

Finally, Deleuze (1988) believed that the way in which the subject “hopes for immortality, eternity, salvation, freedom or death” constitutes the fourth fold. The fourth fold is the “fold of the outside itself” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 104) and examines the “interiority of expectations” that accounts for different and competing conceptions about the limits of existence, the apocalypse, and death and extinction. I illustrated this in my work in the encounters people have with continuously circulated sensations of the impending and anticipating environmental apocalypse.

The contours and pedagogy of ‘the fold’ take me to develop the concept of educational phantasms which I propose are educational programs of ‘occupied time,’ and which produce an intervallic space of silence, waiting, hope, and uncertainty. I suggest that ‘waiting’ compels environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs) and environmental activists to engage in media campaigns and rationalize educational activities that ask people to ‘occupy themselves’ through various technologies and media practices of occupying time. I show how ENGOs’ communication directors and campaigners think about the need to engage with their audiences and in turn, how people resist such ongoing busywork.

Pedagogy of the Concept: Diagramming Four Entangled Folds

Deleuze’s (1988, 1993) vitalist philosophy reverberates in ‘the fold’ as a productive and ontogenetic force that would often change the nature of the particular concepts that I would initially encounter into something very different. My use of the fold proliferated and expanded the initial four-fold architecture, much like how qualitative studies develop in situ. Deleuze (1993) argued that ‘the subject’ was always multiple and that “the multiple is not only what
has many parts but also what is folded in many ways” (p. 3). The fold speaks to the manifold, a concurrent bifurcating multiplicity of subjectification, which gives way to frequent states of intensities (as opposed to intentions) of forces working on its production, aporias and indeterminacy, and problematics in representation.

Graphically, the fold conjured for me an image of what aesthetic and art theorist Claudia Blümle (2016) described as a contrast between clearly delineated figures with closed lines, and “formless fields of colour, the tangents, curves, hyperbolae and undulating lines” (p. 77). Deleuze (1988) would write similarly: “the outside is not a fixed limit, but a moving matter animated by peristaltic movements, folds and foldings that together make up an inside: they are not something other than the outside, but precisely the inside of the outside” (p. 97). Folding can hence be understood to double the world ‘inside’ so as to produce ‘a subject’—pleating a surface into an intensity as though gathering a fabric into a fan or a paper into a crumpled ball, or in turn unfolding and refolding it through stretching, bending, and redoubling.

Foucault (1997) and Deleuze (1993) also showed how we might think about a subject as ‘an event’ which cannot be summarized or reduced to a single cause or representation. As I contemplated how to approach specific decisions in research, such as how to think about the ontological implications of speaking to ‘participants,’ or the material force of oil, ‘the fold,’ as concept, began to multiply in relation to conundrums in fieldwork. The fold stood out as an aptly intriguing mode to think concurrent desire for and a crisis of representation and knowledge, and thresholds, especially subjectification at the thresholds of the post/Anthropocene and human/non-human matters that complicate the boundaries of subjects’ ontology (Ulmer, 2017). Thinking with ‘the fold’ a) enacted a mode of research that emphasized dif-
ference and multiplicity (i.e., folds-yet-to come), and b) became a way of showing how subjectification was folded in multiple and proliferating ways. By following the contours of Deleuze’s (1988) four folds, I produced a pedagogy of a concept that resulted in the production of new concepts of subjectivity, where folds proliferated and become a) topological, b) evental, c) fractal, and d) intervallic. Figure 1 depicts how subjectification became folded in this research, and diagrams the folded modes of research, or processes of thinking, in this study.

Figure 1: Diagramming Texture: More-than-human Folds of Subjectification

My pedagogy of the concept included sketching and diagramming (which I elaborate on more in the next chapter) as a form of non-representational experimentation to think with/through folds and folding, including:

(a) topological folds, which are elastic and capable of being folded in multiple ways without
breaking or rupturing;

(b) evental folds, which are much more chaotic, difficult to present, as they are non-reductive events, characterized by a multiplicity of various expressions – shown in Figure 1 as undulating through the sub/terranean;

(c) fractal folds, which are much more systematic and mechanic, with striated and often repeating folds, here depicting a folded visage, and finally;

(d) intervallic folds, which emerged as a kind of spacing from temporal folds – an intense space filled with memory and anticipations of the future.

Respectively, the ontogenesis of these concepts and diagrams could have only emerged by doing/thinking with folds within the pragmatics of research in relation to environmental issues in these particular sites, times, and people, and in relation to: a) the immanent questions of and knowledge ‘solutions,’ and the limits of knowing in lieu of ‘running out of time’; b) prehensions of chaos and challenges to thought and thinking in relation to the e/affects that oil has; c) the enactments of environmentalism in light of moribound politics; and, d) senses of time and horror produced in ecological apocalypse.

**Methodology: Folding Encounters, Practices, and Theory/Data**

Rather than starting with methodology, my mode of research, as illustrated in this chapter, starts with thinking with theory as an analytic practice (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, 2013), thinking with the contours of the concept—the fold—to see where it would take me (Mazzei, 2017), and using concept as method (Lenz Taguchi, 2016). Elizabeth St. Pierre (1997) also thought with folds. She used ‘folds’ to trouble the thresholds of data/philosophy, by questioning ‘received’ ideas of data and folding research creation into that which constitutes ‘data.’ Likewise, my inquiry followed the contours of the various folds and presented the
twists, bends, knots, etc. in ways that I determined expanded on Deleuze’s ideas of the fold, often in ways that lie outside of his quadripartite formulation.\(^9\)

Thinking about subjectification as folds and folding, impacted my approach to inquiry from the very beginning. I de-centered the subject, refusing to privilege speech and the language of a human voice as representative of subjectivity, and likewise did not examine representations of ‘political subjects’ (in news stories, posters, rhetorical strategies) in decisions about how to approach this study. I conceptualized the subject as an influx or collectivity of conceptual/theoretical/fieldwork/empirical inputs animating the folds that shaped the concepts created in this research. I studied the movements of the concepts I used and developed in relation to fieldwork. I mapped and experimented with what Deleuze and Guattari (1994) called the “many infinite movements caught within each other, each folded in the others, so that the return of one instantaneously relaunches another in such a way that the plane of immanence is ceaselessly being woven” (p. 38). Fieldwork in philosophy is a fractal, or rather temporally intense process.

Subjectification in this research was shaped and re-shaped through encounters of numerous ‘partial’ elements\(^10\): human expressions, material and temporal forces, media texts, media practices, as well as books, hesitations, conundrums of fieldwork, and concepts. I was interested in what media texts and practices do and how they are productive of folds—twists,

\(^9\) Gayatri Spivak, (1974) described the strikethrough, used by Martin Heidegger, and subsequently by Jacques Derrida as *sous rature*, or writing “under erasure” (p. xiv), and a way to acknowledge the concurrent necessity and inadequacy of a word. The strikethrough, perhaps a very simple textual strategy, is nonetheless an invitation for readers to suspend assumptions about the meaning of the word (Burman & MacLure, 2005; Halsey, 2005; Koro-Ljungberg, 2016).

\(^10\) My use of the term ‘partial’ is informed by Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) “partial objects” (p. 5). However, I cannot engage with the full scope of the concept in this dissertation, which was significant and elaborate in their work. In short, partial objects are fragments. They are a way to conceptualize a distributed ontology that works through flows of desire and the way that desire is cut off by how these objects come together and affect one another. Partial objects refer to the absence of a synthesized totality. In my work, partial data (e.g., voice, texts, photographs etc.) are ‘raw’ elements used in enactments and productions of subjectivity.
bends, knots—because of encounters between them, and not what they represent or what effects they have. I was also interested in what residents say and do *does*—how do these artifacts, statements, and practices function as forces that fold or are used to enact subjectivity, rather than as representations.

These encounters were not necessarily direct, but sensed—anticipated, speculated upon, prehended (as opposed to comprehended). Examining how partial elements inflect one another echoes, and not always in direct ways, echoes what Tosoni and Ridell (2016) have called a kind of de-centred communication and media research approach. I did not examine subjectivity by focusing on representations in, or uses of, a specific medium or media platform (e.g., news, blogs, film), specific content (i.e., a specific campaign or image) or with defined media users/producer groups (newsreaders, activists). I focused on the folds produced in encounters that troubled the ontology between the elements, conventionally known as ‘data’ in qualitative research, which I describe in just a moment (e.g., interviews, advertising, ENGOs’ campaigns, residents’ media practices). I began thinking about the *encounters between them* as ‘data,’ rather than on thinking about them as discrete ‘sources of data.’ St. Pierre, Jackson, and Mazzei (2016) noted that “data are no longer discrete bits of information but are continuous, unfolding, and repetition-with-a-difference, thus exchanging units for topological folds in the monadology” (p. 108).11 ‘Data’ are therefore ‘different’ each time depending on how the seemingly separate elements are folded, inflected, or arranged in a composition.

11 Here St. Pierre, Jackson, and Mazzei refer to data as folds in a ‘monadology’, a term developed by Gottfried Leibniz as well as Gabriel Tarde, to indicate that ‘data’ are not units but emerge in relation to folding and stretching (e.g., through fieldwork, theory, etc.).
This approach to analyzing ENGOs’ claims to education and media practices moves beyond the instrumentalist telos to study the practices that could yield ‘effects’ through representations, which readily preoccupies environmental communication research.\textsuperscript{12} My research examines the ever-shifting terrains of ontological formations by examining media practices themselves, and particularly the \textit{affects} they produce, that is, how they inflect, bend, pleat, or fold time, space, and matter to create intensifications of subjectification. This move from effects to affects attunes to the immanent and material practices of communication. Conley and Dickinson (2010) for example, also noted the importance of moving from textual to \textit{textural} analysis of political communication. For instance, they proposed that “a textural approach to critical-communication studies... is less concerned with what is pre-made and given than with what is constantly in the making and therefore up for grabs” (p. 5). They argue for textural analysis that focuses on the “raw spatio-material particularities” (p. 4) and acutely ones attuned to the relations between texts, temporalities, space, and materiality of media practices:

Texturality insists on the depth and specificity and interrelationality of our spatially mediated politics. It replaces the glossiness of the public screen with the granularity of historical practices and their rippling effects. To confront the materiality of mediation is to texturalize the distinctions between this set of practices and those points of relay, between this cluster of expressions and that set of formations, and between this sequence of representations and that field of movements. (p. 4)

Here, Conley and Dickinson (2010) argue for shifting away from images and the screens of ‘image events’ to focus on an analysis of in-between-ness of discrete practices and media

\textsuperscript{12} Studies that examine how people encounter or experience environmental communication and education have focused on the ebbs and flows of awareness about major issues such as climate change by drawing predominantly on public opinion polls (Brulle, Carmichael & Jenkins, 2012; Maibach, Roser-Renouf & Leiserowitz, 2009; Scruggs & Benegal, 2012), formations of public opinion (Carmichael & Brulle, 2017), studying texts produced by users online: for example in the form of news comments (Cooper, Green, Burningham et. al, 2012; Koteyko, Jaspal & Nerlich, 2013), or interactions with ENGOs through social media (e.g., Greenpeace’s posts on Weibo) (Ji, Harlow, Cui & Wang, 2018) to understand how participation and discourse affects engagements with ecological/science communication and potentially behavioural change.
texts and their contexts of use and production, approaches also espoused in what Tosoni and Ridell (2016) called a de-centering of media studies.

Hence another element of my texturology focused on mapping the workings of folds and mapping the multiplicity of folds which emerged from inflections between expressions, practices, representations, and particularly with other forces, such as space, time, and matter. Next, I discuss the texts, people, and organizations in the study, and discuss the superficial division separating ‘sources of data.’

**Organizations and artifacts: ENGO campaigns and oil pipeline advertising**

Throughout the subsequent chapters, I engage with and refer to anti-oil pipeline campaigns from six ENGOs that had a presence in British Columbia’s oil pipeline conflict. I have kept the identity of the organizations confidential when referring to them in my analysis. A full list of the organizations I contacted, however, is included in Appendix B. I examined numerous ‘partial’ elements produced by these groups: email campaigns, posters, websites, social media feeds and posts, online documentary films, flyers. I considered these in the context of ENGOs’ media practices, and particularly as outputs of their intentions and attempts to define, engage, educate, and produce ‘political subjects.’ Subsequently, my research examined how such (attempts at) constructions of ‘political subjects’ factor into, are sensed, and encountered through the immanent practices of subjectification in environmental movements.

Alongside ENGOs’ campaigns, I examined advertising campaigns produced by Kinder Morgan and Enbridge that ran on social media, television and in print between 2012 and 2016, but only when these were encountered or sensed by people I was speaking with,
and in relation to subjectification. These included Kinder Morgan’s campaign from 2014 that featured local employees, and Enbridge’s *A Path to Prosperity* (2012), *Open to Better* (2013), and *Life Takes Energy* (2014) advertising campaigns. I could not separate the swarming of oil pipeline ads, posters, news stories, as well as ENGOs’ campaign materials and email blasts. I examined how these practices affected folds of knowledge, force, matter, and ‘the outside’ in the production of subjectification, and not how they represented ‘political subjects.’

**Partial elements: Participants subjectivities**

I spoke with a total of 30 residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas in British Columbia. I travelled to Northern British Columbia, and particularly Kitimat, Smithers, New Hazelton, and Terrace, where I spoke with 13 residents, as a part of this fieldwork. I also met with and interviewed 17 individuals in the Vancouver Metro Area. Six of the 30 conversations were with individuals responsible for communication activities at ENGOs. This included communication directors and campaigners. Three ENGOs were influential organizations with multiple concurrent environmental campaigns in British Columbia (focused on multiple other issues than oil pipelines). One of these ENGOs is an international organization of which British Columbia is only one chapter in a larger international network. I also spoke with one senior communication strategist employed by one of oil pipeline companies.

---

13 I did not engage in content analysis for the sake of content analysis. The unstated correlation between representation and ‘political subjectification’ reverberates in the prioritization of research on content and ‘texts’ (news, political and/or scientific discourse, film, advertising, social media content) rather than other aspects (e.g., media practices and encounters with texts, the non-representational aspects of media) and forces of subjectification. This correlation can be seen through a persistent focus on content analysis (see for example Dotson, Jacobson, Kaid, & Carlton, 2012; Howard-Williams, 2011; Liang, Henderson & Kee, 2018; Meisner & Takahashi, 2013; Wagner, 2008; Young & Dugas, 2011), discursive analysis (see for example Gunster, 2011; Gunster, Fleet, Patterson & Saurette, 2018; Szeman, 2012) and critical image analysis (see for example Peeples, 2011) of environmental media texts which prevail in this field of research.
I put my conversations with these ENGOs and residents in BC into productive encounters with diagrams, ENGOs’ social media feeds, art, and campaigns. These conversations were but one element of my fieldwork and do not constitute the sole source of what is commonly referred to as ‘data.’ I have included the questions I developed at the beginning of the study in Appendix F and G. Appendix F shows the questions I developed to guide conversations with ENGOs, while Appendix G shows questions I used to guide conversations with residents living in the oil pipeline areas. These may conventionally be called ‘semi-structured interview guides’ that are used to orient the conversations, while acknowledging that these interviews frequently developed different and unexpected directions.

Thinking with theory: ‘Data’ and ‘data analysis’ in concept work

It is however important to note that while my work includes ‘interview data,’ it is not an ‘interview-based study.’ That is, it was not a primary objective of the study to interpret what participants meant. While “interview methods in interpretive qualitative inquiry oblige researchers to ‘center’ the subject” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, p. 262), “interviewing in posthumanist research requires a disruption of the centering compulsion of traditional qualitative research” (Mazzei, 2013, p. 738). Rather than centering interview data as that ‘source’ around which research is organized within relations of representation and interpretation, Mazzei (2013) argued that qualitative researchers ought to “think of research as the machine that is a hub of connections and productions with interviewing being just one of those connections” (p. 739). In other words, I spoke to people, but not for the purpose of deriving meaningful answers about ‘their’ experiences of ‘their’ subjectification. Rather, ‘data’ generated through interviews served as a launching point into theoretical exploration. I am cognizant that I use interviews in a different way that might be found in conventional humanist
qualitative research. My use of interviews is also informed by St. Pierre and Jackson (2014) who note that interview data cannot be expected to sufficiently serve all the conceptual needs of a study:

in conventional humanist qualitative research, words in interview transcripts and in field notes are considered primary data, collected as they are in ‘face-to-face’ encounters in the presence of participants in their natural settings. Again, words spoken by participants are privileged regardless of their adequacy to respond to the study’s substantive and theoretical demands. (p. 716)

Interview data and the data generated in the presence of participants is not sufficient when considering subjectivity as something that is spread out across folds. Mazzei (2013) argued that “from a posthumanist stance, interview data, the voices of participants, cannot be thought as emanating from an essentialist subject nor can they be separated from the enactment in which they are produced, an enactment among researcher-data-participants-theory-analysis” (p. 732). Jackson and Mazzei (2012) also argue that rather than treating the interview as a ‘failed method’ in more-than-human, post-representational analysis, interviews can still become an opportunity to question received practices and “work the limits (and limitations) of such practices” (p. ix). The idea of ‘received practices,’ then, ushers important distinctions about how I conceived of ethics when interviewing participants. I discuss ‘posthuman’ ethics on pages 55-61.

My research therefore moves past positivist, humanistic, deterministic and developmental approaches to subjectivity, evident in qualitative research that utilize ideas like ‘voice’ or other phenomenological constructions that maintain the appearance of an ‘inside’ of a humanist subject (St. Pierre, 2008) and as something ontologically distinct from other entities (e.g., non-human forces or temporal forces). Conversation excerpts are not ‘data’ or ‘accounts’ of political subjects that reveal or help to ‘know’ with any certainty anything
about subjectivity. In my work, these conversations became expressions of forces through which to think about processes of subjectification alongside theory.

I treated what participants said as one force amongst numerous human and more-than-human forces that produce folds in a multitude of encounters. In his fieldwork in philosophy, Roy (2003) referred to the relationship between the empirical and conceptual as “expressional flashes” (p. 2) that can occur between the two, rather than as using one to interpret the other, or as a representation of the other. Likewise, my study, included interviewing human participants as expressional flashes; as one way to understand their relation to a specific ecological conflict, and related to a distinct geographic location and unique eco-political situation. The study is not however, as Roy (2003) articulates, “wholly or even largely empirical” (p. 1). This type of work puts the empirical to work for conceptual reasons which emerge out of empirical conditions, or as Roy (2003) puts it, an effort that “makes philosophy go to work for us amid the turmoil of the everyday” (p. 2). This ‘going to work’ is not necessarily about the ability to affect ecological change directly nor to understand how participants’ lived experiences related to or interacted with different forces and folds.

‘Data’ are determined by one’s conceptual approach, and in this study ‘data’ are those which are constructed, or which appears (St. Pierre, 2013) as useful to the pedagogy of the concept—those moments when concepts, empirical work, theory, thought, and practices inflect one another, particularly in moments of conundrums related to how to proceed in doing fieldwork as it informs, and is informed by, concept work. While I conducted what might be considered ‘interviews,’ I depart from the usual trope of ‘participant’ which denotes a bounded, human subject that becomes positioned as an ‘object’ of research and its informant, and particularly one that gives an account of itself. From the beginning of the study, I was
adamant not to conflate the ‘interview’ with an ‘account’ of subjectivity, as my research focused on processes of subjectification as a confluence of folds, rather than a ‘being.’ My design does not privilege people’s ‘voice’ as ‘data’ that accounts for how ‘they’ became political or what political subjectivity is. In other words, I did not focus on participants as subjects, or how they experience ‘their’ subjection or ‘their’ becomings as subjects. Rather, I treated what participants said as one force amongst numerous human and more-than-human forces that produce folds in a multitude of encounters.

Education research has traditionally focused on how subjection is experienced, and hence appropriately focused on the lived experiences of participants and their ability to give an account of how they take up, refuse, and experience subjectification or subjection. For instance, Rasmussen (2006) focused on young people’s subjectivities, and especially on how young people understand their subjection in relation to ideas about LGBTQI sexualities in secondary schools. Drawing on the work of Foucault, Rasmussen (2006) examined how young “people are categorized, produced, and constrained by processes of subjectivization and identification, scientific classification, and dividing practices” (pp. 57-58), and how experiences of such processes were lived out by youth. A focus on youth’s experiences of subjectivity formation can also be found in Hickey-Moody’s (2013) work. Hickey-Moody draws attention to youth’s subjectivity formation through dance classes and other informal arts-based pedagogy. Her work focused on the connection between “learning and becoming a subject” (p. 2), particularly as art is often positioned as a form of redemption for at-risk subjects. She examined how young people take up and desire prescribed kinds of subjectivity in how art is taught, as well as their resistance through art, to some forms of subjection.
Hickey-Moody’s project draws on theories of subjectivity to examine young people’s experiences of art and ‘their’ subjectivity in relation to that produced through mediated moral panics.

The focus on ‘experience’ is however not the only way to do empirical work that includes humans. St. Pierre’s (2004) work with older women in southern US incorporated interviews yet focused on non-personal individuations that emerged in relation to problems of time and space. For St. Pierre (2004) non-personal individuations belong to no one in particular, and contain within them folds, durations, lines, intensities, and the non-human. This approach to working with non-personal individuations is a departure from conventional uses of empiricism, namely that “existence (existence independent of thought) must be derived from and justified by sense-based observations of experience” (St. Pierre, 2016 p. 113). Instead, St. Pierre (2016) argued for a ‘new empiricism’ based on experimentalism where “the focus shifts from identifying the characteristics of the thing (what is this?) to its genetic conditions (how is this possible?)” (p. 119). St. Pierre (2014, 2016) highlights that experience is not confined to an individual’s sensory or phenomenological engagement with an event, but rather another way to examine external relations of subjectivity.

Webb and Gulson (2013) similarly moved beyond individuals’ experiences by using ‘folds’ to discuss how education policy is used to fold ‘policy subjects.’ They discuss how subjects of policy, teachers, are positioned in relation to being “effective,” “accountable,” “knowledgeable” (p. 57). They maintained a focus on mapping how “educational policy is frequently engaged with folding subjects along numerous affective lines, if not twisting them into knots” (p. 57). While teachers’ experiences informed their research, the study predominantly focused on mapping folds, and the sorts of conditions that necessitate examining such
folds. For Webb and Gulson, ‘the fold’ was a way to examine how policy subjects are produced across different policy spaces (‘the self,’ policy content, technologies of governance, indeterminate purposes) that fold onto themselves in ways that are emergent, and not always related to policy intentions or objectives.

My intention here is to highlight at least two distinct approaches to including human participants as part of education research on subjectivity. The first centres on participants’ voices to develop an understanding of their experiences of subjectification and subjection, sometimes in relation to examining those forces of subjection and how they operate. The second examines human voice in order to map external relations of subjectivity, as well as some of the problematics of mapping ‘the subject’ across shifting external forces (e.g., time and space, but also technologies of governance, ideas of ‘the self’). This second approach is informed by Deleuze’s extensions of Foucault’s thoughts on subjectivity, especially Foucault’s ideas of ‘the double.’ Deleuze understood lived experience as something that is already laden with various externalities outside itself. Building on this second approach, I think with Mazzei (2010, 2013, 2016), who argued that voice is always a result of collective ontologies produced through flows of forces, enactments, and assemblages, rather than the closed ontologies of ‘bodies’ and autonomous subjects.

I also heeded Foucault’s (1985/1994) critique of phenomenological perspectives in which “‘lived experience’ [is expected] to supply the originary meaning of every act of knowledge” (Foucault, 1985/1994, p. 14). Whenever I do include excerpts from participants’ talk, I do so as statements that operate in relation to other forces of subjectification, not as phenomenological accounts of experience in which the individual becomes the interpreter and representative of ‘its’ actions and beliefs. Nigel Thrift (2008) proposed non-representa-
tional as a conceptual and methodological orientation that moves beyond the study of ‘experience’ of research participants, and towards the notion of the “pre-individual field in which the event holds sway and which leads to ‘buds’ or ‘pulses’ of thought-formation/perception in which ‘thought is never an object of its own hands’” (p. 6). Subjectification is an ongoing field of production that decenters the human subject and thereby poses challenges to positivist qualitative research methodology and phenomenology where an individual’s experience becomes a de facto measure of its subjectivity (St. Pierre, 2016). As noted earlier, human ‘voice’ became one of the many forces that inflected experiments with subjectivity in my research, though it did not represent ‘subjectivity’ itself.

A project that is based on a de-centered approach to ontology cannot reliably claim to ‘give voice,’ as might be the aim in critical methodological approaches. As such, my approach to data and data analysis differs from the expectations of critical research on environmental movements, where interviews typically intend to represent or ‘liberate’ voice (Mazzei & Jackson, 2012). This form of critical research is particularly used in contexts where people’s political voices are ignored or intentionally excluded. This is the case in the oil-pipeline conflicts with many individuals and groups who find themselves unable to make their voices count in the decision process. Critical perspectives are absolutely necessary given the entanglement between ecological, racial and ethnic injustices caused by many ‘natural resource industries.’ A good example of this tradition of research can be found in Bowles and Veltmeyer’s (2014) collection of accounts of activism titled The Answer is Still No: Voices of

---

14 Deleuze and Guattari (1994) asserted that any claims to make ‘cuts’ to chaos, requires devising concepts that could stay open to difference, multiplicity, and that which escapes and leaks representation. Theirs was also a non-representational, non-reductive philosophy. I was drawn to non-representational theory, because subjectification, as a process that emerges from folds, demands precisely an approach attuned to that which escapes representations in texts and voices, and their interpretations. Akin to attempting to contain the messy and leaking substance of oil, representational and positivist methods of conventional social science often fail to express emergent and messy directionals and complexities of the world. Hence the ‘more-than-representational’ and therefore non-biographical and pre-individual dimensions of the world (Thrift, 2008) that can be used to diagram emergent folds of subjectification, became central factors in my approach to inquiry.
Pipeline Resistance, which focuses on giving voice to people concerned with and active against Enbridge’s Northern Gateway pipeline in British Columbia. However, providing voice is not the focus of this work.

Ethics and more-than-human, non-representational research

A move away from ‘voice’ and ‘lived experience’ of ‘participants’ invites questions about ethics, including alternative ethical theories that are different than traditional frameworks concerned with moral action. Such a move invites questions of how more-than-human and non-representational research might engage with ethics at times of ecological devastation and anticipations of animal extinction. Threat of oil spills, accelerating climate change, and the decline of entire species are some of the consequences of the event of oil. These consequences are also reasons why research on such topics, and particularly research about education, is often expected to take a deontological position associated with the aim of finding solutions to such problems and threats. Deontology is an ethical theory that stresses how decisions ought to be made in relation to rights and duties. This ethos focuses on how to identify ways to empower, give voice to, or recognize the agency of human participants who are trying to become ecologically engaged and/or politically active. However, there are other ways to think about research ethics, and it is important to ask how research that takes up more-than-human ontological conceptual frameworks, as well as non-representational ones, might contend with ethics differently. In other words, it is important to consider what Foucault (1997c) has argued is a “historical ontology of ourselves in relation to ethics” (p. 262), that recognizes transforming and contingent relations between a) ‘the self’ and ethics in the oil event, and b) ‘the self’ and ethics in research.
My work takes up re-defined ideas about ethics that imports ethical approaches from non-representational theory. Bronwyn Davies (2018) defines representationalism as “an optics that envisages boundaries of separate entities with clearly demarcated interiors and exteriors” (p. 115). This optics is one that places responsibility on language and on a responsibility to produce a representation, for example, one of research participants’ lived experience. Non-representational ethics, however, moves away from notions of responsibility, duties, and rights, including how to adequately represent and interpret these notions, and towards one of enactment in practice (Davies, 2018; Zembylas, 2017). In other words, ethics also comprises the decisions made in research about what is being made to matter and what is omitted or neglected through our knowledge practices (Davies, 2018). Davies (2018), for example, argues that non-representational ethics:

demands that we examine the onto-epistemologies through which any events are constituted and constitutive. We must continually ask: how are we mutually implicated in particular unethical practices; what practices of knowing and being are we mobilizing when we choose the engage in them, or to ignore them; how are we dis/continuous with the world’s injustices; what habitual emotions and embodied practices do we engage in that sustain violations of others. (p. 125)

As such, my ethical commitments are enacted through research by way of thinking through conceptual devices that would be adequate for studying the event of subjectification and the various folds that produce subjectivities. My ethics enacted a commitment to examine how subjectification functions by taking into account multiple forces, including non-human ones, that animate that process, and which affect ideas about action, thought and thinking in ecological conflicts. My ethics therefore refrains from practices of knowing (i.e., traditional research methodologies) that attune to subjectivity as solely human and as positioned within problem/solution logics.
My approach to research ethics works to develop concepts that diagnose or map practices of subjectification that are being mobilized in relation to events and deemed to require a specific ‘ethical response.’ Davies (2018) suggests, drawing on Foucault, that our “ethical task [is to make] particular forms of understanding, visible and revisable” (p. 118) and, in my case, the responsibility to engage in forms of inquiry that demonstrate how concepts of subjectivity are used to evoke particular practices (for example by ENGOs). My ethics also focuses on making visible how ‘thought,’ or understanding of ecological issues and educational intentions, is itself enfolded with an outside (matter, time, chaos etc.). For me, this was a concern motivated by the utmost of ethical care, in that so much of what constitutes thought and subjectivity was enfolded by outside forces that are frequently neglected in forms of educational research (Popkewitz, 1997).

I am however not denying conceptions of ‘lived experience’ but, rather, I examine how sensations of ‘a self’ are produced within and as a result of the oil-event. Such experiences and sensations only partially comprise subjectivity and are produced by forces outside a ‘self.’ I focused on the outside forces in order to assemble understandings of contingent conditions within which subjectification was occurring. Research participants’ descriptions of these forces were important—and were a constant conversation that we shared over the course of the research. For instance, participants demonstrated strong engagements with the research process, including some who used the research as an opportunity to examine some of ‘their’ practices and ambivalences with regard to the oil pipeline conflict. In other words, I did not ‘use’ participants’ voices to engage in a ‘posthuman’ analysis that was detached from their concerns. Instead, participants often informed me about how glad they were to be able to discuss their ambivalent behaviours, hesitations, and critiques of hope, and the con-
fusing and chaotic political campaigns that they participated in. In fact, many times, participants would share with me how they felt being characterized as ‘inactive’ by ENGOs and hence as unethical within the swirling normative ethics that constituted most of ENGOs’ political practices. Even if they did not articulate how their practices were being produced by forces outside ‘the self’ or how their enactments contributed to different ideas about subjectification, participants were constantly engaged in discussions about these outside forces and these anecdotal statements informed the research.

Drawing on Deleuze, Davies (2018) argued that paying attention to enacted ethics is to understand the way in which we are caught up in “enveloped modes of existence” (p. 125). My ethical orientation in this study, then, was in part designed to examine the enacted practices of people living in oil pipeline areas, and how they have been enveloped through forces outside themselves, even if they did not articulate such processes themselves. My research therefore enacts a post-representational ethics that moves beyond the responsibility to accurately represent voice, while seriously engaging with how human voice is enveloped by forces outside itself. It was not designed, however, to identify traditional ideas of ethics concerned with duties to ‘give voice.’

Moreover, I was not outside these enveloped and enacted modes of existence. My own role in this research was to engage with and think through my reluctant habits and ambivalent engagements with ENGOs’ campaigns, and to engage with forces that were animating my contradictory and enacted perspectives. I often shared my ambivalences with participants. I wanted to understand these events and habituated practices, and I wanted to engage in ethical research that defines ethics as the responsibility to experiment and think through these ideas.
Here, I turn again to Davies (2018) who noted how “ethical practice requires thinking beyond the already known, being open in the moment of the encounter” and particularly the way in which “ethics is emergent in the intra-active encounters in which knowing, being and doing (epistemology, ontology and ethics) are inextricably entangled” (p. 121). The focus on enactments was an important part of my non-representational ethics because it engaged with some of the limits of knowing, including problems with qualitative methodology that privilege and smuggle particular ideas of ‘human’ (St. Pierre, 2004). Instead, I was interested with understanding non-human forces that illustrated my commitment to the research encounter that Davies discussed. In other words, I believe ethical research takes up experimentation to move ‘beyond what is already known’ and to identify the conditions for the creation of new concepts. For instance, I realized that the ethics of subjectification was something that was produced partially in the event of my own decisions to pay attention to more-than-human forces. As such, I became concerned with how to think about— rather than ‘know,’ that is—the sorts of conceptual devices that would enable me to examine the ethical arrangements that were unfolding between participants and these more-than-human forces.

Perhaps more importantly, my ethos to questioning my own role away from knowing or being able to articulate what subjectivity ‘is,’ is a demonstration of how I grappled with ‘not knowing’ but constantly thinking. This theme of not knowing is most overt in Chapter Three, but also threads through Chapters Four, Five and Six. I focused my ethical commitments to attuning to the research event itself, that is, to give a sense of how the event of research unfolded, and what St. Pierre (2004) similarly has referred to as being ‘undone’ as a subject, and hence as a research subject.

Lather (2009) articulated an ethics of ‘not knowing’ as ‘getting lost.’ The ethos of the project focused on how to depict the workings of the research event, that is, to articulate the
folding and refolding of subjectivity across the various research conundrums (voice, time, matter, normative ethics, etc.) that emerged as I seriously grappled with my own not knowing. An ethic of ‘not knowing’ is part of my not knowing how to ‘be’ a subject and a way to attune myself to all the ways participants also did not know—but were constantly thinking—at the tense intersection of ecologically devastating events. These devastating events habitually call for ‘resistance’ and my intellectual desire to being accountable to the complexities of micropolitics of subjectivity that push the limits of what resistance and critical thought can offer at this time is one way to honour ethics that maps the shifting relations between subjectification, knowledge, matter, force, and an ‘outside’ or death or escape (i.e., the four folds of subjectivity).

However, I did not engage in trying to represent my own ‘reflections’ as I moved through this research, as may typically be found in ethnographic fieldnotes. Rather, I focused on the enactments of participants and myself, and my own ethical enactments attuned to the responsibility of conceptual experimentation, by doing fieldwork in philosophy. My commitment is hence not primarily oriented to the voices of individual participants, but to being attuned to the events and enactments of subjectification of which they, as well as I, am a part. Again, participants often shared with me their appreciation for this ethical approach, which shared some of their similar approaches to not knowing the outside forces that they sensed were encroaching upon their sense of self.

My ethical commitment to recognize the enfolded, enacted, and at times indeterminate thresholds of the more-than-human subject, can also be seen within discussions of ethics in new materialism research. A new materialist ethics aims to map the relational dimensions of reconceptualized human-non-human relations. For Davies (2018) a new materialist ethos
focuses on listening to and being emergent with non-human forces: “ethical practice is emergent in encounters with others, in emergent listening with others, including non-human others” (p. 121). For Davies, this ethical practice emerges out of the ways we encounter matter, and in my research focuses on my own emergence with oil and the subjective enactments that are expressed through oil. Taylor (2016) for instance argues that “posthuman ethics, from a ‘new’ materialist feminist perspective, is an ethic of ‘worlding’ and proceeds from the presumption that ethics is not about trying to see the words from inside someone else’s shoes—which presumes individuated bodies. Rather, it means recognizing skin not as a barrier-boundary but as a porous, permeable sensorium of connectivity with/in a universe of dynamic co-constitutive and differential becomings” (p. 15). In Chapter Four, where I focus on oil as an ontogenetic force, I take up a form of ethics enacted within posthuman studies of education.

Partial elements: Participants’ media practices

Keeping in mind that interviews were only a part of my fieldwork in texturology, I cautiously identified residents living in oil pipeline conflict through practices, that is by engaging people who were doing, rather than being. I was cognizant not to speak to people as though I had already coded, or positioned subjectification within representational categories. In other words, I wanted to encounter and engage with human ‘voice’ without necessitating that residents identify with words like ‘activists’ or ‘environmentalists,’ words that are already recognized specific ideations of ‘political subjectivity.’ Instead of using representational terms such as ‘activist’ or ‘environmentalist’—predetermined and overdetermined concepts—I engaged with people who had already somehow heard of, had an interest in, or showed concern,
or engagement with the oil pipelines, and who had previously encountered media representations of the oil pipeline conflict. Not all the residents with whom I spoke were explicitly against the oil pipelines, although most were.

I additionally identified three different practices through which individuals might orient towards environmental issues and which would animate their relationship to media practices and adult environmental education differently: (1) residents living in oil conflict areas who are or have been involved in outdoor recreation pursuits; (2) those who are somehow active in organized environmental groups; and (3) individuals involved in the production of media texts or involvement in campaign work to try to reach or educate ‘the public.’ While ultimately, I did not associate subjectivity with these particular human enactments, a practice-based approach initially enabled me to think about how subjectivities were enacted in at least three different ways: (a) media production practices, (b) outdoor pursuits, and (c) participating in environmental groups. A practice-based approach helped me to understand how practices relate to the various signified categories that exist about environmental political subjectivity. I found the three practice-based categories useful in the process of finding people to speak with, but not as useful during the interviews themselves or afterwards, as these categories quickly collapsed. This is most clearly described in Chapter Four where I focus on media production practices of residents, rather than ENGOs.

This first set of conversations occurred with people who were active in outdoor pursuits such as backcountry or cross-country skiing, hiking, and canoeing, as such activities are shown to shape pro-environmental behaviours and values (Chawla, 1999; Larson, Whiting & Green, 2011; Stoddart, 2011; Thapa, 2010). I found individuals to speak to by promoting this study through a variety of outdoor organizations and locations in which I placed posters and sent out messages to listservs (listed in Appendix B). Outdoor activities were practices
that I felt I most related to as someone passionate about hiking, skiing, and mountain biking. Over the past two decades I have been hiking, skiing and mountain biking on Canada’s West Coast, in the Rocky Mountains, Kootenays and South Chilcotin regions of British Columbia, as well as in the US’ Pacific North West, High Sierras, Grand Teton National Park, and in the Khumbu region of Nepal. Perhaps because of this relation, I was interested in understanding how these practices contribute to folds of subjectification, as a way of thinking about my own folds, and a way to think about my concurrent appreciation for how the ‘outdoors’ shape me, and my lack of involvement in any normative, political sense of the term ‘activism’ in environmental politics.

I spoke with residents living in oil pipeline conflicts who participated in environmental organizations by contacting various environmental groups, asking them to distribute my request to people who were somehow involved in their organization. In total, I spoke with 11 residents who contacted me because they in some way took part in or were connected to organized environmental groups. I kept what ‘taking part in environmental organizations’ could look like very broad. This could include people who at some point had subscribed to ENGOs’ newsletters, or those who were more actively involved. I was looking for that spectrum of practices. Not everyone who signs up to be a part of an organized environmental group participates actively, and in general, environmental organizations tend to have an active minority (Manzo & Weinstein, 1987).

Just as I had expected, the people with whom I spoke ranged in their level of affiliation with environmental organizations, as they did in the focus of the organizations they joined. It turned out that some of them were very loosely connected to these organizations as subscribers to listervs or they follow them on social media, however a few were more closely connected, as directors of boards or as active participants or core organizers. Several of the
residents were members of environmental groups, including, for example, groups that focus on marine environments, with concerns ranging from large areas such as the marine habitat of the Strait of Georgia or the Douglas Channel, to specific rivers or watersheds. A few of the residents living in the Vancouver Metro Area were dedicated streamkeepers in their organizations, activities to which they allocate a lot of their spare time. Another three residents took part in organizations that focused on the risk of pipelines to the marine environment in particular.

Finally, I spoke with six people involved in or responsible for environmental communication activities (directors of communication and campaigners) at ENGOs in British Columbia, as well as one communication specialist working for one of the pipeline companies, and four journalists. I found these ENGOs by looking for organizations that were vocal and visible in local and regional news and on social media in both the north and south of British Columbia. Cognizant that many of these organizations have only one or two dedicated campaigners who write, prepare and often cite themselves in stories on specific issues like oil pipelines, I found some of the dedicated ‘anti-pipeline campaigners’ by looking at who was quoted in these stories. I recognize the contradiction of my non-representational research, my critiques of representation, and trying to ‘recruit’ ENGOs by looking for organizations visible in the news and social media. This poses a particular irony to my research, perhaps. However, given that ‘media work’ is a predominant activity that ENGOs engage in, I decided that this contradiction was acceptable as part of a work involving the shifting ‘folds’ and ambiguities of tensions in non/representational theories.
An Invitation to a Geometric Reading

In this chapter, I introduced my conceptual approach and modes of inquiry as one, noting that much of the concept work done as part of this research occurs within subsequent chapters. I also continue to raise methodological problematizations throughout the dissertation because these are closely related to the theoretical concerns with which this work grapples. As noted in this chapter, I see methodological problematizations, that is, the problematizing of how to do research about environmental and political education and subjectivity, as inseparable from the inquiry into how subjectification works, and also hence the analysis part of the dissertation. For example, I discuss the problematic of listening to the ‘authentic’ data of research participants in Chapter Four, and discuss ‘the interval’ as a productive research space in Chapter Six. This choice is intentional. By doing so, I hope to show some of the decisions and thoughts that shaped the research design and process, or what Paul Rabinow (2003) refers to as contemporary research equipment. However, this ‘pleating’ does require a ‘geometric’ kind of reading in that readers are asked to follow many concepts and reflections as they are pleated into other chapters.

This chapter set up the quadripartite architecture of ‘the fold’ as a point of departure for the subsequent chapters. In the beginning of this chapter I presented a quotation from Deleuze’s (1993/1997) Essays Critical and Clinical on ‘undecidability’ of what he referred to as a geometric method. The geometric method, reconceptualized in this dissertation as a fieldwork in textures, resulted in four analysis chapters. Each of these chapters folds, unfolds, and refolds subjectivity in a different way. In the next chapter, I focus on the first fold of subjectification, the ‘fold of knowledge.’ The chapter, as noted earlier, develops an aporetic topology.
3. Aporetic Topologies and Un(knowing) Folds in Environmental Movements

The Anthropocene has produced urgencies in environmental education and communication that position ‘knowing’ as a means to averting ecological crises. However, different and competing forms of and ideas about knowledge in ecological conflicts (hesitation, resistance, chaos, doubt) position knowledge within ambiguous relations to subjectification, often stretched in different directions and novel contortions. In this chapter I show how the relationship between knowledge and subjectification can be understood topologically (de Freitas, 2014; Mansfield, 1963; Thompson & Cook, 2015), especially through topologies of space/time (Massey, 1992). I diagram a topological inquiry, showing how competing knowledge about environmental education might be conceptualized as ‘folds’ (Deleuze, 1988), or interruptions to a teleological and chronological trajectory of ‘knowing’ in transformative environmental education. Folding, understood here as ‘not knowing,’ becomes a political practice of spacing (Doel, 1999), where folds inflect teleological and chronological trajectories, producing new space/time configurations, and hence new ways of thinking about the role of knowledge in the ecological crisis, and about subjectification. Topologies are a way to depict emerging contortions in the relations between ‘knowing’ and ‘being,’ and also a way to depict how subjectivity is itself topological—able to be stretched and contorted through different forms of inquiry.

---

15 The focus is on knowledge that connects ecological issues to political/power dynamics (Clover, 2002) and knowledge production aimed at reframing identities and taking action for social change (Kluttz & Walter, 2018). An information deficit about ecological issues or climate science is no longer considered a primary barrier to environmental engagement in education or communication research (Wolf & Moser, 2011).
This chapter develops the concept of subjectification as a series of folded lines or surfaces stretched in multiple directions and in aporetic ways. ENGOs and activists’ approaches to knowledge form an important part of the environmental communication strategies they adopt in anti-oil pipeline campaigns. This chapter therefore focuses on how ENGOs conceptualize knowledge practices in their campaigns, including the speed or urgency of their campaigns, as well as how residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas encounter and engage with these campaigns, particularly claims to knowledge and temporality found within them. I present what I call an *aporetic topology* by drawing on the mathematical concept of topology (Mansfield, 1963) and its uptake in education research (de Freitas, 2014; Decuypere & Simons, 2016; Thompson & Cook, 2015) and social and media theory (Hansen, 2015; Lash, 2012; Lury, Parisi & Terranova, 2012). I use topological thinking/doing to offer a different perspective on ‘transformation’ than that of the focus on teleological and emancipatory environmental movement education, by paying attention to the “stretching and distortion of continuously connected lines and surfaces” (de Freitas, 2014, p. 95). My pedagogy of the concept produces an *aporetic topology* consisting of a series of diagrams depicting *un(knowing) folds*, by taking ENGOs’ teleological educational and communication strategies and contorting them in various ways. Topologies are an important mode for analyzing the ontogenetic relationship between knowledge and subjectification.

Playing with Deleuze’s (1990/1995) idea that subjectification is a “folding of the line” (p. 113), and that one of the four folds of subjectification is in relation to knowledge or in “relation of truth to our being” (1988, p. 104), this chapter examines *un(knowing) folds*, presenting a series of ‘snags,’ ‘(re)turns,’ and ‘(k)nots’ to ‘knowing’ which inevitably bend and transform teleological directionality of the subject as it is folded through resistance,
memory, and chaos encountered during fieldwork. Topologies, also known as ways of thinking with rubber sheet geometry, are vital modes of analyzing emerging folds between ontology and epistemology. In a “topological culture: surfaces that are spaces in themselves are not only self-organizing and emergent, but their self-organization brings being and knowing, ontology and epistemology, into new kinds of relations” (Lury, Parisi & Terranova, 2012, p. 20). Within ambiguous thresholds of the Anthropocene marked by contrary tendencies in knowing, topologies, rather than offering resolutions to environmental education knowledge practices, depict and illustrate tensions, impasses, doubts—aporias—in how knowledge practices attempt to contrive ‘subjects’ within environmental conflicts.

I show how folding becomes a way of diagramming subjectification in relation to resistance, memory, and chaos, and ways of mapping aporetic topologies. While topological analysis has been positioned as primarily spatial (Lash, 2012), it is, I argue, inseparable from analysis of speed, particularly of the speed at which scholarship moves towards ‘truth,’ ‘certainty,’ and ‘solutions’ found in instrumentalist research approaches. Aporetic topologies produce decelerations in problem/solution logics that position environmental education and environmental education research as responses to the speed of the ecological crises.

I set this chapter up in four main parts. The first part of the chapter shows that ENGOs’ campaigns are informed by a teleological view of education. This part draws the line of transformative learning theories in education though a focus on personal transformation that is enabled through knowledge acquisition. The second part of the chapter snags this line, introducing a warp that shows resistance to ENGOs’ knowledge practices. Here, I focus on how encounters with ENGOs’ knowledge practices produce friction, and how knowledge is folded over as people resist ENGOs’ practices while counterintuitively engaging even more adamantly in ‘their’ subjectification through independent learning about the oil pipeline
debates. The third part of the chapter stretches and \textit{(re)turns} the teleological trajectory, diagramming the role of memory in knowledge practices. Here, I examine how historical BC campaigns such as the War in the Woods and historical industry advertising function as hypomnemata. This section examines the \textit{not knowing} of how to \textit{be} political, and how the impending ecological apocalypse is met through the concurrent production of memory, or hypomnemata, which I explain later in the chapter, of environmental activism’s visual culture \textit{and} resistance to current knowledge practices. The fourth and final part of the chapter twists resistance, memory, and un-knowing in order to examine chaotic \textit{knots} in subjectivity and research, which result from a swarming of forces that fold subjectivities in relation to \textit{(k)not} knowing. This section speaks to the intensity of more-than-human subjectivities, or subjectivity as a swarming intensity of lines.

Together, these four sections produce a topology of un(knowing) folds (Figure 2) in political-environmental education that might be characterized by \textit{lines, snags, turns, and knots}. In this topology, the teleological model of education, depicted here as a line, is “‘doubled’ (passed or folded over) by a becoming of forces, where any number of diagrams—or folded surfaces of thought—are plied over each other” (Conley, 2005, p. 175). At play here, is the desire to proliferate ways to think about the relation between epistemology and ontology, by illustrating how multiple processes might be simultaneously possible.
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\textbf{Figure 2: Topology of Un(knowing) Folds}
This *aporetic topology* emerged from my pedagogy of the concept and the ‘unknowing’ that occurred during this process of inquiry. My initial research question of “How are ‘political subjects’ produced or enacted?” became increasingly unanswerable. Instead, a series of lines of inquiry began to snag, fold, turn, and knot ‘knowing,’ something I focus on at the end of this chapter. Before I engage with the four main lines and folds of aporetic topologies, I start the chapter by showing how the concept of topologies has been developed in mathematics and how it is taken up in education and social theory currently. I define how I use the term ‘aporetic’ to describe this topology, especially to set up that aporetic topologies are closely related to issues of time/space/movement—particularly the role of knowledge as the human species appears to be urgently ‘running out of time,’ and consequently, the collapse of space for ‘not knowing,’ or simply, a lack of space for indeterminacy as to what the ‘right’ approach is. I show how aporetic topologies conceptualized through folds produce space for thought and thinking, aware that such spaces might be seen to delay the speed at which education tends towards ‘solutions’ of environmental problems.

**Diagramming Aporetic Topologies**

In mathematics, topologies deal with the *continuity* of shapes and their transformation such as for example, “when the object under consideration is subjected to stretching and bending without tearing” (Mansfield as cited in Thompson & Cook, 2016, p. 734). Topological thinking offers a different perspective to the developmental focus and transcendence through transformation by paying attention to the “stretching and distortion of continuously connected lines and surfaces” (de Freitas, 2014, p. 95). The continuity and connection of folded surfaces in a topology is useful for thinking about how the same concept of subjectification can be refolded and contorted in multiple ways. Movement and process no longer relate to
the transformation of fixed forms across space and time, but to the continuity of transformation of the same surface/line/object into different shapes by overlapping, contorting, recurring, and folding in on itself (Lury, Parisi & Terranova, 2012). Additionally, topological continuity, that is the ability of a surface to contort in space (for example turn inside out or pleat in a way that reveals new surfaces), interchanges external and internal spaces and challenges the distinctiveness between inner and outer dimensions of subjectivity, problematizing notions of cause, effect, origin and offspring (Deleuze, 1988). Transformation in topologies do not organize according to external coordinates (i.e., a ‘telos’) but contort and deform according to an arrangement relevant to the elements being morphed (Thompson & Cook, 2015). The aim of this chapter is therefore not to understand how one becomes ‘a political subject’ in relation to any ‘effects’ intended by or contained within ENGOs’ public pedagogy campaigns (i.e., within coordinates of Euclidian space), but how subjectification comprises continuous stretching, bending, and folding affected by an unknown or unknowable ‘outside’ in often multiplying and often conflicting directions.

Deleuze (1988) argued that topological thinking best describes attempts to displace and disperse the localization, intentionality, and unity of objects under study in favour of geometrically diagramming their shifting multiplicities in a way that makes the object ‘undecidable.’ In this chapter, folds,—in the form of ‘snags,’ ‘turns,’ and ‘knots’ to ‘knowing’—transform the teleological directionality of transformative environmental education and emerge as ways of mapping tensions within knowledge and limits to ‘knowing.’ This occurs when the forward-oriented movement of teleological, transformative education and intentionality, assumed to lead towards ‘political subjectification,’ is twisted and bent out of shape, as immanent relations to knowledge are folded in multiple directions. The topology produces a
continuously *scrumpled subjectivity*\(^{16}\), (not to be mistaken for a fractured one) that highlights multiple tensions, manifolds of ‘knowing,’ and their continuous variation.

I use the term ‘aporetic’ to accentuate this topology’s relation to knowing, particularly the undecidabilities that emerge from multiplying directionalities stemming from a topology’s pliability, or pliable and emergent relations between knowing and being. Aporia highlights non-coherence and productive problematizations that emerge in and through topological thought in relation to Deleuze’s (1988) fold of knowledge. Lather (2009) also described undecidability as a “praxis of aporia” (p. 345): “generative undecidability is seen as a good thing in shifting the intelligibility of qualitative research away from the neo-positivism that underpins hegemonic understandings of evidence, objectivity, reason, coherence, measurement and fact” (p. 354). Lather drew on Jacques Derrida (1993), who argued that aporia is an “experience of nonpassage” (p. 12). For Derrida, this nonpassage of the aporetic emerges not from contradictory tendencies, but from a “plural logic” (p. 20) or multiplication (for example, the multiplication of responsibility or duty towards not one but concurrently many things or people). Aporia, according to Derrida is not a tension to resolve, but a productive state in dwelling in “undecidability” (p. 15). For Derrida, the aporetic invites the possibility that a solution might be impossible—problematizing ‘knowing’ as the aim of thought and research. Because I do not focus on the experience of aporia faced by my participants, nor on the connection between aporia and the ethics of responsibility, I do not elaborate further on Derrida’s aporia. However, the term aporia energizes topologies as I focus on them here, by pointing out the productiveness of not knowing based on multiplication, and the productive states of non-passage which are characterized by the abilities of topologies to

\(^{16}\) I borrow the term ‘scrumpled’ from geographer Marcus A. Doel (1996). Doel called for a ‘scrumpled geography’ characterized by variation, intervals, joints, and folds rather than Euclidian spaces.
shift shape while remaining the same. My focus therefore is also on ontological aporias, the productiveness of not being able to decide what subjectivity ‘is’ because of its mutations and multiplications. In my work, the aporetic consequently functions to illustrate a process of geometric thinking.

An aporetic topology reworks the ontology of a humanist individual who is expected to transform into a ‘political subject’ through individuation, actualization, and transcendence by way of campaigners’ knowledge practices and a plethora of environmental media texts in the form of social media posts, documentary films, posters, videos, and photographs. It maps subjectification as a process of making space, giving the perception of what appears to be the ‘inside’ of a subject, which is an ‘outside’ folded inward. Deleuze argued that “every inside-space is topologically in contact with the outside-space” (Deleuze, 1988, pp. 118-119) where ‘a subject’ is spatially produced through the organization of forces stretching and folding in multiple directions. Put differently, subjectification becomes a process through which what appears to be an inside-space—a space correlated to ‘knowing’ as a result of the investment of knowledge strategies—is topologically inflected by folds produced by an ‘outside,’ which for Deleuze is the realm of the yet unknown, and unpredictable, or what Deleuze would denote as ‘virtual’ (Semetsky, 2005). I continue to focus here on the process of folding as independent of any specific ‘participant’ or being, even if my fieldwork shows how these processes/subjectifications are taken up in their practices. The aporetic tendency of the topology relates to diagramming the folded space of subjectification that forms out of multiple directionalities of knowledge as a feature of the becoming-topological of environmental education and does not indicate that participants in my study had aporetic experiences, or were being folded into a ‘self-seeing’ entity through ‘their’ experience of aporias.
My depiction of a topology through a series of diagrams works as “an experiment” (de Freitas, 2014, p. 99) rather than a representation. A topology and its diagrams are non-representational, as a diagram “never functions in order to represent a persisting world but produces a new kind of reality” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 35), or as Decuypere and Simons (2016) put it, “the diagram does not affirm or represent anything. Rather, it presents something” (p. 379). Within this particular topology, the diagram also functions to present and experiment with less-than-rational aspects of political education, such as spurts of resistance to knowledge, desiring memory, and swarms that produce chaos. Diagrams are not definitive, nor do they offer a solution. The sketches in a diagram might be better off treated as “tools of inquiry rather than as full-fledged answers” (Decuypere & Simons, 2016, p. 382). Diagrams, then, are tools of inquiry that are used to play, experiment and inquire into processes of subjectification in other realms, and plug in with other maps.

**Environmental Media Practices in Topological Time, Space, Movement and Speed**

The Anthropocene and anticipations of oil pipelines affect space and time. This is because the Anthropocene invites speculations and different senses of duration: Are we running out of time? How much time is left? Are we not already in an ecological apocalypse, now? Why is this happening again? Is this ongoing, persistent, and without end? Different temporalities in the Anthropocene produce different ‘spaces’ in the form of distances between the past, present, and future, and the speed at which these durations are crossed and affect productions of subjectivity that contorts in relation to them. Theorists of temporality and space have long argued that time cannot be examined apart from space (see for example Massey, 1992; Sharma, 2014), and that a shrinking perception of time is accompanied by a collapse of
distance and vice versa. Given these changing space-time dimensions, environmental education morphs in relation to new, non-Euclidian coordinates of time, and becomes intricately linked with chronopolitics (Wallis, 1970) or the idea that politics is inseparable from different sensations of time.

Thinking about space and time in environmental movement education, I sensed a growing inkling that topologies were also inseparable from considerations of time, speed, and movement. In part, this is because topologies do not transform or transcend, that is, their transformations do not go anywhere, but bend, fold, and refold in space. They also bend time, as folds (e.g., crinkles, inflections, bends, and twists) produce decelerations to forward-oriented, teleological movements, and I began to consider that they also bend the role of knowledge practices within it.

A topological analysis produces a deceleration that contrasts the teleological forward-moving nature of subjectification through transformation. Topologically, subjectification might be imagined in relation to processes of ‘spacing’ by way of a “twist, fold, stop, and so on” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 98). While a transformative analysis examines the production of ‘political subjectivity’ over time, a topological one analyzes subjectivity in relation to the shifts created by the folds or textures of a surface. Concavities and convexities space,-expanded, or inflate surfaces, producing delays through decelerations to advancements, or gains associated with mobilizations and ‘making progress.’ I will show momentarily concavities can be interpreted as inefficiencies in problem/solution logics that position environmental knowledge practices as a response to the urgency of the ecological crises.

Spacing engages with what Virilio (1986) referred to as the militaristic and efficient logic of speed. Spacing by way of folds therefore engages with some of the militaristic and

---

17 I am using the word ‘space’ as a verb here, i.e., to space, to create space.
efficient logics adopted by ENGOs in their claims to produce and facilitate educational activities that I talk about in the next section. A topology depicts subjectivity as already folded in strange directionalities, comprising various un(knowing) folds, such snags, turns, and knots, which I explain in this chapter. In relation to time, a snag—a curvilinear fold—produces space by bending or doubling the progressive yet enduring narrative of an emancipatory telos. The (re)turn generates space when aionic time\textsuperscript{18} folds to bring the present in proximity with the past and future, as memory is produced and used to facilitate encounters with an ecological apocalypse. Here, topological analysis requires readings of environmental visual culture and campaign work not as something ‘in the past’ or ‘in the present’ but as intense (Coleman, 2014) or aionic time (Deleuze, 1969/1990), a recursivity, or an intensity of time. The knot or (k)not, creates space in a non-directional way, in contrast to the unidirectional future movement of transformation expected from teleological knowledge practices. The knot dwells with tensions generated between a quick exodus from the current state of petroculture, and a forced exile from a no-longer habitable Earth, as well as between the space of ‘knowing’ in research, and keeping space open for the unknown.

Topologies relate to movements, especially when stagnations or distractions generate anxieties in ENGO campaigns, where not knowing is a detriment and annoyance to mobilization (moving forward, securing a ‘future’), that is, a ‘waste of time,’ in moments when a discourse of ‘running out of time’ prevails and is accompanied by the perception of the diminishing space for human life and the ‘collapse’ of ‘Nature’ as habitat for humans. For instance, I encountered knowledge practices aimed at averting an eventual oil spill and an ecological apocalypse, where such practices were positioned as a war against time, and can be

\textsuperscript{18} Aionic time refers to time that is not chronological, but stretches eternally in two directions (past and future), at once (Deleuze, 1969/1990).
read alongside the concept of dromology, or “the science of movement and speed” (Virilio, 2012, p. 27). Virilio argued for a study of grey ecology (Virilio, 2009) that de-emphasizes the focus on how to save the green ecology, and instead attunes to cultures of speed that transform distance. Speed of progress poses a challenge to philosophical inquiry, as dwelling in the undecidable spaces of aporetic topologies may appear as untimely (Brown, 2005), or out of sync with the perception of urgency of environmental crisis and instrumentalist approaches. My topology and the various sections of this chapter may hence appear inefficient for a reader keen on knowing how people become ‘political subjects.’

**Line: Educating the Public through ENGO Campaigns**

ENGOs, including communication directors, and campaigners working or volunteering for them, position education as one of the primary mandates of their organizations. In this study, ENGOs for example describe their organizations’ goals as being able to “educate, talk about the broader issues, and inculcate a set of values” (Tobias), “educate the public,” (Olivia, Angela), and “share their story in an educational way and teaching people” (Sylvia). ENGOs adopt transformative learning models for adult environmental education described in Chapter One. In other words, they understand their audiences as people who encounter ecological crises with prior knowledge and, when provided with the right information, engage in critical reflection, individuation, and in their own political actualization. ENGO campaigners want to “play to something that’s pre-existing” (Tobias) and encourage people to take action “if they share our concerns” (Angela). They keenly focus on people who are already political, but perhaps momentarily catatonic, and who need to be re-educated about ways of becoming ‘political subjects’ with the advent of recursive ecological crisis events.
I present transformative approaches to education and their uptake in media practices as a linear diagram, not because they are less complex or simpler than some of the folds, but because they reluctantly deal with and problematize manifolds and different type of lines that immanently constitute the folds of subjectification in environmental movements. In my diagram, linearity articulates goal-orientedness, instrumentalism, and commitment to finding how best to engage and help people become political subjects through learning and education, and in the case of my fieldwork, their uptake through an assortment of contrived campaigning, digital, and visual cultural practices. My decision to present an unwavering line emerged both from my sense that I encountered few stories and a dearth of research about productivity of ‘failures,’ expressions of doubt, hesitations or a sense of uneasiness with knowledge practices—shades of dark yet productive ecological hesitation—within environmental movements, as well as in environmental movement education research and environmental communication research. I also decided to depict ENGOs’ knowledge practices as linear to show how speed, teleological directionality, and unwillingness to stop for those who do hesitate prevailed in ENGOs’ knowledge practices, which I discuss next.

Even though ENGOs claim that educating the public about environmental issues is part of their main mandate, consistent with transformative learning ideas about adult environmental education, educational efforts are considered most successful if they require little direct education at all. The focus is on independent learning, where ENGOs envision their role to be the provision of information that can result in critical reflection and transformation that takes into account adults’ prior learning, experiences, knowledge, and self-mobilization. ENGOs describe their public education strategies as “not trying to persuade anybody to change their opinion about anything” (Tobias) and that they were “not going to impose [their] view on them [people living in oil pipeline areas]” (Tobias). One campaigner at a small Northern
ENGOS position themselves as engaged in education, while displaying militaristic characteristics. This might be indicative of the “charity-chill” (Kirkby, 2014) in which the federal Conservative Canadian government pursued, both rhetorically and pragmatically, a financial audit of environmental organizations (especially those registered as charities) engaged in political activities that charities are not legally allowed to engage in. However, of the six environmental NGOs with which I spoke, only one was registered as a charity; while one had been a charity up to 2012 but had transformed its status to an advocacy group by the time I had spoken with them.
Rather than an opportunity to reimagine political education differently, ENGOs characterize people who have been concerned about environmental issues for a long time as ‘environmentalists,’ and campaigns’ cumulative failures are outsourced to such environmentalists and become a reason not to engage with them and ‘their’ apparently diminishing capacity for actualization. Additionally, rather than observing how new, protracted temporal dimensions of environmental conflicts inflect (new) relationships between knowledge and subjectivity, ENGOs differentiate between their ‘expert’ knowledge and other environmentalists’ knowledge, creating a rift between un/knowning and not seeing how these are topologically connected.

Such breakdowns insinuate a form of excommunication (Galloway, Thacker & Wark, 2014) that outcast people who have been involved in ecological issues for a long time by engaging in non-practices that state that “there will be no more messages” (p. 10), curtailing the relationship between ENGOs and their ‘audiences’ into ones mediated by sense, anticipation, apparitions, and micropolitics. Excommunication therefore foregrounds a “non-media condition, not so much the extensions of man but the exodus of man (sic) from this world” (Galloway, Thacker & Wark, 2014, p. 21), which is the world of humanism. For ENGOs, it only excites more media practices, as attempts to make claims to education amplify and propagate educational phantasms (see Chapter Six), particularly phantasms about sustaining the need for public pedagogy campaigns, which in turn sustain recursive conceptions of knowledge practices.

**Snag: Resistance to ENGOs’ Educational Strategies**

Knowledge practices designed for transformation and emancipation face resistance. This resistance contorts linearity that initiates from a ‘snag.’ The snag indicates a troubled relation-
ship to the certainty that recursive ‘knowledge’ practices can solve environmental and politi-
cal problems through transformative learning, and arises from the friction between conceptu-
alizations of the role of knowledge in ENGOs’ public pedagogy campaigns and expectations
that people have about ENGOs’ educational role. The snag enacts resistance to the unified
face of environmentalism characterized by the positioning of a select few who ‘know what
needs to be done’ and the clarity of problems (oil pipeline corporations) and solutions (mobi-
lizing people to protest, donate, petition, and close the tar sands) offered by activists.

The motion of diverging tendencies that contorts topologically without tearing, as I
depict in a diagram of a ‘snag,’ is a way to illustrate subjectification, conceptualized as a pro-
cess of folding. I focus on the process of folding as independent of any specific ‘participant’
or being, even if my fieldwork shows how these processes/subjectifications are taken up in
their practices. The snag is a process that interjects in the recursive repetition of enduring
ideas of environmental public pedagogy campaigns, introducing difference in its recurrence.
Deleuze (1988) notes how “the snag is no longer the accident of the tissue but the new rule
on the basis of which the external tissue is twisted” (p. 98). For Deleuze (1988), the snag
doubles over linear trajectories twisting them open to an ‘outside,’ arranging subjectivities as
topological folds that are intensified in their proximities to an ‘the outside,’ here defined as
the limits of knowledge (e.g., uncertainty, chaos), and also to an ‘outside’ external to itself,
i.e., to the prospective limitations or breakdowns in claims to education and communicative
practices. Perhaps ironically, snags become even more pronounced when the twist between
outside/inside, or the way in which the outside (limits to knowledge) doubles the inside (cer-
tainty in knowledge) becomes even more intense at moments when ENGOs claim urgency
and amplify certainty or draw on universalizing narratives.
Snagging does not snap the line or abandon it entirely. In a topology, it “is not, of course, a matter of one rationality displacing the other, but of their overlapping and mutual implication such that the continuity of movement—or the continuum—becomes fundamental to contemporary culture” (Lury, Parisi & Terranova, 2012, p. 6). A snag is a fold that hinges, multiplying directionalities and concurrently stretching and moving towards macro and micropolitics of knowledge in environmental movement education. In other words, residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas resisted the knowledge politics of oil pipeline corporations and governments’ claims to science-based oil pipeline safety standards and the economics of oil pipeline-based jobs, and they also resisted the knowledge practices of ENGOs advocating for ongoing participation in workshops, attending talks, taking part in learning events, and other methods aimed at incessant upkeep of hope, motivation, self-information, and personal transformation through information. The snag hence shows ambivalence and undecidability: multiplication of directions in the form of concurrent wishing for knowledge and knowledge resistance. Snags mark the simultaneous aspect of politics, in which “every-thing is political, but every politics is simultaneously a macropolitics and a micropolitics” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 213). Resistance to ENGOs’ public pedagogy campaigns and their knowledge practices does not preclude the pursuit of information about oil pipelines and their impacts, or resistance to the oil pipelines. This resistance is to a set of knowledge practices that expect specific outcomes such as donating to ENGOs or protesting in the streets as preferred forms of actualization, or to outcomes that remove complexity or fail to recognize complex temporalities that produce new spaces of subjectivity. Micro-resistance to ENGOs’ educational campaigns exists coextensively with macro-resistance to oil pipelines, even when they move in different directions.
Resistance to the transformative approach to environmental movement education in anti-oil pipeline activism snags the teleological line of ENGOs’ knowledge practices and begins to warp it proliferating its surfaces. Snagging strains language and destabilizes meaning (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013) about knowledge. While ENGOs claim that one of the aims of their knowledge practices is to translate personal learning into realization about the dangers of the oil pipelines, and subsequently into willingness to donate money to help with fundraising for legal aid for groups in the position to oppose the pipelines (Indigenous groups, environmental organizations), as I show below in Figure 3, people clearly resist such requests for coupling information with requests for donations when they find that information fails to orient their thinking towards anything new. There is also resistance to public pedagogy campaigns when they appear to equate becoming political with participation in protests or marches. For residents of Northern BC, micro-resistance takes the shape of questioning Northerners’ absence from Southern ENGOs’ narratives, which produce meaning about oil pipeline activism through the narrative of the Great Bear Rainforest. Resistance also centres on ENGOs’ strategies to simplify information in their attempts to make the anti-oil pipelines’ public pedagogy more ‘accessible’ to people who are not familiar with environmental issues, while ignoring people who are long-time environmentalists. The following excerpts highlight micropolitics of resistance and sensations of ambivalence to ENGOs’ knowledge practices:
1. They have their own narrative. They have their own agenda. Fewer of those people [from Southern ENGOs] show up here than actually from the energy industry. You know? I mean the whole idea is to save their Great Bear rainforest and unofficial boundaries of the Great Bear rainforest are right at the end of this Channel. So the concern of people here are the estuaries, like Kuljawa estuary, the Gingolx, even the Kitimat estuary. They’re sort of not on the agenda of these large environmental NGOs. – Thomas, Northern British Columbia

2. I am a member of groups like Wilderness Committee and Greenpeace, but I have to admit that I find that virtually everything they have to say, I already know it.
– Viktor, Metro Vancouver

3. Environmental groups are in the consciousness business. And a lot of it is founded in good things. Making our world and animals’ worlds more livable. Saving sea ice. Keeping winters around. Making more livable communities amidst uncertainties and climate change… I like to be very informed about some of those things, but… I’m not a protestor. Like an out in the street protestor. Which doesn’t mean I don’t have preferences or values about development and the environment.
– Maverick, Metro Vancouver

4. Every time you hear from the [ENGO] communication, it’s saying, “Oh this is really urgent. Donate!” First of all a) I’m already donating on a monthly basis and b) there’s always a kind of symbiotic relationship between an organization and a potential donor. What are you giving me in return? And it doesn’t have to be a lot, but it has to be serious, and valid.
– Cameron, Metro Vancouver

Figure 3: Ambivalent Sensations of Environmental Knowledge

Acts or even sensations of resistance snag ENGOs’ strategic attempts at educating the public through campaigns. They illustrate how subjectification relates to environmental education through “different loops, knots, speeds, movements, gestures, and sonorities” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 312). Snags come in various forms, often responding to impositions on knowledge practices specific to space-times. For instance, there is resistance to dwelling in prolonged durations of crisis and encountering long-term campaigns that make it difficult to
discern ‘a moment’ for action (e.g., excerpt #2). At the same time there is resistance to the production of moments of urgency (e.g., excerpt #4) that try to accentuate the ‘now’ by dispensing information that is ‘needed now,’ through calls to ‘donate now’ that are characteristic of “routinization of emergencies” (Ekström, 2016, p. 5355). Snags also form when knowledge practices are sensed to be inadequate in understanding place (e.g., excerpt #1) or are sensed to contain prescriptions about the normative spaces—e.g., the street—of political action (e.g., excerpt #3).

Intensified pursuits of information (e.g., the implied statement: ‘is that all there is to know?’ in excerpt #2) become enactments of subjectification marked by a layering of micro-resistance to environmental campaigns and macro-resistance to oil pipeline corporations. As residents in oil pipeline conflict areas resist environmental public pedagogy campaigns, they synchronously pursue knowledge about the oil pipeline conflict elsewhere, ostensibly stretching and folding knowledge practices in multiple ways. ‘Snagging’ speaks to concurrent resistance to ENGOs’ knowledge practices, and desire for other kinds of knowledge practices, particularly learning about what does not necessarily ‘agree’ with what people already know. Deleuze (1990/1995) argued that people enact micro-resistances to attempts to educate them, only to find themselves assimilated into established knowledge practices:

as they take shape, they elude both established forms of knowledge and the dominant forms of power. Even if they in turn engender new forms of power or become assimilated into new forms of knowledge. For a while, though, they have a real rebellious spontaneity. This is nothing to do with going back to ‘the subject,’ that is, to something invested with duties, power, and knowledge. One might equally well speak of new kinds of event, rather than processes of subjectification. (p. 176)

The snag, as micro-resistance to ENGOs’ campaigns, is a way of “bringing a curve into the line, making it turn back on itself, or making force impinge on itself” (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 113). Acts of micro-resistance to ENGOs’ knowledge practices become a seductive and
co-opting force that produces a sense of an ‘independent self.’ Such resistance appears as an act of individual resistance that is however assimilated in the event itself. It “become[s] the imaginary space where subjectivation can be realized” (Conley, 2011, p. 198) through claims to independent thinking in response to a unified face of environmentalism and activists’ communication strategies. Becoming a ‘subject’ or producing a ‘self,’ even if momentarily, occurs in resistance to knowledge practices and practices aimed at using education to produce ‘community’ and a univocal ‘resistance’ movement. The degree of the fold of knowledge, as marked by the proximity or distance to claims to knowledge, certainty, or ‘knowing what to do,’ is linked to the fold of force discussed in Chapter Five, or the bending of relations of self to self. Degrees in the fold of knowledge are therefore related to the intensity of force and become a topological feature of subjectification.

(Re)turn: Producing memory

A feature of aporetic topologies in environmental movement education is that resistance to environmentalists’ campaigns occurs simultaneously to a desire for their recurrence. An aporetic topology depicts how subjectification is produced by stretching a surface in two seemingly opposing temporal directions, and subsequently twisting it to double the future into the past and vice versa. An aporetic topology creates a temporally dense and multidirectional space of subjectification, where the novelty of campaigns are constantly refolded with each recurring eco-crisis, through reappearance of the phantasms of historical campaigns, in a way that produces undecidable relationships to environmental campaigners’ efforts and attempts at education. Subjectification occurs with the production of space through that stretching and turning; hence, there are no subjects as entities, but only what Deleuze (1985/1989) refers to
as a “recollection-image [that] comes to fill the gap” (p. 47). The gap does not denote an absence, but an act of spacing, or the production of space through temporal intensity, as memory “is brought into the presence and given a new ‘life’ or context in terms of current circumstances” (Stagoll, 2005, p. 163). Environmental audiences’ mnemonic productions of environmental activism folds oil pipeline resistance into a long history of activism, reassembling and resembling history as a comfortably and pleasurable cyclic return, especially as people anticipate impending pipeline decisions and an ecological apocalypse. As the topology folds and turns, the affective force of mnemonic production constitutes the ‘inside’ of subjectivity (Deleuze, 1985/1989) which emerges as an ‘inside’ to a folded line.

Residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas who were concerned about the ecological, economic and social impact of the Kinder Morgan and Enbridge pipelines spent more time talking about the past and future than about what they were doing that makes them ‘political’ in the present moment. This absence of the subject in the ‘present’ initially produced frustration as I heard how my participants hoped to be, or once were political, while I clung to hearing how they are ‘political subjects.’ The consequences of this infinite divisibility of the temporally decentred subject acted as one of the forces that moved my focus from the ‘political subject’ to subjectification as an event, rather than a being. The diagram of the (re)turn troubles the notion that subjectivity can be treated as an ontologically stable unit, as an intelligible ‘being,’ or as a stable object of inquiry in ‘the present.’ The (re)turn inflects teleological linearity and the incessant speed with which ENGOs seek to keep ‘moving forward,’ that is, it affects a ‘turn’ in events using public campaigns under the auspices of education of the public and contribution to political transformation. The implications of thinking temporally dispersed ontologies is that it becomes impossible to ever note the moment a transformative learning experience ‘arrives’ at political subjectification, as its ontology is and
continues to be perpetually dispersed. It also becomes impossible to engage in ‘recruitment’ of people as though they are ‘political subjects,’ to treat participants as representative of ‘political subjectivity,’ and to listen to participants’ voices as though they were authentic voices of ‘political subjects.’ An aporetic topology becomes a key mode of thinking/doing in a fieldwork in texturology as it allows concurrent and seemingly unending ‘stretching,’ ‘snagging,’ and twisting to replace ideas of arrival or directionality.

Subjectification occurs when the future stirs anticipations, folding time through the flowing force of memories of ecological destruction events and memories of activism, whether these were quick or protracted, and whether they were witnessed or imagined, sensed or ‘known’ (through climate science), affected (revulsion, hope), or affected (toxicity, disease). Despite resisting ENGOs’ current educational campaigns as discussed earlier in relation to ‘snags,’ residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas continuously produced memories of campaigns and educational efforts of environmentalists in the past, in order to encounter phantasms of apocalyptic futures (as argued in Chapter Six). Conley (2005) argued that “whether forgotten or remembered, history is one of the formative doubles...of subjectivation” (p. 114). ‘Productions’ of memory indicate that people draw selectively on an archive of environmental crisis and activism so that the return constitutes archival generation that allows the past to produce the future as different. Here, the past never ‘returns’; rather, it is based on a sense of the future (anticipation, prolonged waiting for the apocalypse) through which the past is selectively re-created. Memory is produced in the present in such a way that makes it useful for the purpose of encountering, or even steering a future, even if its ‘re-currence’ no longer guarantees stability or the repetition of events. For instance, Deleuze (1988) argued that we often “surround ourselves with foldings that form an ‘absolute
memory’ in order to make the outside into a vital, recurring element” (p. 99). Memory functions as a type of ‘archive’ or ‘database’ that allows for recombinant memories and mnemonic alterations to be produced (Pisters, 2016). Residents in oil pipeline conflict areas show resistance to ENGOs’ abilities to use public pedagogy to affect change by producing and drawing on memories of distinct campaigns with which to engage with the future, constituting ENGOs’ practices as part of or within a recurring ecological event, even if ENGOs do not address history or memory themselves. Such memories of environmentalists’ previous efforts take numerous examples and forms, and, can be characterized as hypomnemata.

Foucault (1984) described hypomnemata20 as the production of memories, especially in the material form of writing in notebooks in order to produce a depository of ‘truths’ that may be reactivated in the future. While referring primarily to writing, hypomnemata were practices of memory used for recollecting what was learned, heard, or taught, in order be able to reassemble the “already-said” (p. 365) as a practice of the self. Subjectification in the anti-pipeline movement emerges as anticipations of a future of the ecological apocalypse are enfolded through recollections ranging from mid-19th century horror about the impact of the Industrial Revolution on Nature, to the Exxon Valdez in 1989, to the British Petroleum’s Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2010, and other copious visibilities of Greenpeace and Sea Shepherd Conservation Society image events. One way that subjectification enthralled mnemonic folds or ‘returns’ is through the history of ecological horror and environmentalists’ efforts to encounter such horror. For instance, Cameron, a retired professor and kayaker in the Metro Vancouver Area, sensed a future of the ecological apocalypse and impending oil pipeline decisions as ‘horrific’ through an archive of ecological horror:

The middle of the nineteenth century...we’re talking about the major industrialization particularly of Britain and France. Things were apocalyptic. They had a lot of other things going on with Darwinists and whatnot, too, but it was seen as a kind of apocalypse, and this natural world that they had—it wasn’t very natural, but—of hedgerows and animals and so on—was being destroyed by these coal mines, by these smoke things. When I take a look and see what’s going on, now, I don’t see huge differences in terms of spreading industrialization, faith in industrialization, and its consequences on the natural world. So I guess I’m using a kind of really old term [horror] in the environmental discourse. Edward Abbey and all the rest of them are part of that rhetoric. (Cameron)

Subjectification hence is produced in the folds of horrors of recursive ecological crisis, and by extension, the cyclical, substantially undifferentiated, and allegedly unsuccessful character of generations of environmentalists’ efforts. Yet in producing and drawing on memories of historical ecological efforts, they do reproduce public pedagogy, successful or not, as a temporal force through which to encounter the future. In other words, while the snag indicated how knowledge practices stipulated through campaigns are resisted concurrently to intensified pursuits of knowledge, the (re)turn shows how the same campaigns constitute a prospective source of memory that may be encountered in (yet another) event of environmental degradation. Hence, these temporal folds are quite different from ideas about utilizing ‘prior knowledge’ in adult environmental because they highlight the concurrent resistance to and utilization of campaign work. Deleuze (1988) notes how this “vital topology...frees a sense of time that fits the past into the inside, brings about the future in the outside, and brings the two into confrontation at the limit of the living present” (p. 119). Subjectification takes on a folded character marked by (re)turns that fold together the future and past in a way that produces undecidable directionalities in a topology as a space of subjectification.

The (re)turn, as a characteristic of aporetic topologies can also be seen in how the memory of the 1993 War in the Woods pleats space and time. The War in the Woods was a period of protests, camp-outs, and arrests to stop logging of old growth forests by MacMillan
Bloedel, Canada’s largest logging company, in Clayoquot Sound on Vancouver Island. In my fieldwork, the War in the Woods worked affectively as a useful educational force for encountering protracted waiting for pipeline decisions. While none of the people with whom I spoke in the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipeline conflicts personally took part in the 1993 War in the Woods, they animate and draw on memories of that period of environmental activism to engage with and resist Kinder Morgan advertising. The memory of the War in the Woods traverses and pollinates through media texts and education campaigns as a “transversal insect [in]…zig-zagging flight” (Bryx & Genosko, 2005, p. 292) and acts as a force through with which oil pipeline futures are enfolded. Such memories do not belong to any one person, but are “extraneous floating memories” (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 138), a part of the event, or that which becomes increasingly amplified as news via a variety of media platforms, recirculating episodes of the War in the Woods with the anticipation of anti-Kinder Morgan protests. Memory of ecological conflicts, such as the War in the Woods is hoped to be a force to encounter anticipations of, and to, oil pipeline decisions. Memory of the War in the Woods, despite not being a personal memory, becomes a key mnemonic device that not only shapes people’s encounters with Kinder Morgan oil pipeline ads, but also affects their imagination of themselves as ‘political subjects.’ Intensifying advertising campaigns for the Trans Mountain pipeline also become seen as a resonating topological response to the force of such memories such as the War in the Woods, for instance through claims that Kinder Morgan is “worried about another Clayoquot sound happening” (Logan). Subjectification is therefore a process of folding claims to knowledge through temporal turns and particularly re(turns) of memories of environmental movements. Memories, such that the War in the Woods, act as but a single hypomnematon force among endless environmental hypomnemata that circulate on news, films, blogs and social media, and “that might touch, affect and insert
us into the folds of an event, into the pulsing of a logic of sensation” (Slack, 2011. p. 161). In other words, these artifacts, whether encountered or, as I argue in the next chapter, produced by residents in oil pipeline conflict areas, aid in their emergence within the event that precedes them, as subjects.

_Hypomnematic events_ illustrate that subjectification moves beyond ‘the experience’ of any one particular person, and instead, as a more-than-human temporal force, produces subjects through the topologies of event-memories imbued with anticipation, resistance, and micro-pleasures of both. In other words, while people resist the recursive and repetitive aspect of environmental groups’ current communication campaigns that attempt to mobilize a future, they are drawn to the hypomnematic force21 of such campaigns as archives of environmentalist knowledge and public memory that environmental groups contribute to over time. As anti-oil pipeline campaigns are ‘doubled,’ folded over, or topologically recast into proximity to their archive, this multidirectional fold produces, in ongoing ways, environmental activism campaigns as a source of environmental knowledge as topological, and a space within which subjectification occurs. This topological multiplication of temporal directions is characterized by concurrent ENGOs’ militaristic speeds and intentions to affect a ‘turn of events.’ This includes recasting environmentalism within a contemporary image, perhaps by not waiting for ‘environmentalists’ who have ‘lost’ previous environmental battles. Their intentions are however exposed to their ‘outside,’ or in other words, (re)turned to the unknown ways in which they are (or may be) taken up by those who draw, or will draw on them as a hypomnematic and enduring force. Campaigns’ educational intentions, while perceived to be

---

21 In the next chapter, I continue with the idea of hypomnemata, showing how hypomnematic practices become expressions of chaotic material events such as the event of oil. Hypomnemata are therefore not something accessed only from the past, but are continuously produced.
ambivalent sources of environmental knowledge, are therefore productive in their \textit{(re)turn}
and their inability to pass (non/passage) fully into the contemporary.

Memory was also produced when residents in environmental conflict areas encountered oil pipeline industry advertising, particularly as oil companies made claims to histories that erase memories of activism. In Northern BC, industrial memory in the town continuously affected how residents anticipated and encountered Enbridge’s advertising, for example. Kitimat, located over 965 kilometres north of Vancouver, has a rich history as a town built on natural resource industries. Branded as a “dream community” (Figure 4) when it was built, Kitimat was a master-planned industrial town aimed at accommodating thousands of new labourers who arrived in this geographically remote part of Canada. The town was built by Alcan, an aluminum company, in the 1950s, primarily to house labourers working the smelter. Residents of Kitimat could sense and resist Enbridge trying to engage them through the rhetoric of jobs and capitalizing on their history as being an industry-heavy town. In their encounters with Enbridge’s Northern Gateway Pipeline advertising, residents could sense that they were positioned within working-class subjectivities that resemble citizens from the ‘50s who accepted their place as part of the utopic production of Kitimat, including the role of industry in providing sustainable employment for future generations.
Figure 4: ‘Incredible New Frontier’: Saturday Evening Post. February 9, 1957, p. 36
With permission from the Kitimat Museum & Archives and Curtis Licensing/The Saturday Evening Post
In their advertising campaigns promising jobs, stability and prosperity in the North, Enbridge and their multiple advertising campaigns between 2012 and 2016 appear to make claims to Kitimat’s utopia, to evoke and capitalize on what Jessica Rich (2016) calls industrial nostalgia by drawing attention to the labour roots of the town and reflecting a time in the 1950s when the town was developed as an industrial boomtown and portrayed as an idyllic family town for employees of Rio Tinto Alcan (the aluminum smelter still known amicably as Uncle Al). Advertising campaigns appear to fold people of working-class subjectivities into a memory of Kitimat that evokes the utopia of stability in which people could “go hiking and fishing on your way home from work,” have “job stability,” and retain the family-focused community feeling. Enbridge’s advertising is, for instance, encountered by people living in the North through a force of memories of environmental activism and campaign efforts:

Well, they [Enbridge] look at RTA [Rio Tinto Alcan] and say, “Oh, they work in heavy industry, so they’ve got to support it [the Northern Gateway Pipeline], right?” But...I’m not sure they did their homework very well. Because yes, we’re a heavy industrial town with a history of heavy industry, but we also have a history of going back to the 1970s, there was a proposal to actually bring oil into Canada through a port in Kitimat that would receive—not shipping it out, but bringing it in. At that time, it was a proposal to have Alaskan crude brought from Alaska across the Gulf of Alaska in tankers and then put in the pipeline going east, and eventually heading into Chicago or somewhere in the US, Mid-west, delivering oil to the Lower 48 through that route. And at that time in the late 1970s, there was quite a kerfuffle about oil... and it was at that time that the moratorium on no oil tankers [got implemented]. (Richard)

As people enact resistance to environmental and political education in order to produce themselves as independently thinking subjects, they converge with the cultural memory produced by previous ENGOs’ campaign efforts, as well as the communication and public education materials that constitute the archive of environmentalist memory. Subjectification is therefore a never-completed project, as it draws on the forces of previous events and their role in encountering the future.
(K)not Knowing: Chaotic Folds

I’m a lot of things. The way I grew up, and being outside on the sailboat a lot, snorkeling and spearfishing when I was a kid, that definitely gave me connection to being outside and the environment. I’m in construction now. I think I have a pretty diverse kind of perspective on the pipeline debates because I have a huge love for the outdoors and am obviously environmentally conscious, and meanwhile I burn 100 litres of diesel fuel a day… I don’t feel like I’m an expert and I don’t know what’s best. I believe that global warming is real. I’m not a climate change denier, so I think we really need to act on that, so the pipelines ultimately are bad, but you know, when you tie it to social programs in Canada, I’m a socialist at heart, so I think we do need really well-funded healthcare and education and everything else, and if that’s the only option we have, you know, then I honestly don’t know. I want to say ‘no, don’t do it,’ because I like the outdoors, but ultimately I don’t know, like I’m not 100 percent confident in saying ‘no pipeline, shut the oil sands down, let’s see what happens’. (Logan)

It is possible to be against the pipeline and yet not be against the pipeline. It is possible to have a perspective (or competing perspectives) on the pipeline, and yet not to know. It is also possible to inquire into processes of subjectification, and not know what a subject is. In fact, it might be the aim of inquiry to produce concepts that engage with the simultaneity of disparate multiplicities (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994) and multiple concurrent folds.

While, I draw closer attention to the idea of chaos in relation to matter and knowledge practices in Chapter Four, in this part of the chapter, I discuss chaos as a type of fold and in relation to aporetic topologies. With ‘the knot,’ I want to argue for a tangle without flattening it, inspired by Law (2004) who claimed, “if this is an awful mess… then would something less messy make a mess of describing it?” (p. 1). I have wrestled with what to do with the chaos in my data, and particularly the multiplying orientations towards knowledge in environmental movement education, depicted as productive aporetic tendencies in this topology. It is not that this data ‘does not make sense,’ but that it produces a sensation in research that orients my texturology towards thinking about how knowing is inflected with not knowing,
and the inability to make sense of the multiplicity of forces, voices, swarms and desires acting within data itself.

Initial questions such as: Should I include Logan’s talk as representative of a political subject?, Is he even a political subject?, and, How do I interpret the opposing forces in his talk? shifted as I considered (k)not knowing as a feature of topological thinking. Thinking about the ecological crisis and environmental educators’ clarity of telos and genuine desires to avert the catastrophe of an oil spill through public education has become increasingly incompatible with thinking about the non-individuated subject, with its compositions through swarms of force, and distributed affective power.

And so...I began to think with knots, and particularly, in this section, to consider how some of the fieldwork engaged with so far has been productive for the formulations of new concepts. de Freitas (2014) argues that a knot has “no interior or exterior. It is all line, or all outside...we are always in the milieu of the knot, along its paths and expanding or contracting loops, and never positioned at a fixed point, or at a beginning or end” (pp. 109-110). Logan’s talk began to act with provocation (St. Pierre, 2011). The interview presented a knot to representational conceptions of how to account for his talk as ‘data,’ which positivist orientations to research, and ENGOs alike, might interpret as an impediment and deceleration to ‘knowledge production or acquisition’ and to ENGOs’ militaristic character of teleological speed outlined earlier in this chapter.

An excerpt from a conversation can be a provocation: “a line that takes us elsewhere” by moving beyond the “coherent, intentional, knowing, speaking subject” (St. Pierre, 2011, p. 620), as well as beyond the idea that ‘knots’ and aporias can ever really be known.  

---

Knots and topological thinking can also be found in psychoanalysis. Lacan used topology and knots to describe the human subject, especially its psyche (Greenshields, 2017). Lacan argued that three overlapping rings make up the Borromean knot. These describe the enjoinment of three connected areas of the psyche called the
Transformation and instrumentalist approaches to education in environmental movements ought to stipulate the ontological assumptions imbedded in the removal of ‘knots’ and other curvatures and strange directionalities when representing transformation stories. Chaotic data has an educational force as it pushes researchers towards “accounting for all the different ways in which thought produces order out of chaos” (Colebrook, 2002, p. 80). What MacLure (2010) has called data that glow, that pulsate with affect, might be chaotic data that has not yet been reduced in their intensity. Such intensities “pulsate in the ensemble of life” and cause “a person to think, to write, to act” (Nordstrom, 2015, p. 187), as well as to sense.

The chaotic data presented above invites expanding the field of forces and speaks to that which is not reducible out of chaos. People who seem not to know, doubt, or appear incoherent are problematic subjects within environmental movement education, particularly if public pedagogy educational education efforts appear not to be effective on their mobilization. Logan’s talk consists of “a lot of things,” though not of certainty or coherence as he describes his “not knowing,” “not being an expert,” and “not being 100% confident.” This ‘not knowing’ of how to engage with the situation of oil pipelines and climate change alongside work demands and humans’ reliance on petroculture, operates in stark opposition to the belief and desirability of ‘knowing,’ exemplary in ENGOs’ campaigns. The excerpt from Logan’s talk shows how subjected is more than a subject as it consists of a plethora of

symbolic, the imaginary, and the real. He was particularly interested in what happened when one of the three rings broke so as to affect the other two and affect a patient/subject’s mental stability, including issues like phobias or anxiety (Greenshields, 2017). I was initially not aware of Lacan’s knots while writing this chapter; however I subsequently became aware of the use of topology in psychological approaches to subjectivity where I learned that there is a substantial difference in Lacan’s approach to subjectivity, topology, and knots to what I propose here. While Lacan focused on subjectivity primarily in reference to a psyche, I am focused on the more-than-human forces that inflect lines so as to produce folds as a process of subjectedification, not as a representation of the internal state of a psyche. In my work topological knots additionally function to depict multiplication to lines of inquiry, a kind of troubling rather than removal of ‘knots’ that functions against attempts to present ‘coherent’ data.
processes and forces: human and non-human that work together to produce the event of subjectivity, which is constantly reconfigured and refolded in its topology (more on this in Chapter Four).

Logan’s voice pulsates with an intensity of affects in two ways. First, the various forces that fold Logan are not significant because of what they represent, but impactful because of the way they “swarm” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 7). Deleuze and Guattari (1994) characterize chaos “less by the absence of determinations than by the infinite speed with which they take shape and vanish” (p. 42). Chaos refers to the speed at which the subject becomes, yet unravels, knows, yet resists knowledge. It illustrates the concurrent multiplicity of lines and folds operating on in subjectification. It is a density and speed of folds that exits before cuts are made to define the perception that there is any individual, autonomous subject.

It is helpful to think of the more-than-human as a virtuality that is intense in the multiplicity of forces that fold it, whether they are known or not. Deleuze and Guattari (1994) suggest that “this virtual appears first of all as a cloud or a fog, or even as a chaotic virtuality rather than the reality of an ordered event in the concept” (p. 160). It is only “the line of actuality [that] lays out a plane of reference that slices the chaos again” (p. 160). In other words, ENGOs’ attempts at ‘political subjectification’ involve making slices through a rich virtuality, organizing, or sieving through all that which seems chaotic and undecidable or, in other words, unpromising in realizing the potential of a ‘political subject.’ Transformative educational approaches might be envisioned as means to facilitating actualization of a ‘political subject’ as intended, and as individualized and autonomous, yet they risk collapsing that which is already multiple, as though they “merely collected and solidified the visual dust and the sonic echo of the battle raging above them. But, up above, the particular features have no
form and are neither bodies nor speaking persons” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 121). Visual dust and sonic echoes might otherwise be the uncollected residue or excess of the ‘political subject’ that a teleological storyline flattens or leaves behind, and that I am particularly drawn to.

Engaging with such visual dust and sonic echo, I present (k)not knowing as a radical deceleration that severs ‘knowing’ as a taken for granted dimension of thought and subjectification. Humanist voice becomes “troublesome material for research” (MacLure, 2009, p. 97) when it is treated as coming “from a subject who knows who she is, says what she means, and means what she says” (p. 104). Data that appears intrusive because they resist lines of familiar interpretation and subsequent representation in research, invite thought about why chaos is continuously ignored or suppressed and ‘controlled’ in learning environments. This includes the suppression of chaos in ENGOs’ interpretations of residents’ practices and actions, as well as suppression of chaos in research paradigms that depict stories of individuals who have become political without depicting the folds, snags, turns, and knots of that process, or if so, depicting them as folds that are ‘smoothed out’ or overcome [a very humanist orientation]. Where environmental educators might expect the intact and coherent self-engaging person on their pathway of conscientization, they find “chaos [as] a tangled bundle of aberrant lines” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 312). The concern in this dissertation is that ENGOs are reluctant to engage with that chaos in their public education campaigns because it ruptures the phantasm of political education (which is the focus of Chapter Six) that they instead prefer to sustain through busywork and the occupation of time through discourses of hope. Chaos shatters certainty as well as the phantasm of political education, showing how the knowing subject is never guaranteed to exist in the first place.
Knots add an interesting texture to fieldwork, especially as they are a diagrammatically useful tool with which to think about the virtual as that which has multiplicity of concurrent bifurcations of events simultaneously possible through layering. Knots create a “multidimensional effect, suggesting a layering precisely where Cartesian geometry would have imposed an intersection” (de Freitas, 2012, p. 595). As de Freitas (2012) points out, the knot points attention away from “concepts of measure and rigid transformation (like linear causal links) and focuses on the stretching and distortion of continuously connected lines and regions” (p. 596). The knot, as a key part of thinking with aporetic topologies, engages with the tendency for ‘subjectification’ itself, as concept, to be layered and stretched in new arrangements and arrangements-yet-to-come, and becomes a key mode of inquiry in non-representational thinking. Layers include thinking about the simultaneity of the Anthropocene, as the geological era instigated through humans’ impact on the earth, and more-than-human forces (e.g., geological and temporal ones) which direct attention away from the human, challenging an anthropocentric ‘agency’ to do anything about it. This ‘unknown’ of chaos is frequently ‘left out’ of inquiry. I speculate this is because it occurs under the auspices of ‘noise’ to teleological directionality. It is left unexamined and hence marked as ‘unknown,’ concurrently avoiding the productive ontological possibilities of that which is chaotic and can never be fully known and more generally of ‘not knowing.’ The fold of knowledge merges topologically with the fold of matter, which, as I describe in Chapter Four, is further directly related to the production of subjectivity in relation to the incapacity to know the oil-event.

Thinking with Aporetic Topologies of Un(knowing) Folds

In this chapter, I presented an aporetic topology that diagrammed complications to lines that collapse the space/times of political becoming through their chronologies and teleological
knowledge practices, including hypomnematic practices. I have shown that the topological dimension of thought in environmental movement education consists of a series of folds, including a) snags, where pursuits of knowledge rearrange the militaristic speed and certainty of knowledge practices b) turns, where we see a temporal space form through recursivity of educational attempts, and the role of memory and archives; and c) knots, which attest to layering and complexity, rather than removal of chaos. This fieldwork in textures, that is, this process of learning while doing fieldwork in/with/through the concept of ‘the fold,’ has produced twists and folds to knowledge, demonstrating that multiplication of diverging tendencies to knowledge can be productive in creating space for thinking about environmental movement education and the media practices through which it is engaged.

While I have presented only a few contortions to linear conceptions of how knowledge leads towards ‘political subjectification,’ I have tried to attune to richness—to let in some of the free and windy chaos in the act of writing. This comes at a time when, as Deleuze and Guattari (1994) argue, “a struggle against chaos seems to be an essential part of science” (p. 205), including the instrumentalization of environmental education. As such, this topology should be considered inexhaustible in its virtuality and in its memory. If this topology perhaps appears disjointed rather than smooth, it is because its various contortions play with offering an inefficient reading for the reader so as to perhaps delay the speedy conclusion of a transcendent and hopeful interpretation that is often sought in environmental and political education. In other words, it does not offer a topology as a solution, and instead invites dwelling in not knowing and geometric undecidability a little longer.

In the next chapter I continue fieldworking in texturology, this time thinking with folds to consider another type of topology—a material continuity between matter and geology—and how geology/matter/oil become *expressed* as enunciations of subjectivity through
media practices, such as commenting in news forums, documentary film productions, writing letters to editors, donating online, etc.). The next chapter argues for considering the materiality of oil and its expression in political subjectification as part of the same monist undulating fabric of the universe. Thinking with concept as method, the next chapter also engages with the problematic of how to inquire into an event that takes on multiple expressions, and that seems chaotic, bifurcating, and generally evading representations. To do this, I demonstrate how events, including research events, have multiple folds, unfold in multiple ways, or take on multiple expressions that are part of the same event, arguing that a feature of fieldwork in texturology is non-reductive inquiry and the capacity to hold difference, bifurcations, and multiplicity in the same space.
4. In the Fold of the Oil-Event

Oil is a chaotic and dark event. It is an event both geologically ancient and perpetually present. Oil is simultaneously the prolonged and recurring death-event that fossilized flora and fauna millions of years ago, and the accelerant of an automobile culture that suburbanized North America amidst a maze of highway construction. It is concomitantly spilt, fracked, pumped from oil rigs, lubricates 100,000 daily airplane flights, morphed into a blue plastic bottle cap undulating in the South Pacific garbage patch, becomes the object of 300,000 people preparing protest signs, and incites a hiker to lace up her brown leather boots to hike the Pacific Crest Trail in pursuit of respite. It inflects unknowing, indeterminacy, and shifting scales of time. The Big Bang, fossilization, accidents, peak oil, urgency, the Anthropocene, time left to appeal a pipeline decision—folds of the oil-event—emerge as problematic and erratic. Oil is a perpetual, ubiquitous, and unfolding event.

In this chapter, I discuss oil and its multiplicity, not only as a material substance, but as illustrated above, as an event. I demonstrate how the oil-event folds the subject, as a figure. The focus of the chapter is on the material fold, or “the material part of ourselves which is to be surrounded and enfolded” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 104)—one of the four folds identified in Deleuze’s framework of subjectification.23 I position the material fold in relation to ‘the event’ (Deleuze, 1993), and, in my study, the oil-event. Deleuze (1993) demonstrated how an event, always multiple, bifurcating and cacophonous, becomes *expressed* in/as, or folded into, a subjective form through prehensions, or senses, and not comprehensions, cognition,

23 The material I discuss in this chapter is oil, as it is the key focus of this research, and I am aware that other materials also comprise subjectification practices in environmental movements, but these lie outside of the scope of this work. I do discuss air, water, and aluminum in other published work (e.g., Piotrowski, 2019).
nor understandings, that try to ‘make sense of’ or ‘summarize’ the event. Deleuze (1993) stated:

the subjective form is the way by which the datum is expressed in the subject, or by which the subject actively prehends the datum (emotion, evaluation, project, conscience...). It is the form in which the datum is folded in the subject, a ‘feeling’ or manner. (p. 88, italics added)

Prehensions are links, pleats, or folds between events’ expressions of matter and subjectification. Prehension, a term Deleuze borrows from Alfred Whitehead, depicts the “multitude of heterogeneous ways in which an entity (a category that includes humans) is attached to, and emerges out of, the external world” (Michael, 2002, p. 367). Prehensions are hence the link to engaging with the different intensities of the oil-event. The event becomes folded or pleated into a subjective figure by way of a prehension, a process of ‘folding’ different expressions on the same topology into each other. The expansive event turns outside-in as though it were expressed in the form of a fold coming into place, a process that relates directly to subjectification.

I show how the oil-event produced anxieties of not knowing, as discussed in the previous chapter. As a result, the oil-event folds subjectivity through enunciations of media practices, specifically the media practices of residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas, including activity in online discussion forums, citizen science, documentary film production, filling out surveys online, encounters with campaigns, writing letters to editors, and reading and commenting on news online. As a material and chaotic event, oil and oil pipelines affect a problematic, namely an abundance of representations that attempt to articulate and ‘know’ what oil is and does, a problematic that appears to be ‘solved’ through ‘a subject’ coming into being through media practices that attempt to ‘make sense of’ or ‘summarize’ the event.

24 Prehension differs from comprehension (cognitively grasping, understanding), and apprehension (grasping ideas and developing emotional or moral judgement) (Michael, 2002).
I examine how residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas take pleasure in engaging in media production (in the form of documentary films, citizen science, online comments) about oil and oil pipelines. I show the material inscription practices and hypomnemata (Foucault, 1984) of residents living in oil pipeline conflict. Hypomnematic media practices are expressions of prehensions, attempts to reconcile or make sense of the event, and as such fold subjectivity, and produce subjectivity as another intensity of the event. These expressions and inscriptions become a ‘double articulation’ of matter and subjectivity, which Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discussed in their chapter ‘geology of morals.’ I subsequently show how participants’ enunciations were attempts to understand, make sense of, or summarize the oil event, in light of its abilities to be many things, a multiplicity, or what Deleuze (1993) would note as ‘chaos’ (p. 92). The incapacity to think ‘a whole’ of an event or to understand it in terms of unambiguous causes and solutions, places media practices and pursuits of ‘knowing’ into the realm of prehensions and pleasurable sensations of dealing with chaos that animates all sorts of knowledge practices, including the enjoyment of how to summarize the event, make a memory of it, to deal with its multiple intelligibilities, and ‘know it.’ In other words, knowledge practices taken up through a variety of different media practices work as multiple forms of seduction and pleasures, as in the pleasure to ‘learn,’ ‘understand,’ or ‘grasp’ the event, but that inevitably fail in the totality of ‘knowing’ the event. The cyclical aspect of these practices/failures perpetuates beliefs in the importance of more education, which I discuss in Chapter Six.

In this chapter, I turn to the event as a concept through which to focus on the ontology of ‘the subject,’ as an event. This orientation examines subjectification as an event, or more precisely as a ‘fold’ of the event—an inside of the outside—where the subject/event cease to be distinct parts. It allows me to focus on an ontological shift away from matter and ‘the
subject’ as distinct or separate entities, and towards positioning them as different intensities of the oil-event.

The event is not so much about ‘what happened’ at the moment of fossilization (if that is even understandable), but rather, the event is a way to discuss subjectification as both extension and intension of the oil-event, as a fold in/of that ongoing and persistent event that is multiple and occurs across multiple space/times (Deleuze, 1990/1995). My orientation to events takes a radically different direction to ‘the event’ than is often proposed in environmental communication literature, where it is analyzed in terms of a temporary and distinct human-made ‘moment’ or ‘a happening’ and particularly as a ‘media event’ or ‘image event’ (e.g., DeLuca 1999; DeLuca & Peeples, 2002; McHendry, 2012; Yang, 2016). Uptakes of events in this formulation draw attention to activists’ wishes to attract media attention (e.g., activists staging a protest to attract attention), or the media attention that ensues due to activism or other media practices (attention due to the release of an environmental documentary or show, for instance). The term ‘event,’ as I use it here, draws on Deleuze’s (1993) concept of ‘the event’ as a way to speak to a methodological shift, or a shift in thinking about ‘things’ not as entities, but as ‘events’ that are temporally and spatially dispersed, multiple, and often incomprehensible to human thought.

Material events are extensive and intensive as they ‘stretch’ over multiple instances and also become intense, folded, and actualized, retaining their concurrently multiple and singular character. For instance, Deleuze (1993) noted that “matter generally always tends to unfold its pleats at great length, in extension” (Deleuze 1993, p. 141) and not through a single event, but through manifold events over time and across space. In other words, many instances of subjectification/folds become “jets of singularities” (p. 53), intensities and actualizations of one and the same event.
Much like Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) *Geology of Morals*, I propose a geology of the subject that emerges through a myriad of material folds. Tar is physically pressed, expressed, fracked, and converted to oil, but is also concurrently morphed and expressed into prehensions, enunciations, and layering of subjectivity. In other words, I am not speaking about the geology of the human (bacteria, elements, biochemical makeup), or subjects’ emergence through inscriptions in geological strata, such as, for example, through rock art (Yusoff, 2015), but about the oil-event as geology that functions as a ‘double articulation’ in both matter and expression through media practices. Geology is doubly articulated (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) in content and expression across the event, where oil is both the sedimented material content and its expression in an oil spill, as plastic, or as a subjective figure. As part of such monist continuity between contents and expressions, the oil-event becomes *expressed* in a geology of the subject that emerges as a fold in its material morphology and that far exceeds the confines of any humanist ontology.

A geology of the subject, then, is performed through media practices, and my turn to the oil-event is based on observations of media and data practices of participants in the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan oil pipeline conflicts attempting to make sense of the often confounding event of oil. Deleuze (1993) argued that “folded forms are styles or manners. We go from matter to manner; from earth and ground to habitats and salons” (p. 40). Oil affects habits of thought that emerge first from sense (prehension), and subsequently manners that attempt comprehension, but never begin in understanding. Deleuze (1993) showed how the “individual is a ‘concrescence’ of elements” (p. 88) and specifically a swarming of sense or prehension (as opposed to comprehension) of matter that, interestingly, “somehow anticipate[s] psychic life” (p. 88). Subjectification is a fold in the oil-event, and I demonstrate this
by showing several examples how this took place as various forms of hypomnemata, including uses of online news and social media, forms of ‘citizen science,’ and filmmaking, and that are double articulations of both the oil-event and the folds of subjectivity.

My discussion however begins first with a turn to the event (Deleuze, 1993) and Foucault’s (1994) eventalization, which I introduce as important to my modes of inquiry and fieldwork in textures. The event becomes a way to engage with multiple yet unsummarizable instances of the same process, including the process of inquiry, as event. In other words, the event becomes a way to resist ‘summarizing’ bifurcations of research and the multiple media practices I encountered, and a way to work with events as plural and appearing as many folds, rather than identifying what ‘caused them.’ I also turn to the event to argue for a ‘geology of subjectification’—a fold of the oil-event, and particularly its relation to problems of thought, thinking, and prehending. In the second part of the chapter I focus on the relation between the geology of the subject as concurrently emergent through a double articulation of hypomnematic media practices related to dealing with oil’s multiplicity through enunciations of subjectivity. Here I focus on my participants’ attempts at making sense of the event and their inscription of ‘memory’ which produced the second fold in its attempt to organize, understand, and locate prehensions of the oil-event. Grasping, analyzing, expressing and making oil intelligible, are some of the ways in which oil enfolds subjectivity—its double articulation—by becoming expressed in the figure of ‘the subject’ as a way of dealing with the event’s ‘chaotic’ character (Deleuze, 1993). My engagement with Deleuze’s treatment of Whitehead’s event also provides another, different, orientation to thinking about ‘matter’ than is currently being taken up in new materialism literature. New materialism is a broad term to describe a reimagined, post-Anthropocentric and post-Marxist orientation to thinking about material vitality and agency. Deleuze’s ‘event’ has not yet been used to describe the
ontological relation between non-human matters, humans, and discourse production practices, in favour of terms such as intra-action (Barad, 2007), viscous porosity (Tuana, 2008), vibrant matter (Bennett, 2010), and trans-corporeality (Alaimo, 2016). While these concepts have been invaluable for thinking about the entanglement of humans with the non-human world, I work with ‘the event’ for a specific reason: I wanted to focus on the relation between human and non-human ontological continuity in relation to chaos and the limits of thought. In the next part of this chapter, I explain how thinking with events functions, and how it helps set up an approach to examining a geology of the subject in relation to a chaotic outside.

**Evental Folds**

Events function through extension and intension, where they are cacophonous and operating across multiple temporalities and spaces, and where they become singularized and actualized in a subjective form (Deleuze, 1993). The subject cannot be reduced to either the specific fold-event, or the overarching event of which it is a part, but comprises both at once (Deleuze, 1993). In Deleuze’s (1969/1990) words, the approach here is to “remove essences and to substitute events in their place” (p. 53). Here, the event is not so much about a ‘happening’ as there is no precise moment of the event (Patton, 1991). Inquiry into subjectification hence shifts from a focus on ‘being’ or ‘essence’ and toward an examination of how it functions as an event that proliferates and is distributed across multiple sites and bifurcations, and how such a proliferation becomes actualized in relation to practices that sense, and consequently try to make sense of the chaos. One way of thinking about the event’s multiplicity, is that it functions in the infinitive. Deleuze (1969/1990) provides the example of a “ideal
event”: ‘greening’ or ‘to green,’ which can, could, and has occurred multiple times in its actualization in a specific event of a tree turning green on a given year (p. 21). Each time a tree turns green, it is part of the event ‘to green,’ yet none of the trees can be claimed to represent the event.

Events therefore “communicate in one and the same Event which endlessly redistributes them” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 53). Event-thinking drifts away from an acute focus on causality or intentionality of an event, towards a “pluralization of causes” (Foucault, 1994, p. 249). For Foucault (1994), event-thinking or eventalization, functions as a mode of inquiry that constructs “around the singular event analyzed as process a ‘polygon’ or, rather, ‘polyhedron’ of intelligibility”’ (p. 249). Eventalization advances a modal transformation of ontology from ‘being’ to an ‘event’ occurring across multiple manifestations, and through multiple processes that are part of the same event, similarly to the way in which each chapter of this dissertation attempts to give subjectification a [new] event. Here, the subjective form is distributed across both the event and specific instances of subjectivity, both as extension and intension. Specifically, this distribution occurs through evental folds, a term that I propose expresses the monist and topological movement between a virtual event and its many actualizations, well as between the matter of the event, and its expressions in subjective forms, and here particularly, in media practices. These media practices, I argue, are related to the limits of thought, thinking, knowledge, and knowing.

The chaotic event, oil, stretches itself over (extension) all elements, and its multiplicity becomes folded through sense—a personal mood—that folds oil’s chaos. The subjective form appears as an outcome, or a product ofprehension. Thinking with events produces a new orientation in thinking about subjectification in relation to its production as/with/through
matter, yet in the context of questions of thought and (non) representation. Payne (2016) describes how environmental education needs to contend with such a material world that is virtual in the sense of being inaccessible to human thought:

The ‘real’ is far more expansive and extensive than human consciousness and its languages…and this problem of correlationism is further exacerbated when, as we are prone to do in environmental education, the non-anthropocentrism of ‘Nature,’ the nonhuman, more-than-human or other-than human and their ‘environments,’ are, invariably, inaccessible and affectively ‘non-representational,’ be they in policy, curriculum, pedagogical and research makings. (p. 171)

Event-thinking, particularly with evental folds, assists me in engaging with temporally and materially dispersed process-based, and fold-based ontologies that occur in multiple, often discordant sites and multiple processes of intelligibility (Foucault, 1994) that are profoundly non-representational. My aim for the rest of this chapter then, is to focus on theprehensions that the oil-event produced, and specifically how and when this event folds subjectivity to create singular expressions of itself in a more-than-representational figure.

Geology of the Subject

Folds of winds, of waters, of fire and earth, and subterranean folds of veins of ore in a mine. In a system of complex interactions, the solid pleats of ‘natural geography’ refer to the effect first of fire, and then of waters and winds on the earth; and the veins of metal in mines resemble the curves of conical forms, sometimes ending in a circle or an ellipse, sometimes stretching into a hyperbola or a parabola. The model for the sciences of matter is the ‘origami,’ as the Japanese philosopher might say, or the art of folding paper. (Deleuze, 1993, pp. 6-7)

The idea that the same event occurs via various, multiple, and concurrent folds, speaks to the ability of an event to be expressed not just once, but as a texture – something that is folded in multiple ways. I use evental folds to consider how matter, and in this case, oil, constitutes an
ongoing event consisting of many folds of subjectification. Here, ‘subjects’ are not entities or beings; “not things or facts, but events” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 5), and there are “event-type individuations where there’s no subject: a wind, an atmosphere” (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 115). This curious bridging of the elemental and the evental in Deleuze’s work opens up space to not only conceptualize the classical elements in terms of ‘events’ that are inherently multiple or can be many things at once, but also to consider how subjectification appears as a fold in/of material events, such as the oil-event.

Deleuze (1993) asserts that there is no ontological difference between matter and subjects, as “the fold is always between two folds, and because the between-two-folds seems to move about everywhere: Is it between inorganic bodies and organisms, between organisms and animal souls” (p. 13). Put differently, geology, strata, etc. are not metaphors to think about social strata—they are of the same composition, although they differ in intensity which gets redistributed through the fold. Subjectification in environmental movements hence forms not only in relation to matter (and material/environmental conflict), but of matter, as though a subject was a fold of a crumpled paper, an origami figure, or one of the manifolds or pleats in geological strata. A geology of the subject emerges from oil’s double articulation in content and in form, in the particles and formations of rock strata, and particles and formations of a figure or subjectification, both emerging constantly anew.

Deleuze (1968/1994) noted how thought follows from affect or sense—prehensions—especially the sense that emerges from being folded from a more-than-representational, saturated, multifarious matter:

Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental encounter...It may be grasped in a range of affective tones: wonder, love, hatred, suffering. In whichever tone, its primary characteristic is that it can only be sensed. (p. 139)
If ‘something in the world forces us to think,’ the effect on thought is not direct but appears in affective encounters with the elements in the form of sense, rather than direct effect or recognition. ‘What forces us to think’ is also not necessarily matter’s direct force, but matter’s evental distribution. This ‘something’ that forces us to think is, as Deleuze (1985/1989) describes, “the inexistence of a whole which could be thought” (p. 168). Thacker (2012) notes how oil becomes that which can only be intuited by humans: “the unhuman is not even known indirectly—and yet it is still intuited, still thought, but only via a thought that has been stripped of all its attributes. What is thought is only this absolute inaccessibility” (p. 179). Here, as oil confounds in its multiplicity and extensive reach which cannot be held in a harmonious composition, it appears chaotic and problematic and affects prehensions. The emergence of subjectivity forms out of the ‘doubling’ of an outside that cannot be thought, on the inside. The prospective of an unthought, or conversely a ‘polyhedron of intelligibility’ through sense (wonder, love, hatred, suffering), which may emerge as echoes, reflections, prismatic deformations, perspectives, and thresholds (Deleuze, 1993), function as anticipations of a sense of a subject. Subsequently, prehensions are taken up in a variety of hypomnemata, or projects that attempt intelligibility, through which oil appears in a ‘subjective’ form.

Oil became articulated as something more expansive and multiple in scope than the Enbridge or Kinder Morgan oil pipeline debates. One example shows how subjectification emerged from sensations of a polyhedron of the oil-event that coalesced in a subjective figure. For instance, oil produced sensations of place, engagements with the history of oil spills, previous political work, echoes of earlier oil disasters and engagements in activism, and sensations of the Great Bear Rainforest:

I love wilderness. I’ve not been up to the Great Bear Forest or around that region, but I can feel it in existence. And I have for a long time been very
adamant against fossil fuel energy and the disasters that spilled oil—on land but mostly on water—the devastation that they can cause, and the pollution that this created. It’s not so much a definite thing that made me say ‘no way’ to Enbridge, it was like an accumulation. (Kirstin)

The oil-event folds to produce a subject that appears as a prismatic texture—dispersed, a-causal, with multiple angles. ‘Accumulation’ denotes how subjectivity apprehended the multiple instantiations of geological forces. Rather than rational reflection of causality or chronology, sense emerges from oil-event’s ongoing bifurcations and possible re-eventalization of the oil-event in the future (what oil could do). Oil’s ubiquity and ability to proliferate across material sites and temporalities as well as the symbolic spaces of the Great Bear Rainforest, previous oil spill sites, and morphing into different forms (pollution), also produces prismatic deformations about subjectivity in which singular articulations of the oil-event tend to recur (Patton, 1991), though they will take on different forms and shapes in each instance.

Events can therefore take on various iterations of inflections or folds. Inflection of the fold begins with the intense proliferating difference in material intensity which gets pleated into a subjective figure, or singular expression of the event, by way of different types of ‘folds.’ Events expressed as singularities appear as “turning points and points of inflection” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 52), or folds, such as for example: “bottlenecks, knots, foyers, and centers; points of fusion, condensation, and boiling, points of tears and joy, sickness and health, hope and anxiety, ‘sensitive’ points” (p. 52). These ‘feelings’ are not possessions of specific individuals and are more like non-personal affect, rather than feelings. Knots, for example, which I described in Chapter Three, are folds of the event that are intense and condensed, and that stretch in non-directional, non-teleological ways in terms of how to deal with this chaos, while foyers are a type of temporal fold in which a subjective form emerges in spaces of waiting, related to problems of how to wait for oil pipeline decisions and the sense of anticipation, particularly of the Anthropocene, as described in Chapter Six.
Geomnemata as Media Practices in the Anthropocene

How might one think about the different and multiple instances of personal media practices, more broadly in the Anthropocene? For instance, a self-identified Northern journalist set up his own website to document the dissatisfaction with ‘southern’ journalists from Metro Vancouver and ones from Alberta, which he argued ‘parachute’ into the ‘North’ and fail to understand, describe, and document the culture of Northern oil pipeline resistance. A computer programmer tracked shifting public opinion by examining online news comments on a daily basis. Residents of Metro Vancouver wrote letters to editors of various news outlets when they felt that journalists underestimated the effect the oil pipelines could have on their communities. A streamkeeper waded into a local stream to document salmon counts and silt run-off in a morphing local watershed. A cyclist in Vancouver began to create an archive of all the online petitions he had signed. A long-time activist in Metro Vancouver wrote letters to Kinder Morgan to contribute to the public record of oil pipeline resistance and dispute the oil pipeline company’s version of the event. Two different residents of Metro Vancouver embarked on kayak and canoe expeditions up BC’s Strait of Georgia to document and directly grasp the sense of difficulty of the oil tanker routes, that is, to find themselves within the event. Surfers travelled to ride the waves of the coast of the Great Bear Rainforest threatened by Enbridge, capturing it all on film.

Media practices such as the ones above, and which I encountered in my fieldwork, are expressions or enunciations of prehensions and attempts to make sense of and inscribe the oil-event. Media practices are in this sense mnemonic devices, or hypomnemata (Foucault, 1984) or modes of establishing the event in memory, even explicitly as part of the ‘public record,’ or producing memory as a way of being folded in the event. Foucault’s (1984) con-
cept of hypomnemata which I introduced in Chapter Three, identifies the importance between material mnemonic inscription practices and formation of subjectivity in relation to affect, particularly affect related to some sort of ‘defect’ or problematic. Foucault (1984) named a variety of mnemonic inscription practices as modes of subjectification that were beyond autopoesis, and that aimed at inscriptions of subjectivity in relation to a sense of a problematic. Hypomnemata were material inscription practices through which one synthesized what one saw or read. These included books, public registers, and individual notebooks serving as material inscriptions:

They constituted a material memory of things read, heard, or thought, thus offering these as an accumulated treasure for rereading and later meditation. They also formed a raw material for the writing of more systematic treatises in which were given arguments and means by which to struggle against some defect (such as anger, envy, gossip, flattery). (p. 364)

Material inscription devices become modes of struggling and sensing events, and of ‘summarizing’ them, while being produced as a subject through those very acts of collecting or inscribing what one hears, sees, or encounters. These practices, extended for the Anthropocene, include other modes of inscription and media practices that function as modes of establishing memory, and not only accessing it, which includes amongst other things, citizen science, participation in online commenting on news stories, comparative photographs that depict before and after landscapes of receding glaciers, and writing letters to editors demonstrating opposition to resource extraction or pipeline projects. Folding becomes a “memory of the outside” (Boundas, 2005, p. 275) as hypomnemata function as inscription practices with which to archive one’s encounter with matter, while concurrently being expressed as a subject, as a fold of the oil-event. Perhaps productions of memory become means for subjects to surround themselves with folds of memory, even though such action is but a product of material forces, rather than of intentionality.
As hypomnemata relate to practices of the geological subject, I suggest they be termed *geomnemata*. *Geomnemata* transpose and expand hypomnemata (Foucault, 1984) inside the Anthropocene as material inscription practices that function as modes of sensing and hence attempting to summarize events, as a practice of being folded into a subjective form by geological events as chaotic, multiple, and proliferating. Much like hypomnemata, geomnemata do not serve predominantly as communicative acts intended to transfer meaning to others, even if they do so consequentially. That is, my analysis of geomnemata positions them as modalities for being produced as a material subject through practical participation in the oil-event. In addition, my analysis of geomnemata is produced in light of constituting hypomnemata/the self as ‘solutions’ to the sensation of a ‘problem,’ namely sensations of an absence of a ‘whole,’ and of an uncertainty of the geological event in its pandemonic affects. In other words, geomnematic practices and subsequent outputs (e.g., personal donation archives, letters, video recordings) do not ‘represent’ the event; instead they are media practices that facilitate evental folds. The practices of geomnemata continue to actualize the event, while concurrently bending it and expresses it in a fold/subject figure. Geomnemata serve as personal technologies of engaging and rearranging a chaotic material world, its pandemonium of affects, and the resulting ‘not knowing’ and ‘unthought’ of what is and what is to come. In this sense, geomnemata might be considered what Thacker (2014) has called a type of dark media (Thacker, 2014), which mediate not between point A and B, but between the inhuman and human, or that which “we are normally ‘in the dark about’” (p. 85). Dark media, defined by Thacker as “the mediation of that which cannot be mediated” (p. 107) become communicative expression of the failures of representation and the inability to mediate oil, as an event, to ourselves and between ourselves. Most of all dark media consider oil as dead media, understood in media archeology as a kind of material that has exhausted its use,
that has been exhausted (there is no more left), and that which transform into obsolete or even deadly (toxic) materials (Hertz & Parikka, 2012) such as discarded piles of plastics and the inheritance of CO2 emissions). Geomnemata become a way for the event to mediate only itself, or express itself, in the form of a subject.

As an object of ENGOs’ public pedagogy campaigns, the accelerant of petroculture, the gushing goo of the Kalamazoo oil spill, the fuel of one’s work, the reason for being out of work, an object of fear, and a subject of force, the oil-event is prehended through, or folded into geomnemata as figurations or articulations of an inside of an outside to the cacophonous geological events. Citizen science, for example, involves data generation and is a mode of material inscription and documentation—an environmental archive of habitat transformation and changes to flora and fauna that often serve comparative purposes. Science is in perpetual struggle against chaos (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994) and data generation through grassroots citizen science becomes a tool, or an instillation of memory of a changing biome through which to encounter the event, to emerge as a subject within the event, particularly within a multiplicity of other ways (advertising, ENGO campaigns, government statements) that the event is being inscribed or attempted to be made meaningful. Streamkeeping is an example of citizen science, a specific form of taking care of streams and their inhabitants as part of watershed conservation, which involves documentation such as checking water levels, silt runoff, and salmon populations. These practices, in which several residents in oil pipeline conflicts in the Vancouver Lower Mainland were involved, became not only modalities of environmental record keeping, but subjective intensities of the modes of the event unfolding and refolding. Streamkeeping, and other forms of citizen science become archives and practices of inscription that attempt to grasp, make sense of, and feel one’s enunciation as a fold in the oil-event.
A lot of people have jumped on board [with ENGOs against the oil pipelines]. They don’t know the facts. They don’t do the research. They’re easily persuaded through the sensationalization of the media. They don’t understand economics. What I try to do is influence to make the world a better place through my stream keeping. Right now, we’re doing salmon counts. People walk along the creek [and] they will actually count the number of returning fish. I do water sample tests every day, from runoff from [local mountain]. That’s the one that has salt pollution. I also do a runoff [count] from a covered creek, where the creek was covered over when a [building] complex was done. I love to catch fish. I love to give fish to the neighbours, and part of my way of giving back to nature is to be involved in salmon’s future by looking after streams. (Tim)

Geomnemata function at the pragmatic level, of being able to declare practices of material ‘inscription’ as personal projects that grapple with the unease of a ‘sense’ of chaos that others are feeling regarding the oil-event, and perhaps how ‘sense’ can easily become susceptible to manipulation and totalization of corporate advertising, or ENGO campaigns. Inscriptions in the form of geomnemata become practices of not only documenting the changing geology of the earth (e.g., shifts to silt deposits, water levels, death of fauna), but become accumulated material inscriptions through whose very act (cataloguing, measuring, photographing, understanding, tracking, making sense) subjectification is constituted through senses of the oil-event as problematic. My focus here is more on the practice of geomnemata as techniques of dealing with material ‘sensings’ than on any content that the artifacts are implied to retain.

Geomnemata, or geological memory, are doubly articulated in sedimentation, fossilization, and geological strata, and as the geology of the subject, through the way different prehensions accure and contribute to the event and future prehensions. I therefore suggest that geology refers both to the way in which oil’s ongoing and creative excavation (hydraulic fracking, blowouts, well drilling, offshore drilling) affects ever new and unexpected bifurcations in the oil-event and to the expressions of subjectification, and their recursive layering, folding, refolding, and hence sedimenting of ‘problems’ and ‘solutions’ (Webb, 2014) to how
to engage with such geological, and hence economic, social, psychological and macropolitical chaos. For instance, returning to the example of streamkeeping as a form of citizen-science, the event folds and comes to be expressed in Tim’s data collection practices in streams. Streamkeeping becomes ‘doubly articulated’ in expression and content. Streamkeeping, or taking care of streams, becomes an expression of subjectivity as a fold in the oil-event, and yet it also becomes a public output, or a declarative statement through which Tim relates to the event, and concurrently ‘evaluates’ arguably ‘less-useful’ modes of being a part of the event, or being political, such as engaging with ENGO public pedagogy campaigns.

Prehensions of the oil-event are continuously folded and refolded, and are “public and private, potential and real, participating in the becoming of another event and the subject of its own becoming” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 88). Each subjectification, or each actualization of the oil-event contributes to its possible future bifurcations and contributing to the geology of the subject (e.g., film screenings, public education workshops, personal online conversations). A geoarcheology of the subject can diagram why or how certain ideas about what subjectivity is expected to be/do with regards to geological events, can take on on different durations and temporalities, recursions or resuscitations. In other words, a geoarcheology can map how certain expressions of the ‘political subject’ last longer than others, have thicker strata than others, or start to fracture, denude, or bend and fold into each other.

Geomnemata also operate at a very pragmatic level, as the geological layers that track one’s political memory, as discussed, for example, by one person involved in the Kinder Morgan oil pipeline conflict:

I have a very huge folder of all the causes, the ‘thank you causes,’ and I store them in a folder. So you get ‘Thank you for filling out this survey’ and it’s over three or four years old, this folder, and it’s so big. It’s to kind of track to what I’ve said ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to. (Cruz)
Tracking one’s online activities becomes a mode to contain the oil-event and its bifurcations over the years in a geomnemetic archive that can be used to refer to the event’s strata, a practice that accrues in a sensation of subjectification. Whereas it is impossible to track the infinitesimal expressions of the oil-event (its chaos), it does become possible to emerge as a fold of the event, a sense of individuation, through modes and devices that sieve, appear to create and connect points in a digital memory that expresses the event.

Media archeology (Parikka, 2015b) understood as a tracing of the geological and elemental foundations of media and technology, can become extended to an archeology of geomnemata, or the archeology of media practices related to material politics, or matter. This is not to be mistaken, as Parikka (2015b) warns, with an archeology of discursive statements. Instead, archeology of geomnemata constitutes inquiry into the distributions of media practices across a diachronous geological event, such as the oil-event. Put differently, an archeology of geomnemata maps the stratification, folds, and recursions of types of media practices (and not necessarily ‘texts’ or discourses as their outputs) and the geological materials they are continuous with, for example, aluminum, or silicon, as well as how these practices constitute different types of subjectivities.

The event positions subjectification as part of a topological geo-ontological surface that includes on the same continuum, oil as “age-old media of nature” (Parikka, 2011, p. 35) and algorithmic media practices using digital technologies. This topological extension is important. Media archeology scholars have shown the absurdity of thinking about ‘media’ without evoking the material that enables the existence of technology, from the tantalum in iPhones, to the water used to cool data centres on which the Internet runs (Hogan, 2015), to the arsenic used in semiconductors used in digital devices in the film industry (Cubitt, 2015).
Similarly, not only are technologies material, but so are media practices. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) note how alloplastic or anthropomorphic strata emerge not from human ingenuity, but as distributions, or folds in the material event:

What some call the properties of human beings—technology and language, tool and symbol, free hand and supple larynx, ‘gesture and speech’—are in fact properties of this new distribution. It would be difficult to maintain that the emergence of human beings marked the absolute origin of this distribution. (p. 60)

The fold acts as the mechanism that distributes matter across the event and its continuum of intensities. The oil-event likewise emerges not only as ‘oil’ and ‘oil pipelines’ as objects to be resisted, but also interesting bifurcations of media practices that produce subjectivities.

**Oil and the Pleasures and Desires of Geomnemata**

Visualization, datafication, writing, sign making, archiving geological memory, etc., are produced pleasurably, especially as modes of emerging as ‘subjects’ in relation to the chaos and chaotic affects that these practices try to grasp or ‘make sense of.’ In this section, I show how hypomnemata, or, as I have suggested, *geomnemata*, are pleasurable and seductive educational practices. People living in Northern and Southern BC often noted the pleasurable aspect of producing and engaging with geomnemata in light of the oil-event’s chaos. As inscription practices, geomnemata relate directly to managing and responding to sensation of chaos, and as such a sense of becoming constituted as a subject. Pleasure’s coincidental emergence with subjectification depicts how oil manifested through sensation of satisfaction, as participants expressed joy at being produced as ‘political subjects’ through the event of oil. These pleasures were related to taking part in sensing the event of oil, sensing it as multiple, chaotic, and hence problematic, and ‘grasping it’ while contributing to the production of information about the oil pipelines, as an enactment of being enfolded by oil.
For example, Viktor, a self-described outdoors recreation enthusiast and ‘news junkie’ from Metro Vancouver noted the pleasure of emerging in the event of oil and of engaging media practices such as monitoring online news for oil pipeline information and debating it with others: from grasping and becoming informed about the Northern Gateway pipeline project, and the sadness that overcame him when he sensed the that the oil pipeline would not be built:

*I love* discussing these issues. *I love* identifying what is not necessarily of paramount concern as opposed to what is. I have a lot of conversations. I have friends involved in policy. And I read. I’ve got news alerts coming my way from—you know, I must have about 12 Google alerts coming up just regarding pipeline issues and environmental issues. It’s become *such a passion* for me that *I almost was sad* once I felt it was finally defeated. I would get up in the morning and hop on the computer to read the latest articles and, you know, respond to comments and stuff. Often what I’m more interested in than the news article is the comments because it tells me where the Overton window is at any given time. I mentioned that some people attend rallies and stuff, well I post to the comments sections and I have conversations all the time online. (Viktor)

Sense takes on an incorporeal dimension, in which the subject emerges from sense folding the event. The emergence of a sense of singularity corresponds to a sense of multiple intelligibilities of the oil-event that are rendered problematic. When events are expressed in the form of a subject, this process is accompanied by pleasure that appears during the emergence and formation of subjectivity. Deleuze (1993) noted how pleasure is produced in the prehension of the event through which the subjectification takes place in chaos:

satisfaction as a final phase, as self-enjoyment, marks the way by which the subject is filled with itself and attains a richer and richer private life, when prehension is filled with its own data… this becoming is not completed without the sum of perceptions tending to be integrated in a great pleasure, a Satisfaction with which the monad fills itself when it expresses the world, a musical Joy of contracting its vibrations, of calculating them without knowing their harmonics or of drawing force enough to go further and further ahead in order to produce something new. (p. 89)
The oil-event is taken up pleasurably as people take pleasure in being produced by and within it. Put differently, ‘the subject’ forms from the swarming sense of pleasure in emerging as a fold in the event, a pleasure that is accompanied by sensing the event as problematic, and subsequently by sensing ‘their’ political self coming into being through a project of intelligibility, the inscription of statements, data, and meaning, or as Deleuze describes above: “calculating it.”

The oil-event might be considered a “mathematical monster”: a continuous and topological entity that is simultaneously fractal and organized in its own logics, but jagged and bifurcating, making it unruly to human calculation, such as a snowflake (de Freitas, 2016b). As a mathematical monster, the oil-event becomes folded within the emergence of a subjective form of a calculating subject. The monstrous oil-event’s plural character enfolds and is doubled as a subject’s practices (data collection, inscription of oneself online, instillation of memories etc.), or as ways of dealing with both the geology of the subject and the event as prismatic, mathematical, and computational. Hence, Viktor’s pleasure in calculating the Overton Window of online news comments about the oil pipeline conflict, functions as the pleasure of summarizing the event and its double geological articulation under ‘a unity’ and giving meaning to the unfolding of an ancient, tumultuous event that foliates under many expressions (political, geological, economic, social, cultural). Pleasure and subjectivity emerge simultaneously through such projects of comprehension and manifest within projects related to constituting subjectivity, particularly within events that are transformative, vital, and beyond human control. There appears to be a sense of interiorization, a delusion of becoming a ‘self’ or a subject through these efforts. For instance, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argued that pleasure is “an affection of a person or a subject, a way for people to ‘find themselves’ in the process of desire that exceeds them” (p. 156). In other words, pleasure is a means for a
“subject to ‘find themselves again’ in a process which overwhelms them” (Deleuze, 1997b, unpaginated). The event of oil might be said to affect a problematic that is ‘solved’ through the event of a subject/pleasure coming into being through sense, thought, and geomnemata. As the oil-event becomes more and more linked to unstable thresholds of life/death in rapidly deteriorating material conditions (draught, stronger heatwaves, etc.), productions of geomnemata are only likely to intensify. Geomnematic practices may become more strongly correlated to a devising a sense of ‘self’ as a solution or way of orienting to the event, even as a nominal one. However, intensified geomnematic media practices may ultimately cease to be a source of much of that pleasure as the eco-Apocalypse accelerates beyond thresholds between life/death.

Similarly, the example of Tim’s streamkeeping given earlier as a form of data production functions to mathematically calculate a course of action within a concoction of persuasive efforts of oil pipeline corporations, ENGOs, governments, activists, and neighbours to define what ‘political subjectification’ might look like. Since science is in perpetual struggle against chaos (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994), data generation through grassroots citizen science becomes a tool, or an instillation of data about a changing biome, through which to encounter oil, to emerge as a subject by way of an evental fold in the event-oil and particularly within a multiplicity of other ways (advertising, ENGO campaigns, government statements) that the event is being inscribed or attempted to be made meaningful.

Such pleasure functions in contrast to the concept of desire (Deleuze, 1997b). While I do not focus specifically on Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of desire in this chapter, it is important to highlight that for Deleuze (1997b) pleasure and the focus on individuation as source of pleasure undermine the revolutionary force of the flows of desire that is pre-personal and functions in more-than-human singularizations. Desire becomes the unlimited
postponement of the event from being summarized as a unity, while pleasure is the individualized act—‘a subject’ that is produced as a craving of individuation in light of this chaos. While pleasure speaks to the concurrent emergence of sense/subject as an expression of a material, geological event like oil, desire helps to articulate how such pleasure functions beyond human individuation or ‘emotion,’ and as a result of the connections of what Guattari (1989/2000) called ecosophy, where affect flows between and folds material, psychological, and social realms. What I argue here is that pleasure erroneously highlights human individuation cotangent with media practices as modes of problem-solving, ‘giving voice,’ critical thinking, ‘knowing more,’ or helping others ‘know.’ Desire becomes an inquiry into geogramming affective flows from matter to the production of subjectivity that is a fold of the material event, not a separate entity. In ‘summarizing’ the event through geomnemata, a sense of pleasure of subjectification emerges, yet such sensation of individuation is but a fold, a distinctness in the shape of a fold of/in the event, rather than actual individuation.

de Freitas (2016) argues that any sense of distinctness are twists and folds of a shifting fabric:

distinctness is no longer that which separates and cuts off one individual or object from another, but refers rather to a particular fold or twist in the undulating fabric of the universe. Processes of individuation, by which identities and subjects and institutions come into being, are not acts of disconnection or separation, where by the one is cut off from the rest, but are continuous topological folds of the whole. (p. 225)

Such a shifting fabric without rupture, extended to geology and, in this case oil, functions as an event that distributes oil across many folds, twists, wrinkles and pleats of its topological surface. Matter is inseparable as an object from ‘the subject,’ and rather, each are a variation or modulation of each other (Fraser, 2006). Grasping,prehending, or sensing oil are not the result of an autonomous subject, but an ‘outside’ doubling or folding—one of the folds of multiple evental folds. Viktor’s love, passion, and sadness of engaging with oil debates
through digital technology do not ‘belong’ to ‘him’ but appear as a prehension, or expressive articulation of the material event. In other words, they are not personal, but rather “pre-individual, non-personal, and a-conceptual” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 52). Such pre-personal affects characterize ‘subjects’ as distributed within or throughout the event.

This approach to understanding pleasure in relation to subjectification in environmental movements is very different to how pleasure has been thought about in ecological thought that attempts to position human/non-human entanglements at the centre of post-human approaches to ontologies. My understanding of pleasure is that it emerges in the process of folding, when the chaotic force of the oil-event is folded in a singularity that simultaneously is expressed through attempts to summarize its multiple embodiments and engage with it. Such an approach offers a different take on how pleasure is being currently theorized in ecological thought, especially at the intersections of ontology/matter/ ecology, which has been devoid of the topic of pleasure (Alaimo, 2016). More recently, however, eating organic food, urban beekeeping, gardening, or other do-it-yourself manifestations of environmentalism are rekindling interest in the idea that more-than-human ontologies might be characterized through registers of playfulness and pleasure. Stacy Alaimo (2016) defines such pleasure as an important aspects of material engagements and more-than-human ontologies: “Connection, interrelation, and intersubjectivity are the ontological conditions from which new delights and new ethics emerge. Pleasure spirals through these ethical ontologies that are unmistakably material rather than abstract, disembodied principles” (p. 26). For Alaimo (2016), pleasure enfolds more-than-human ontologies especially as humans cultivate “forms of kinship and interconnection with nonhuman nature” (p. 30). She has argued for a turn to the role of pleasure in more-than-human ontologies, in which she envisions humans taking an ethical role in creating space for animal pleasures and capacities within cityscapes and urban
enclosures that too often infringe on animal habitats. In this direction, Alaimo suggested a trans-corporeal understanding of intra-penetration between humans and non-humans, exemplified by the flow of toxins within human bodies, or human-formed plastics in the oceans, arguing for a renewal of trans-corporeality based on pleasure that moves between humans, and animals and other materials in a way that accentuates their vitality.

Alaimo’s (2016) approach to pleasure is guided towards a harmonious more-than-human ontology that is echoed throughout new materialism literature and that focuses on entanglement as productive and harmonious. My aim has been to draw attention to how ‘pleasure’ functions as an affective force/outcome of geological events which become ex-pressed into subjectivities in ways that are less harmonious, compatible, and romantic. Through ex-pression, pleasure characterizes the formation of ‘a subject’ as a fold that emerges from the problematic of chaos, or in other words from the ‘problems’ of not knowing, uncertainty, excesses/insufficiencies of meaning, mixed with sedimentary cracks, fissures, extractions, spills, and other stratigraphic undulations.

This is not to say that people living in oil pipeline conflicts do not spend time ‘away,’ ‘enjoying nature.’ They do. However, such ‘time spent in nature’ perhaps becomes another mode of ‘grasping’ another ‘nature’ such as oil, that is dark, dangerous, unruly, and uncertain. Films created as part of the Enbridge anti-oil pipeline movement especially illustrate the convergence of ‘going outdoors’ and activism as alternatives to urban and legislative modes of protest and are attempts at creating material inscriptions of the oil-event in ways that are perceived to be direct and tactile and highly personal in response to the sense of being caught in others’ version of events (ENGOs’, governments’, other residents’ enunciations of the event). Pipedreams Project (Vandecasteyen & Des Roches, 2011), a film focused on kayaking along the coast to the proposed terminus site of Enbridge’s Northern Gateway oil
pipeline; *Tipping Barrels* (Gauthier & Reid, 2011) and *Groundswell* (Manzilla & Malloy, 2013), two films focused on surfing in the Great Bear Rainforest threatened by the oil pipelines; *On the Line* (Wolf, 2011) a film about hiking the proposed Northern Gateway oil pipeline route; and *Stand* (Bonello & Teichrob, 2012), a film about stand-up paddle boarding to the terminus area of the Northern Gateway oil pipeline, all become personal film projects that highlight how environmental activism, coupled with the pleasures of outdoor recreation, become tactile modalities of understanding, grasping, memory-making, and documenting the event of oil. Ironically perhaps, the films also become a way for the filmmakers to find themselves within an event that has been ‘mediated’ for them, and which perhaps has become too computational. These tactile modalities are enacted as part of education’s seduction, the seduction of the pleasure to ‘understand’ or ‘know’ the event. The oil-event hence comes to be expressed through sensations of pleasure as means of finding oneself within the event, as a fold of the event alongside the pleasure of emerging as a subject.

The belief that ‘outdoor’ experiences, and spending time ‘in’ and ‘returning to’ ‘Nature’ are an important factor in producing ‘effects’ in transformations of people’s ecological outlook (Clarke & Mcphie, 2014) has been a prevalent one in environmental education. This approach to the role of ‘nature’ produces nature/culture and human/nature binaries, which assume that ‘humans’ encounter ‘nature,’ thereby cultivating an ethical orientation and desire to protect ‘nature’ and ‘wilderness.’ ‘Holistic’ approaches to critical environmental education that advocate for a ‘being’ that is ‘embedded’ and ‘part of nature’ still reaffirm these deep-seated binaries (Clarke & Mcphie, 2014), as they rarely engage with expanding, morphing, and overflowing ontological boundaries, or as I have argued, understanding subjectivity as a fold of/in a material event.
Subjectification as an Event: More-than-Representational Inquiry

The oil-event is the discarded pile of plastic cups at children’s birthday parties, the flight one takes to destination vacations, news about birds strangulating in toxic tailings ponds, the slow realization of the monstrosity of the Anthropocene, the current haste to remove cosmetic microbeads failing to decompose in the ocean, the future haste to remove 15 billion annual kilograms of synthetic rubber used for making tires for cars and bikes, and the expression of a subject emerging concurrently with the pleasure of getting it all on film. The oil-event is not separate from subjectivity, it is subjectified in its (the event’s) multitudinous expressions and actualizations.

In this chapter specifically, I have deployed ‘the event’ in relation to the problematic of how to conceive of subjectification as a material fold, and how to deal with the plurality of expressions through which an event takes place. Using evental folds, I enumerated several actualizations of unconnected media practices as part of the same process of subjectification, which refused summary, definition, or being ‘made sense of’ with respect to any summaries of media practices in the oil-pipeline conflict. In other words, the ‘data’ in my research offered momentary folds in subjectification as an event that refused to be summarized as a definition of ‘the subject,’ ‘its’ causality, or chronology. I have focused on the idea of pleasure in environmental movements in relation to chaos and to practices of thinking by examining how ‘a subject’ emerges through practices that give sieves or filters to attempt an encounter the more-than-representational material word. My suggestion has been that such practices emerge from the affective force of a monist, topological, and evental character of matter and its capacity to bend and fold into multiple types of expressions. Such practices do not individuate the subject, but emerge as folds to the event—as ways that the material event comes to be expressed.
The next chapter takes on a very different approach to thinking with folds. I continue fieldworking in textures, this time moving away from a concern with matter and the materiality of subjectification that occupied this chapter, towards examining fractal folds. In the next chapter, I focus on ‘the face’ and the sense or appearance of ‘the self’ of political subjects. These ‘faces,’ I argue, are not individuals’. Instead, I discuss subjectification in relation to the fold of force, where force bends, doubling relations of force on the inside in a fractal fashion, which can very clearly be seen in hypocrisy micropolitics that propel ongoing enactments of ‘authentic’ subjects, even if these ‘authenticities’ are relational, rather than individuals.’ In thinking with fractal folds and the fold of force, the chapter presents an orderly neatness that contrast this chapters’ chaos. Instead of an event with bifurcating chaotic folds, the next chapter offers a systematic presentation of a) how ENGOs and activists are folded by hypocrisy micropolitics that divert their attention from education, b) how those folds are enfolded within people’s engagements with ENGOs’ campaigns, and c) how such folds are capitalized on. The texturology so far shows that folds can be elastic and chaotic, evental, and now, systematic.
5. ‘Authentic’ Folds: Faciality Enactments in Hypocrisy Micropolitics

Figure 5: Douglas Coupland. War Boy. 2014. Courtesy of the artist and Daniel Faria Gallery, Toronto
I really believe in getting them to know my face and who I am, and that I’m just an ordinary person, and I’m not a crazy hippie. I’m a credible, normal person. And so I talk to the reporters, and I talk to all the people. - Olivia (Anti-oil pipeline activist)

It’s about being authentic. - Tobias (Director, ENGO)

The face, what a horror. It is naturally a lunar landscape, with its pores, planes, matts, bright colors, whiteness, and holes: there is no need for a close-up to make it inhuman; it is naturally a close-up, and naturally inhuman, a monstrous hood. - Deleuze & Guattari (1987, p. 190)

A portrait-face spans a Tar Sands Solution Network Facebook post, [Figure 6, next page] titled The People of Burnaby Mountain. The close-up depicts a face of a resident active in the oil-pipeline movement, where Kinder Morgan initiated surveying work to identify possibilities for expanding the pipeline underneath Burnaby Mountain. The bare faces starkly contrast with the masked visages of contemporary protesters, for instance, those wearing a Guy Fawkes masks in the Occupy movement (Spiegel, 2015) or those wearing ski masks, such as in the feminist performance ensemble, Pussy Riot (Braidotti, 2015). The accompanying text describes a concurrent wish to represent faces of authenticity in environmental movements, while rejecting ‘environmentalism’ as a ‘face’ of ecological identity. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) suggested it is important to question “what circumstances trigger the machine that produces the face and facialization” (p. 170), inviting the question about what compels ENGOs and activists to produce ‘authentic faces’ of environmentalism, yet ones that claim to be neither ‘activists’ nor ‘protestors.’ I began to wonder to what extent ENGOs participate in what I call faciality enactments, while claiming to be predominantly engaged in education practice. Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari’s assertion of faces as inhuman and monstrous, I focused on the more-than-human aspects of faciality enactments typically associated with integrity, authenticity, and a craving for individuation, which I encountered in oil pipeline
conflict areas. I was particularly interested in attempts to use the face to alter traditional ideas of what an ‘activist’ or ‘protestor’ looked like. I argue that ENGOs struggle to act on their aims and claims of environmental and political education in the form of people’s self-transformation, because they cannot attend to how subjectification seeps outside of the boundaries of ‘being.’ As a result, ENGOs find themselves trying to manage, and inadvertently contribute to, the way in which ‘political subjects’ are produced within what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) have called faciality machines which are the conditions of possibility that produce ‘the face.’

Figure 6: Tar Sands Solutions Network. Public Facebook post. December 16, 2014. “Who were the #PeopleofBurnabyMountain? Read their stories. Share Yours.” With Permission from Stand.Earth (Formerly Forest Ethics).
When I learned that ENGOs, which claim to focus on education, channel energy towards developing an authentic connection with residents in oil conflict areas, I wondered how this type ‘authenticity work’ functions. Particularly, I wondered how authenticity work conceptualized not as a property or intention of ‘the self’ but through a relational process ontology, functions through folds and folding, and how this might help me think differently about subjectification and a dark(er) ecological/political education.

This chapter takes a different approach to the elastic fold of topologies of Chapter Three and the chaotic, evental and material folds of Chapter Four. Here, my concern is with thinking with folds that are much more systemic and machinic. The fold, here in a fractal iteration, is additionally a way to de-centre human voice and affective investments into ‘authentic’ data. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) identified the face as resulting from machines, suggesting that faces and presentations of authenticity have less to do with representations of the self, especially with self-work and integrity, and more with how the face and ‘authenticity’ are folded by forces outside of the self. Hence, while it may seem strange that a discussion about a kind of more-than-human subjectification attunes to the human face, the study of subjectification is, as Guattari (1992/1995) argued, “a question of being aware of the existence of machines of subjectivation which don’t simply work with ‘the faculties of the soul’” (p. 9), especially those that might be associated with the self, identity or authenticity. The particular fold that I focus on in this chapter is the more-than-human fold of ‘force.’

‘The face,’ as taken up in this chapter, becomes a surface of contested and conflicting relations to force, rather than emblematic of acting authentically, which is how it is depicted in transformative environmental education as an often-desired outcome of moral integrity, resoluteness, or choice, aspects of one’s own inner-work. I show how ‘political subjects’ and ‘their’ authenticity do not exist as a property of ipseity, but as a process of fractal folding
that emerge from hypocrisy micropolitics in the environmental movement. Fractals, a mathematical concept, describes how patterns at micro levels (in this case, the humans who enact ideas of ‘being authentic’) are part of larger folds at the macro level, that display similar patterns.

‘The face’ refers to how ‘political subjects’ are produced, as well as to how environmentalism projects humanism onto ecological issues. Faces are continuously reproduced varyingly across time and space based on screening practices and performances (Thompson & Cook, 2013). Instead of dismantling Anthropocentric thought, faciality enactments produce the screening practice of facialization (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), which projects humanism onto the landscape of environmentalist thought. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to this process as the “face-landscape” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 172), the reproduction of correlations between the face and land, a key one of which is the pastoral face of and saviour-complex of the majoritarian, or recognizable face, and its stewardship of land. Faciality enactments are taken up, perhaps, as a means to maintain relevancy of environmentalism and environmentalists’ communication interventions, at a time of ambiguous ideas about what constitutes ‘solutions’ to issues like oil or climate change.

Building on this approach of subjectification, the chapter continues to engage with one of the four folds of subjectification described by Deleuze (1988), this time, the ‘fold of force.’ The “fold of force,” (Deleuze, 1988) occurs when the “relations of the outside fold back to create a doubling… allow[ing] a relation to oneself to emerge, and constitute an inside which is hollowed out and develops its own unique dimension” (p. 100). In other words, the fold of force focuses on how power relations on ‘the outside’ are bent or folded in the form of a relation that produces an ‘inside.’ Deleuze (1988) described force as something operating independently of humans, where the human is only “a force among forces” (p.
Force is not the same as agency, or individuals’ ability to have power over themselves, or in other words, to produce ‘a self.’ Rather, force is more-than-human, an event that moves through humans, non-humans, and events: “Man [sic] does not fold the forces that compose him without the outside folding itself, and creating a Self within man” (p. 114). ‘The outside’ folds and keeps changing itself—doubling and redoubling—and this doubling is what is twisted, brought from the outside in, reproducing those pleats in the formations and sensations of a ‘self.’

I think with the ‘fold of force’ to discuss how hypocrisy micropolitics and the struggle over ‘authenticity’ in oil pipeline conflict areas become folded within ENGO campaigns, and how such power relations, are subsequently folded within people’s relations to their ‘selves.’ Hence, fractal folds (de Freitas, 2016) rather than a ‘self’ becomes the basic unit of analysis in this chapter. I show how the fractal fold emerges as a key texture of subjectification environmental movement, and also a mode of inquiry to examine dispersed ontologies.

I begin the chapter with a brief overview of hypocrisy micropolitics in environmental movements and introduces Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of faciality to discuss how images fold subjectivities. I do so in order to show how ENGOs and people living in the oil pipeline conflict areas ‘keep face’ as part of what I call authenticity enactments aimed at survival when they are mapped along folds of authentic/inauthentic images of ‘political subjectivities’ portrayed in news stories, blogs, social media, and advertising. Second, I argue that ENGOs sense hypocrisy polemics and fold themselves into hypocrisy micropolitics by investing significant time and resources in producing an authentic image of themselves and showing new activists how to do the same. Based on this, I frame authenticity as a fleeting capacity that is attained, sustained and extinguished through micropolitical tactics. Third, I analyze how ENGOs’ intended environmental audiences, especially those concerned about
oil pipeline debates, encounter hypocrisy micropolitics and ENGOs responses to them, demonstrating how the authenticity assemblage tightens its folds. Fourth, I discuss how authenticity is fabricated through authenticity portraits, and how it works in relation to the trope of anonymity, such as that found in the Occupy movement. Finally, as part my pedagogy of the concept and aim to show the conditions of the productions within which these concepts emerge, I focus on a discussion of authenticity and data. I engage with Patti Lather’s (2009b) caution about the insufficiency of listening to participants’ ‘authentic voice’ during research.

**Hypocrisy Micropolitics in Environmental Movements**

Hypocrisy micropolitics is a key affective atmosphere in environmental movements. Affective atmospheres occur “before and alongside the formation of subjectivity, across human and non-human materialities, and in-between subject/object distinctions” (Anderson, 2009, p. 78). Hypocrisy micropolitics challenge ENGOs mobilization strategies aimed at producing ‘political subjectivities’ by disrupting dualisms of victim/agent of environmental destruction and problematizing people’s enactments of ‘political subjectivity,’ activism, and environmentalism. Micropolitics refers to the political dimension of affects in environmental movements, and works not in opposition to, but together with macropolitics of states, movements and resistance, where “every politics is simultaneously a macropolitics and a micropolitics” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 213). Micropolitical analysis examines perceptions, desires and affective flows that constitute political events, while identifying how these micropolitics relate to or emerge in relation to macropolitical influences.

Representations of environmentalists as hypocrites in news and blogs point to inconsistent behaviour in which they demand an end of oil extraction while using products made
out of oil. Hypocrisy discourses have become polemical tools of warfare against environmentalists aimed to position them as incoherent (Chang, 2016) and are amplified through political events in which environmentalists participate in, by using oil-dependent consumer goods such as cars, kayaks, and planes, or by wearing Gore-Tex rain jackets to protests and so on. In the context of Canada’s oil pipeline debates, hypocrisy narratives are additionally positioned as issues of class and gender. For example, opposition to East-West oil pipelines has evoked accusations of environmentalists’ war on class because such a blockade perpetuates Eastern Canada’s dependency on oil from Saudi Arabia, keeping resource jobs away from ordinary Canadians, keeping oil prices high, and allegedly betraying feminism by propelling trade with a country with limited women’s rights (e.g., Cattaneo, 2016). ENGOs and activists often campaign against hypocrisy attacks (e.g., Skuce, 2011) only to have journalists and political pundits aim to ‘expose,’ explain, and discredited campaigners to the public (e.g., Marsden, 2013).

Environmental groups that claim to focus on public education, anticipate or sense hypocrisy polemics and invest significant time into producing communication strategies allowing them to participate in enactments of authenticity. I show how environmental audiences encounter such enactments and how they use them in the production of their own political ‘selves.’ I do not focus on how authenticity exists in opposition to inauthenticity, as I agree with Banet-Weiser (2012) that such a binary erases the operations of how authenticity operates. Similarly, I move away from moral investigations of the concept of hypocrisy in environmentalism (Chang, 2016). Instead, by attending to the affects produced in the encounter with circulating images and discourses of ‘good’ or ‘bad’ forms of environmental activism in petroleum advertising and news, I draw attention to hypocrisy micropolitics and authenticity
enactments as specific textures and technologies of subjectification in the environmental movement.

In the twentieth century, the trope of authenticity has been associated with a cultural movement of self-realization (Vannini & Williams, 2009) that might most closely be associated with liquid modernity (Bauman, 2000), especially a focus on self-reflexivity and responsibility for producing oneself, being ‘fluid’ and malleable, perhaps as a mode to counteract or exist within a fragmented culture without traditional points of reference other than ‘the self.’ Preoccupation with the idea of authenticity has only been intensified through selfie-culture (Hess, 2015). Within environmental movement education, as I showed in the first chapter, authenticity is treated as an important component of ‘self-work’ that makes activism meaningful and enables people to form authentic relationships with others that facilitates engaging in ecological issues (Kovan & Dirkx, 2003). This conception of the ‘political subject’ as one that emerges from ‘authenticity work’ appeared to be one employed by the environmental groups with which I spoke. However, I noticed that ENGO campaigns that aim to accentuate ‘their’ ‘authenticity’ in environmentalism do not contribute to heartwarming characteristics typically ascribed to authenticity such as fluidity and nimbleness, integrity, wholesomeness, realness, and high degrees of reflexivity, but rather, to ambiguity, tensions, and stress. I develop the concept of fractal faciality enactments to explain self-realization not as integral project, but as state acquired, sustained, and lost through the fold of force that bends force back on itself.
Faciality and the Fold of Force

If human beings have a destiny, it is rather to escape the face, to dismantle the face and facializations, to become imperceptible. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 173)

The practice of faciality enactments is not continuous, but appears under circumstances of extreme magnification—“the close up” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, pp. 170-171)—associated with portraiture in film, which illuminates the face, or more likely, highlight its shadows and contours. As in film, a face appears at moments of inspection or critical juncture. The face of environmentalism is excessively and abundantly produced at a time when the environmentalist movement appear ‘under review’ or inspection for whether its tenure has yielded success and efficacy (after all these decades), as can be seen in news stories that question gains made by environmentalism (see for example Duke, 2011; Montague, 2012; Suzuki, 2012; Galperin, 2015; Purdy, 2016).25 The face hence becomes an accumulation of intensified or concentrated representations about environmentalism, particularly where there is a sensation of failure or a ‘glitch’ in how or what environmentalism was supposed to achieve. The face, as Braidotti (2015) puts it, is “a landscape of power” (p. 243). In other words, the ‘the face’ acts as a screen on which amplifications and close ups of environmentalism are projected with scrutiny at times when ambivalent sensations circulate about what environmentalism is or should be, even amongst people living in oil pipeline conflict areas who are against the pipelines (Figure 7, next page). The production of authentic faces—in their various online and offline manifestations—becomes a mode of intensity that moves beyond any individual

25 While I do not discuss government surveillance in this dissertation, governments’ amplified attention to environmentalist groups in portrait-face style or via a ‘close up’ can also be seen within surveillance strategies, most poignantly where governments scrutinize ‘environmentalism’ as radicalism under the auspices of monitoring charities’ expenses.
being, and most importantly beyond the idea of any warm-hearted notion of self-determination, self-realization, or ‘integrity,’ and instead, becomes systemically and machinically produced (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

**Figure 7: Ambivalent Sensations of Environmentalism**

Faces become “multiple possibilities of affectivity (and neither a hearth nor a site of warmth) [but rather] a zone of intensity” (Conley, 2005b, p. 102). ‘The face’ dismantles authenticity as a property of ‘realness,’ ‘integrity,’ ‘essence’ or ‘goodness’ (Conley, 2005b), and becomes
an important screen surface of the sensations that people have of environmentalism being scrutinized.

The face becomes an important surface of hypocrisy micropolitics, as it serves as an emblem of in/authentic, non/credible enactments. For the purpose of my argument, the face becomes an important surface of hypocrisy micropolitics, as it serves as a space in which ENGOs, and subsequently people engaging with their public pedagogy campaign are folded by in/authentic, non/credible lines. Rather than an individual’s reflection or projection, the face might be imagined as a surface through which ‘the outside,’ namely the preoccupation with authenticity found in environmentalist hypocrisy micropolitics, folds on ‘the inside’ to produce a craving for a sensation of self.

An analogy from architecture helps to imagine the face as space doubling the outside on the inside. A face might be imagined as a ‘transition’ room (a room for bringing the outside into the inside of the house) that becomes an analogous space for the encounter between the inside and the outside. This encounter includes enactment or production of the self:

The infinite fold separates or passes between matter and soul, the façade and the sealed room, the interior and the exterior.... An exterior always on the exterior, an interior always on the interior. It is characterized as an infinite ‘receptivity,’ and an infinite ‘spontaneity’ - the external façade for receiving, the interior chamber for action... the expressed does not exist beyond its expression (Deleuze, 1991, p. 242).

The façade becomes a kind of transition surface or a space for the encounter with the outside or the double. The inside in turn becomes “an imaginary space where subjectivation can be realized” (Conley, 2011, p. 198) through “a method” or “an act” (Deleuze, 1991, p. 243). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) noted that “the face is not an envelope exterior to the person who speaks, thinks, or feels” (p. 167). Instead, the face operates as a “white wall/black hole system” (p. 167), in which the white wall is a signifying surface upon which “signs and redundancies” are inscribed and bounce off. Facialization functions like a machine, producing
subjectivity by consuming various expressions and affective investments (MacCormack, 2018). In other words, the face includes white and dark areas, where the dark parts of the face absorb affective investments, while the white part are the places where investments of desire are projected or reflected (Conley, 2005b). The face starts to take shape by becoming “a screen” (p. 167) through which it, and others, engage with the world. Jensen and Ringrose (2014) asserted that a face can operate as a micropolitical screen or surface that is used by others to project their various desires, warning that subjects can become a projective screen upon which fantasies unfold, operating as spectres for battles over meaning that have little to do with the specific individuals or persons in question.

Thinking about subjectification in environmental movements and junctions of the post/Anthropocene as folding, as I have been proposing, I suggest that faciality enactments are transitions and projective screens, and potent ways to examine ‘the face’ and authenticity, as it operates from a posthumanist understanding. Enactment refers to the way in which something (e.g., authenticity) is ‘multiple’ and dispersed (Mol, 2002) rather than as a property of ipseity. The idea of ‘the authentic self’ is therefore best understood as emerging from a set of interactions or relations, and in this case ‘folds’ that produce subjectivity—fractal folds—which I discuss later in the chapter. The value of the concept of faciality enactments is in its micropolitical dimension, which considers the power and desire invested in its production that operates beyond individuals and their self-transformation. Faciality is particularly dangerous as it reduces the elasticity of the event of subjectification into a machinic current of flows; structured, repetitive, seemingly inescapable, and characterized by cutting off and turning on flows of desire. Thompson and Cook (2013) note how faciality reduces elasticity and flow and attempts to systematize subjectification: “faciality is an abstract machine that captures the multidimensional and polyvocal flows of possibility and forces them into
one dimensionality and univocity. This is why the face is an ordering machine” (p. 381). This faciality machine automates the pull of the \((re)\)turn of enduring conceptions of environmentalism, particularly as it emerges through a combination of spontaneous expressions of events and copies of historical faces (Thompson & Cook, 2013) at times when ‘environmentalism’ appears at a juncture, or even collapse.

Next, I examine several excerpts of interviews conducted with environmental activists and environmental audiences. I start with Olivia, a retired health professional who began to engage in anti-oil pipeline activism by forming an ENGO in the Vancouver Metro Area a year before I spoke with her. My aim is to show how people who are just becoming involved in anti-oil pipeline activism are folded by what they perceive to be representations of authentic activists, folding themselves into hypocrisy politics’ preoccupation with un/real subjectivities. Second, I examine an excerpt from conversations with Angela, a director of communication, and an environmental campaigner at a large and established ENGO. I show that even seasoned campaigners invest significant time and resources into authenticity education to mitigate hypocrisy micropolitics.

Subsequently, I illustrate how to think about folds as an intensity and as fractal. That is, folds become more tightly woven when residents, as readers/viewers/followers of ENGOs and their campaigners, respond to authenticity enactments. To do this, I engage with excerpts from conversations with Viktor and Cameron, two residents who live in the Vancouver Metro Area and who are concerned about bitumen pipelines. I use these examples from conversations as ways to inflect my thought and thinking, and my pedagogy of the concept engaged in experimenting with ‘folded concepts,’ not necessarily as representative or/as ‘the findings’ of my research.
The regulation of authenticity in social and environmental movements operates across various plateaus and involves that activists diagram what I call *authenticity terrains*, namely real or sensed lines that produce un/real, non/credible, in/authentic divisions of subjectivity across space. Diagramming authenticity terrains is a cartographic technique of enacting ‘real’ activist subjectivity and is fueled by a wish to be recognized and to emerge among familiar signs, along enduring symbolic as well as material/spatial/temporal lines. Activists who have just begun to learn how to organize politically do so by orienting themselves within authenticity terrains by quite literally mapping how authenticity might be looked at or seen in relation to different regions in the city in which they do campaign work as well as memories of environmentalism, and expectations about what it can achieve.

I turn to an excerpt from my conversation with Olivia, a new environmental activist who started a small organization focused on stopping oil-pipelines in the Vancouver Metro Area, to show how images of hypocrisy fold campaigners and produce subjectivity. Olivia described that her encounter with news discourses that represent environmentalists as ‘hippies’ affected her preoccupation with her own ‘self’ image and interrogated aspect of her life that may produce an image of her as inauthentic. Preceding what she says in the excerpt (next page), Olivia has just finished discussing her decision to divest mutual funds and retirement savings from portfolios that invest in the oil and gas industry because otherwise she would “look like a hypocrite” (Olivia) and she could not engage others in opposing the pipeline. This has meant divesting her mutual funds as a means of preparing to speak to individuals in North Vancouver, a neighbourhood where she believes “everybody’s got mutual funds, and every mutual fund has stock in oil and gas” (Olivia). When I asked Olivia to tell me about her approach to communicating with the people whom she was trying to reach through
her organization’s anti-oil pipeline campaigns, she explained that she first needed to place herself, or map her ‘self’ vis-à-vis expectations of authenticity across urban space and adjust herself as a means of preparing to engage her audience in specific geographical communities and municipalities. In the extract below, *faciality*, or the production of face becomes an act of enacting ‘political subjectivity’:

**Olivia:** I really believe in getting them to *know my face* and who I am, and that I’m just an ordinary person, and I’m not a crazy hippie. I’m a credible, normal person. And so I talk to the reporters, and I talk to all the people.

**MP:** To what extent would you say it’s important to present that image of a regular, ordinary, normal-looking citizen?

**Olivia:** I think it’s really, really, really important. And from the people—well, the North Shore [North Vancouver] is different from Burnaby, because when I go to Burnaby it’s a different, um, a different population, again. So yeah, for North Vancouver, you need to be credible. People here are very well-educated, very well-informed. They have opinions, and they get turned off by hippies just ranting off without having the facts. That came up again this morning. You just get an automatic “Pfft, whatever” from them.

Olivia believes that her face operates as a surface that depicts her ‘real self,’ and more so, that this self is average—“just an ordinary person”—that others can associate with, which she can use to her credit/avoid being discredited. While Olivia aims to use her ordinary face to disrupt representational politics that associate stereotypical images of “crazy hippies” with environmental activism, the last part of the excerpt shows that she knows her face might be read as ab/normal, extra/ordinary, non/credible across different authenticity terrains across the urban landscape.

New activists therefore sense that authenticity circulates as an affective texture that is spatially defined and *folded* along geographical lines. Authenticity is organized according to looking and sensing relationships that operate spatially. Olivia knows her face becomes an image of environmentalism that may be ‘read’ as a text in different ways across space. She uses her knowledge of such spaces to *fold*, or double spatial preoccupations with authenticity.
and produce herself as a ‘real’ ‘political subject.’ Malins (2004), refers to spaces that structure the productive of subjectivity in constrictive ways as the “space of rigid foldings: where spatial folds become tightly embedded in the body, and body-space relations become sedimented and locked into place” (p. 486). We might therefore read Olivia’s diagramming of herself and her authenticity in relation to space as *faciality enactments*. Faciality enactments might be taken as a form of affective labour and authenticity work (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009), namely the type of everyday labour required to be seen as an authentic subject (for example, the requirement for women to smile in some contexts to appear affectively feminine).

Subjectivities are therefore not the results of inner-work associated with authenticity, but an effect of plugging-in face, with space, and with images of non/credible, in/authentic environmentalism. Subjectivities are malleable spaces that temporarily actualize through affect—that is to say—they are affectively produced by a series of folds that emerge from relationships that images and practices of looking facilitate. These practices include mapping authenticity terrains, and faciality enactments that fold the preoccupation with the self on the inside.

Olivia desires that people *see her* and “know her face” in order to be recognized by members of the North Vancouver community within the parameters of what *they* may determine to be authenticity work. Olivia’s desire to register as “normal” and unspectacular, based on what others perceive as unthreatening activism, meant bending or doubling the preoccupation with authenticity differently in different spaces, yet it also meant internalizing, or folding, a credible image of herself into her selfperception. Through her decision to divest, she chooses to craft a new form of ‘authenticity’ that makes her appear as authentic campaigner—one who walks the talk—yet not an authentic environmentalist, which in her perspective would make her a “crazy hippie” in North Vancouver. Later in our conversation
Olivia suddenly observed her repeated use of the word ‘hippie,’ a word she had just refused to use to identify herself with, in relation to her authenticity enactment:

I keep saying ‘the hippie’ person like I don’t want to be a hippie. I’m a hippie at heart, but presenting yourself as a hippie and saying, “Oh energy healing’s going cure everything” or “Close the tar sands tomorrow!” It doesn’t work. It doesn’t work. People just get their back up, they don’t believe you. You have no credibility. So the person that I am now is based on that experience.

Olivia produced herself as “the person that I am now” as an enactment of a credible and authentic ‘political subject’ within the span of those sentences in our conversation, discursively estimating the boundaries and limits of what “doesn’t work” in her pursuit to negotiate the tensions between what is expected of her and her unruly desires. She and ‘her’ authenticity are produced from the folding of ‘self’ that occurs in relation to authenticity terrains and the faciality enactments that respond to how she senses she is looked at comparatively to images of radical environmentalists. This folding is what produces authenticity as subjectivity, “but only as a derivative” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 101), of subjectification.

A relationship of self-to-self that is folded, and refolded again from the outside, produces a fractal subjectivity haunted tensions within the self (Baudrillard, 2002). Hickey-Moody (2006) explained that “in order to become a subject, to be consolidated and socially coded, one limits one’s capabilities and desires,” but, in doing so, “the subject is captured in a black hole” (p. 191). The desire invested in authenticity enactments means people neither “want to undo the doubling and pull away the folds… [nor] reinforce the doublings from snag to snag” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 99). We might see Olivia’s production of an authentic environmentalist’ face as a mode of survival (Bignall, 2012) in which performances of the self are aspirations for recognition of authenticity that trap a person within the desires of others,

---

26 Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discuss Mandelbrot’s fractals in relation to smooth space; however, I will leave the connection between folding and smooth space for another time.
yet produce a shield for enduring under the circumstances. Subjectivities are therefore folded along lines of in/authentic, and also fold themselves along in/authentic lines in order to survive hypocrisy micropolitics. These self-managing fabrications allow subjects to exist in-tension between the demands they face and their desire to negotiate them (Webb & Gulson, 2013).

**ENGOs’ Authenticity Strategies vis-à-vis Hypocrisy Micropolitics**

Choices are guided by faces, elements are organized around faces: a common grammar is never separable from a facial education. The face is a veritable megaphone. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 179)

I want to sketch out faciality enactments along multi-dimensional axes on which subjectivities comprise a relation that collapses inside/outside by bending and folding various notions of environmental authenticity, that are not only spatially determined, but also work temporarily, through memory and pre-emption. A director of communication at an ENGO in this study argued that even seasoned campaigners need to continuously learn to negotiate hypocrisy micropolitics in new ways. ENGOs therefore spend significant time and resources on faciality enactments that might otherwise be used on environmental education through public programs or in other ways. Angela, who has been a director of communication at an ENGO in Vancouver for over a decade, describes her previous encounters with media pundits means that she pre-emptively prepares for potential encounters in which journalists who may question her authenticity as an environmentalist vis-à-vis her lifestyle as an urban, oil-dependent consumer. Her upbringing in a rural area has also made her keenly aware of the perceptions that citizens in rural areas may have of large urban ENGOs and the “cappuccino-sucking urban environmentalists” (Angela) that run them, whom audiences principally encounter

151
through media representations. Preparing for these attacks on her authenticity and her campaigners’ authenticity is not only a means of self-care, but also a form of image management that helps to build alliances in the environmental movement, and gain support from citizens who may not otherwise be immediately associated with environmentalism. Small activist groups and ENGOs are conscious that their grassroots movement may be perceived as locally inauthentic amongst the broader public if they are supported by larger organizations like the one Angela runs. A similar example of this might be seen when right-leaning bloggers covering Occupy tended to write that unions’ and other large groups’ support of Occupy made them appear inauthentic (DeLuca, Lawson & Sun, 2012).

A Northern journalist explains that small Northern ENGOs take great care to disassociate themselves from large Southern ENGOs from the Vancouver Metro Area who adamantly maintain the image of environmentalist authenticity through lines and links to the archival image of environmentalism, namely its Western, ‘green’ and Greenpeace-like image:

> You know, the big Sierra Club and Greenpeace, and Tides Canada and all that, Forest Ethics? You're always going to have organizations like that who obviously have a very direct perspective on what should be happening with these pipelines, in terms of, you know, “Keep it out of BC” [British Columbia]… But there are other [local] organizations [in Northern British Columbia]. They don’t really take a direct stance…I’ve seen is a lot of that over the past five years; this shift going from saying a definite “No” to, “Ok, how can we make this better for everyone?” And still keep face. – Henrik (Northern Journalist)

Activists engaged in ENGOs therefore enact authenticity varyingly across space and time. Northern activists’ authentic ‘political subjectivity’ is produced in relation to anticipating how they might be perceived by environmental audiences in relation to Southern authenticity. In contrast, Southern authenticity emerges when campaigners anticipate how they may be folded by discourses of hypocrisy in relation to urban life, and by populist pundits. In this sense, we might understand subjectification as a process that produces sensations of a ‘self’
by enfolding the past with the future in a way that “a person’s relation with his or her body becomes both an ‘archive’ and a ‘diagram’” (Conley, 2011, p. 194). Keeping face becomes a strategy of maintaining historical lineage and mapping new connections—archiving and diagramming. Faciality, including the artifacts (images, stories, campaigns) referred to and created through faciality enactments, becomes a way of drawing on and contributing to the hypomnemata discussed in the previous two chapters.

In her role as a director of communication at an ENGO, Angela trains her staff to be prepared for attacks on their authenticity by guiding her teams’ campaigning training which involves preparing for an encounter with right-wing columnists,’ or ‘populist pundits’; media personalities who are seen to seize all available opportunities to emphasize the hypocritical and therefore inauthentic behaviour of campaigners’ lives. ENGOs are keenly aware that these individuals can represent campaigners as hypocrites by emphasizing they are fake or delusional about who they are. By acting pre-emptively, campaigners participate in negotiations about subjectivity that are fuelled by questions about people’s capacity to be critically reflexive about their lives and who they are, folding the power of critique within themselves as a practice of self-fabrication. The authenticity assemblage, comprising various practices of folding, is one of the terrains in which subjectification operates, and in which residents in oil pipelines negotiate their subjection, of being trapped within practices of resisting/desiring, being/becoming, in/authentic, and other thresholds of ‘transformation.’

The Texture of Fractal Folds: Folding Environmental ‘Audiences’

When corporations, journalists or radio talk-show hosts attempt to ‘expose’ campaigners’ inauthenticity by pointing to how they act in hypocritical ways, the folds in the authenticity as-
semblage are doubled, refolded and tightened. Residents who encounter images or news stories about authenticity micropolitics that fold campaigners along lines of il/legitimate, non/credible, and hence in/authentic, are folded by them as they are invited to reflect on their relation to their political self. We might therefore imagine a fractal diagram that repeats the fold of authenticity, in which the detail of a specific fold resembles the larger folds of the whole. Fractal folds are iterative repetitions of a fold (de Freitas, 2016), in which subjectivity is not ‘wholesome,’ as might be associated with authenticity, but dispersed.

The fractal fold is a way to describe the recombinant characteristic of ‘a subject’ that takes shape through “an unlimited finity” of ways the subject can be organized (de Freitas, 2016, p. 227). Deleuze (1981/2003) argues that “the face is a structured, spatial organization” (p. 20) that might be envisioned not as one fold, but as a fold that organizes other folds. This can be seen amongst so called ‘audiences’ of ENGOs campaigns, that is the residents living in the areas who are encountering ENGOs campaigns. Some of these residents are affected by what they think are common beliefs about ENGOs’ campaigners, namely that they are hypocrites. Environmentally concerned people develop a relation to their own ‘self’ by being folded into the authenticity assemblage. For example, Viktor, an avid canoeist from Vancouver chose not to join environmental organizations because he wants to avoid “explaining himself” when he engages in online conversations about oil pipeline issues. He chose to navigate the terrain of authenticity by moving ‘off the plateau,’ in which the terms ‘environmentalist’ or ‘activist’ are used interchangeably with inauthentic subjects who are dishonest about their actions, rather than explain himself and his affiliations to ENGOs, a relationship he believes positions him as a hypocrite. Viktor chose to avoid the ‘authenticity discussion’ by not joining such groups in the first place:

You know, it’s interesting. I should be a member of some of these things, like Dogwood Initiative or some of these other groups, but it labels you, and
it removes a lot of the...it becomes something, a conversation I have to have before I can have a conversation about the pipeline with a pipeline advocate. It’s, “Ugh, you’re a member of that group,” or something like that. And it’s important to engage pro-pipeline people about the issue rather than, “Is it my personal—Am I getting something out of this, am I being paid to do this? Or am I just a soldier for some ENGO or something like that?” So I tend not to be—I actively avoid becoming a member of these groups and stuff like that. I’d rather have the...be able to stand on a platform of independence. It’s more credible. (Viktor)

Viktor’s choice to avoid negotiating attacks on environmentalists’ authenticity and his decision to “stand on a platform of independence” show his wish to focus on the production of an authentic, credible, autonomously determined political face. However, as I have argued in this chapter, such self-determined accounts of authenticity operate within a tangled web of hypocrisy politics, authenticity terrains, and ever in-coiling folds: the ‘inside’ as it is produced through the fold of the ‘outside’ that attempts to disrupt the face of environmentalism. Victor’s authenticity exists as part of the authenticity assemblage that produces his subjectivity through folds of force, shaping his relation to himself. Discourses and images are used to fold environmentalists along in/authentic lines; activists fold themselves along lines of in/credibility through authenticity enactments; and finally, environmental audiences choose to separate themselves from hypocrisy micropolitics and hence activists’ strategies, to produce themselves as credible ‘political subjects.’ For these campaigners and their audiences alike, the fold of force, that is the fold of internalizing a relation of power on the inside, becomes evident in the way that they relate their sense of authentic self to their perception of credibility—something that is also expected of them and that they expect of others.

The environmentalist ‘authentic self’ emerges from a series of fractal folds produced in a machinic way, rather than by any individuals’ own directives. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) described the machinic dimension of ‘the face’ in this way: “This machine is called
the faciality machine because it is the social production of face, because it performs the faci-alization of the entire body and all its surroundings and objects, and the landscape-fication of all worlds and milieus” (p. 181). Trapped in the fractal fold, hypocrisy micropolitics forces an iterative engagement with ‘environmentalism,’ stifling new engagements with environmentalist thought, even as environmental organizations and their ‘audiences’ reluctantly engage in faciality enactments.

**Fractal Faciality Portraits: The Striations of ‘Activism Selfies’**

Photographs equally work at extracting an autonomous, abys-sally fractalized gaze. A face-profile movement can be sketched out, a contrast of light, of posture...all things that animate and hollow out representation. (Guattari, 2015, p. 58)

The tactical practice of representing close-ups of ‘real people’ in the oil-anti pipeline movement (e.g., as shown earlier in Figure 6 and below in Figure 8) becomes another enactment of the “faciality machine” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 181). It binds the production of subjectivity to in/authentic, in/credible cartographies. The production of portrait-faces stems from a desire to navigate hypocrisy politics. Braidotti (2015) notes how the production of face in social movements becomes a tactic of “visibility while escaping re-territorialization in the age of hyper-mediation” (p. 247). The production of what I call *fractal faciality portraits* speak to the desire to at once become imperceptible, apart from a unified ‘environmentalist’ landscape, while maintaining visibility, and finding oneself within the oil-event.
The smiling faces of protesters in Figure 8 demonstrate pleasurable becomings through familiar media practices (e.g., selfies) through which they emerge/become expressed in the event. Here faces themselves become produced as ‘data,’ or geomnemata that register the event and concurrently register the pleasures of being expressed as a subject within it. Representations of ‘real’ political faces that aim to produce authentic subjectivities, exists in contrast to recent associations of protest with anonymity, and particularly the appearance of the Guy Fawkes mask as a symbol of de-individualization and collective subjectivity in social justice movements (Cambre, 2014; Gerbaudo, 2015; McDonald, 2015; Spiegel, 2015). If
masked protest challenges the concept of the private individual (Spiegel, 2015), faci- 
alit en-actments by way of ‘activism selfies’ are equally non-individual when considered a produc- 
tion of relational faciality machine. De-masked, collective authenticity enactments through 
social media such as the Tar Sands Solutions Network’s (Figure 6) and Forest Ethics’ Face- 
book (Figure 8) posts indicate an attachment to authenticity as an atmospheric affect that 
structures protest performances in environmental movements somewhat differently than in 
other types of activism. We might think of subjectivities in more-than-human and de-centred 
terms, namely existing not as individuals who interact with media representations and prac- 
tices, but relational entities that exist in the intra-action (Barad, 2007) of multiple texts, prac-
tices, and discursive and material forces.

The multiplication of faces in Figure 8 (previous page) quantifies the repetitious di-
mension of authenticity, speaking to its machinic, more-than-human character depicted in a 
diagram of a fractal faciality portrait (Figure 9, below).
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**Figure 9: Fractal Faci
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diality Portrait**

Here, what is considered to be a ‘political subject’ is more-than-individual and more-than-a-
‘being’ because it is already multiple through authenticity enactments that multiply it through 
folding. de Freitas (2016) speaks to the quantitative character of subjectivity in the fractal 
fold:
The individual is always already the quantitative in that the ‘one’ is never given. This qual-quant collective character of our individuality is based on the monadological fractal fold. (p. 229)

Fractal folds speak to the seduction for subjectification, conceptualized as individuality and autonomy found in media practices such as those in this and the previous chapter. In this case the craving for subjectification operates within an environmentalist project/landscape that produces these faces/subjectifications in a way that is machinic, that is, it aims to efficiently proliferate the face of environmentalism. As such, fractal authenticity portraits, are part of an evaluative mechanism under which enactments of subjectivity are not only produced but judged in the environmentalist landscape. de Freitas (2016) further explains that fractal folds are characterized by being “creased by an iterative imitation or an algorithmic repetition of miniscule quantitative evaluations” (p. 222). These repetitive ‘evaluations’ suggest that ENGOs are continuously assessed and assess themselves on their faciality performances. There is, quite literally a ‘war’ over how to present and enact ‘the face’ that produces striations, as are so clearly depicted, for example, in the light and dark striations on the face in Douglas Coupland’s (2014) *War Boy*, on the opening page of this chapter. Additionally, the fold of force that produces faciality enactments with its ever in-coiling fractals, and its associated assessments, is related to attempts to continuously evaluate a face’s ability to project or ‘screen’ ideas about environmentalism onto the physical landscape. Environmentalist sense they are evaluated not only in relation to each other, but in relation to their ability assert ‘their’ and the relevancy of Western environmentalism as stewards of a ‘natural’ world. The “face-landscape” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 172) correlation links subjectification directly to issues of space, land, and ecology.
Capitalizing on Authenticity: Pro-oil Pipeline Advertising Ritornellos

Faciality enactments are not benign, as faciality is engrossed in capitalism. Writing about race and gender, Minh-ha (1989), in her discussion of authenticity and race, has shown that the staging, rhetoric, and spectacle of authenticity as a form of address, produces even more desires for ‘the real self’ by those being invited to appear ‘more authentic’ than they already are. Authenticity strategies therefore capitalize on the attention that individuals pay to themselves and their desires to ‘be themselves’ while failing to disclose that ‘authenticity’ is a circulation of desire that is fueled by looking and being looked at and judged. Such “planned authenticity” operates like a trap:

Today, planned authenticity is rife; as a product of hegemony and a remarkable counterpart of universal standardization, it constitutes and efficacious means of silencing the cry of racial oppression. We no longer wish to erase your difference. We demand, on the contrary, that you remember and assert it. At least, to a certain extent. Every path I/i take is edged with thorns. On the one hand, i play into the Saviour’s hands by concentrating on authenticity, for my attention is numbered by it and diverted from other, important issues; on the other hand, i do feel the necessity to return to my so-called roots, since they are the fount of my strength, the guiding arrow to which i constantly refer before heading for a new direction. (Minh-ha, 1989, p. 268)

The point that can be drawn from Minh-ha’s reflection on authenticity is that environmental audiences’ desires for authenticity operate as modes of survival, and hence participation in hypocrisy micropolitics and preoccupation with the self, can be understood within such “planned authenticity.” Additionally, enactments/productions of subjectivity might best be understood within an obscurity-transparency binary. Barry (2013) has argued that the messy and controversial politics of materials (politics of oil pipeline spills, resource extraction, animal cloning, etc.) are frequently inseparable from deliberate fabrications of transparency.
Similarity to activists and environmentalists, oil pipeline corporations take an active role in producing authenticity as an affective atmosphere to counteract the obscurity of decision-making and the threat of messy oil pipeline spills within their advertising strategies. This occurs when oil pipeline corporations choose to advertise by portraying their companies as authentic. However, this tactic does not aim to produce a linear effect of buy-in amongst the public, but operates affectively, as an invitation for an encounter with discourses on authenticity that may prompt audiences to reflect on their authenticity. In other words, people are not invited to recognize themselves in the ‘reflection’ of authenticity presented by the brands but are invited to produce themselves as ‘political subjects’ with integrity. Oil pipeline companies do this most intensely through recruitment of ‘local subjects’ for their advertising campaigns, namely people living along the proposed pipeline routes or working for the oil pipeline companies, who are featured in commercial authenticity portraits.

Before the plebiscite in Kitimat, in which residents gave their opinion about whether they wanted to see Enbridge’s Northern Gateway Pipeline built, Enbridge featured ads online (YouTube ads and ads on news websites) as well as on television throughout Northern BC—the region where the Northern Gateway pipeline would prospectively be built. These ads represented families and individuals living in the North with slogans such as “I want my grandchildren to work here. I’m voting YES”. Similarly, Kinder Morgan, the company that operates and has proposed to duplicate the Trans Mountain pipeline that terminates in the Vancouver region in Southern British Columbia, featured local employees in their ads during their campaigns. In the Kinder Morgan ads, pipeline employees were shown walking in parks or speaking about their work as ‘local neighbours.’ These authenticity portraits folded local people into corporate pipeline advertising as part of the production of transparency that functions by way of a ‘confession’ of what has to date been unspoken—that individuals can
and should acknowledge their conflicting desires, which include the desire to implement the pipeline despite being parents of children whose future would be affected, or despite caring for the environment.

One Kinder Morgan ad, which was circulated online, on TV and distributed in the Vancouver Metro Area, depicted an employee with dreadlocks and the statement: “Safety is something we take seriously. Everyone around here is a neighbour or a friend”. The authenticity portrait appeared be deliberately chosen as a way of engaging counterculture and co-opting the image of the ‘hippie’ to invite interaction with the authentic face of the brand, showing the company employs individuals who do not appear as ‘polished’ as, and hence are more genuine and trustworthy than a ‘suit-behind-a-desk’ employee of an oil-pipeline corporation. Planned authenticity encourages difference and incompatible desires—as an effective strategy of demonstrating that one is willing to take care of oneself by acknowledging one’s hypocrisy in public rather than dealing with conflicting desires in private.

Corporations’ fighting against the environmental movement aim to capture the desire for transparency in anti-pipeline activism by circulating authenticity as an organizing principle or an affective atmosphere that gives meaning to the concerns that people already have about their sense of self and generates new concerns by folding them back to their audience. We might imagine authenticity portraits operating as facial refrains or ritornellos (Guattari, 1990). A facial ritornello “derives its intensity from its intervening as a shifter” (Guattari, 1990, p. 74), because it has the capacity to shift and affect subjectification. Guattari gives the example of the role of religious icons that display the faces of saints in a church. Icons are not meant to represent the saint, but “open up an enunciative territory for the faithful, allowing them to enter into direct communication with the Saint” (p. 74). A refrain, or a ritornello (Deleuze, 1993/1997; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Guattari, 1990), repeats and produces, time
and again, a means for an encounter with the song/icon/face, including the face-landscape correlation produced through close-ups as part of activism campaigns and the faciality portraits that try to capture and capitalize on them. Like the output of geomnemata, its repetition is a way of marking out a territory as it creates the affective space for an encounter over and over. What matters with the ritornello is not its content, but the way in which it contributes to activating space for subjectification through repetitive practices—in this case, repetitive faciality enactments. Posters and ads that continuously focus on presenting ‘authentic’ employees encourage repeated interactions with hypocrisy micropolitics and re-assert the link between micropolitics and macropolitics.

A communication strategist at a pipeline company that I spoke with as part of this study argued that transparency is a critical tactic in getting individuals to cultivate a sense of trust that would allow them to listen to the facts. During the interview, the strategist repeatedly used the word “authentic” to describe the pipeline company’s strategy saying: “people are used to and accustomed to, and actually respond better to real people:’”

It’s not like ‘you should trust us’; it’s ‘you can trust us, and here is why.’ It’s like ‘we’ll show you who we are, we’ll tell you who we are. Throw open the kimono. We’ve got nothing to hide here.’ It’s not just a style of communication; it’s just how society is now. There’s nothing secret. Everyone’s just more authentic then they used to be. So, what the job is for me, and for our engagement people, is to capture that authenticity and try to reflect it back to people. (Jacqueline)

This pipeline’s media specialist’s reference to the words ‘reflection’ and ‘capture’ shows the company’s strategy to use transparency to fold subjects, by encouraging them to take up a critical examination of their own authenticity, and, presumably finally acknowledge the integrity crisis they are facing as oil-consumer/environmentalist subjects. Authentic individu-
als are therefore folded into pipeline corporations’ self-branding because they depict individuals willing to share transparent stories about their honest lives and also because these stories are depicted as their own, rather than produced by someone else.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) noted how ‘capture’ appears to structure relationships autonomously. Corporations do not just seek to appropriate authenticity in their campaigns, they want to make desire for authenticity circulate through the various arrangements that comprise subjectivity in hypocrisy micropolitics, rather than making it appear like a corporate strategy. In doing so they deliberately become involved in the micropolitics of environmental movements, linking macro with micropolitics. This includes intervening in the sorts of relationships that campaigners have with citizens. In other words, capitalism appropriates faciality by leveraging the desire for transparency that is already affectively produced. This is well explained by Toscano’s (2005) description of Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of capture: “the logic of capture is such that what is captured is simultaneously presupposed and generated by the act of capture, appropriated and produced” (p. 39). Individuals contribute to the apparatus of capture by engaging in faciality enactments and desiring authenticity not because it is something they ‘lack,’ but because it is a means through which they become produced as subjects. Desiring-production is a social production, which within capitalism contributes to their subjectification as social subjects (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983).

Resisting ‘Authentic’ Data in Inquiry

Writing about the pleasures of authenticity attained through fractal faciality machines does not mean that the voices of residents with whom I spoke have been ‘unproblematically authentic’ in my research. This would assume that participant’s voices are neutral accounts of ‘their’ experiences and can therefore be easily classified, coded and interpreted. One of the
methodological moves that I made in this chapter was to think about subjectivity and how it operates in assemblages that function in relational ways, rather than as individual and ‘their’ ‘authenticity.’ Mazzei (2009) argues that we should not give up on the role that the ‘voice’ of our research participants has in our research, but that we may need to give up on the promise that voice has offered in much qualitative research, namely “the promise of a voice that can provide truth, fixity, knowledge, and authenticity” (p. 47). Listening to the ‘authentic voice’ of research participants is problematic, especially if it is not seen as part of a research assemblage in which researchers ‘decenter voice’ (St. Pierre, 2008) and use it to ‘plug-in’ with other data, such as theories (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013). This problematic particularly emerges when ‘voice’ is examined as what is evident, or authentic.

For instance, at the start of my fieldwork, I was particularly worried that I was not hearing ‘exciting stories’ about political activism, as I had hoped. I ended up interviewing more and more participants in the Vancouver area, and decided to also travel to Kitimat, Terrace, New Hazelton, and Smithers to speak with residents there. McWilliam, Dooley, McArdle, Pei-Ling, and Flashing (2009) had a similar experience in their “desire for clarity” when conducting interviews with young refugee students in Australia. They wrote that their “fantasy that ‘authentic’ interviews conducted ‘on location’ with those for whom we were seeking to advocate a better, more meaningful schooling experience would deliver ‘clarity’ was foundering” (p. 70). Not seeing myself within the typologies of ‘activist’ or ‘environmentalist,’ terms I sought to avoid in my research due the pre-formulated conceptions these were associated with, I wondered about what phantasms about ‘data’ had propelled me to travel to more allegedly ‘authentic’ sites of activism (such as Kitimat) as a desire to produce myself as an authentic researcher of political and environmental education and communication, and of social movements. This worried me. I quickly wondered about my choice to
conduct more and more ‘interviews,’ and thereby produce more ‘research data,’ and whether this constituted a desire to develop more ‘authentic accounts’ of how political education and subjectification work.

In his discussion of the material politics in the case of British Petroleum’s pipeline near the Georgian village of Dgvari, Barry (2013) showed that the desire to produce transparency is entangled with the production of more and more data. Production of transparency through the production of more and more data (including research data, as I would argue) operates as a “technique of governmentality, one that is often associated with ideas and practices of accountability” (p. 11). In his study Barry shows how the production of information for the purpose of transparency is part of a need to govern the ‘unruliness’ of unpredictable materials and their behaviours, such as oil, land, landslides, pipes, etc. How then, was my desire for more and more data, really a desire to also attempt to manage the heaps of ‘unruly’ subjects who did not fit tidily into manageable interpretations and analysis? Rather than focusing on what ‘authentic’ ‘political subjects’ are, I began to map out the folds through which my empirical encounters of ‘selves’ trying to be ‘authentic’ began to become empirically problematic in my understandings of subjectification as a decentred process animated by an influx of forces, bending, folding, and refolding it in various ways. Jackson and Mazzei (2013) argue that ‘data’ is what happens when we plug-in ‘data’ with theory. I took to diagramming how concepts like integrity, hypocrisy, and truthfulness work in relation to education and subjectification, rather than focusing on what ‘authentic subjects’ are. My perception of campaigners’ and ENGOs’ resistance to being folded into the broader educational

27 In Barry’s study, British Petroleum readily accepted responsibility to produce data for an impact assessment study (in an area prone to landslides) in order to produce an information archive that would contribute to the company’s global desire to appear transparent.
attempts at their perceived ‘energy illiteracy,’ hypocrisy, and political wilfulness, reverberates in their resistance to be folded as ‘research subjects’ into any interpretations I might make to get them to fit into a ‘tidy’ analysis of what ‘authentic political subjects’ look like.

It became important to see how political subjects are operating on the boundaries, of and against common ideas, that are produced and circulated about ‘authentic’ political and environmental subjects, including ideas that are produced by researchers. This is well captured by Bronwyn Davies (2013) who writes that feminist poststructuralist research about environmental education ought to not only make visible how participants make their world ‘real,’ but also how researchers contribute to the production of the real through practices of categorization and normalization through recognition and repetition, one of which is the reduction of detail and trying to identify ‘themes’ about a topic, such as ‘authenticity.’ Authenticity is a relationship of looking and being recognized; it operates as a screen for the projection of desire, that is also projected onto landscapes. Political subjects emerge by being folding, re-folding and being folded along various discursive and spatial lines along which ideas about ‘authentic political subjects’ operate.

In this chapter, I have argued that hypocrisy micropolitics fold political subjectivities along lines of in/credibility, non/belonging, in/authenticity. I also argued that political subjects participate in fractal faciality enactments by producing an ‘authentic face’ that allows them to survive within media discourses that demand that they navigate authenticity terrains. ENGOs and environmental activists anticipate and encounter images in news, blogs and corporate discourse that demand that they justify and hence pre-emptively manage productions of authenticity. When we look closer at how authenticity operates, not as a question of identity or a project of the individual, but as a fractal machine characterized by faciality enactments, we can see that authenticity involves folding-in relations-to-the-self. Folding occurs
not once, but multiple times, as environmental audiences encounter and sense environmental activists’ in/authenticities. This accentuates a fractal texture to environmental movements. These findings challenge preoccupations with the development of environmentalist identities, complicating the desirability of those identities, and the kind of work that environmental educators and communicators do.

In the next chapter, I fold ‘the fold’ a final time. So far, I have engaged in a fieldwork in texturology that consisted of elastic aporetic topological folds, chaotic evental folds, and now fractal faciality folds. In Chapter Six, I develop the concept of on intervallic folds, especially those produced through anticipations, sensations of the future, or more simply ‘waiting.’ I engage with anticipations of the apocalypse that justify what I call educational phantasms, building on Deleuze’s (1969/1990) concept of the phantasm, particularly as ENGOs and residents wait for oil pipeline decisions. I suggest that ‘waiting’ compels ENGOs and environmental activists to engage in media campaigns and educational activities that ask people to ‘occupy themselves’ and show how ENGOs communication directors and campaigners think about the need to engage with their audiences and in turn, how people resist such ENGO chronologies. Intervallic folds are also a mode of thinking with the productive research space that forms when one waits for ‘data’ that might never come and the types of phantasms that are produced about what ‘data’ might achieve.
6. Waiting for the Apocalypse: Phantasms, Campaigns, and Ecological Futures

To wait. In its infinitive form, the verb produces anxieties about ecological futures. How should one wait? For how long? Doing what? A multitude of anticipatory logics, practices, and styles of approaching futures (Anderson, 2010) inform how one might wait in the ambiguous thresholds of the Anthropocene. Beliefs about whether futures can be intervened in, or how they are told, tamed, and tended (Adam & Groves, 2007) move beyond the imaginary and representative realm, into the realm of practice and sense. For some, futures constitute a historical ‘return,’ while, for others, they become epistemic objects of calculation, speculation, anticipation, or dread. These varying engagements with futures drive different logics that are produced to justify a response to how to engage with them.

Subjectification in environmental movements occurs in relation to time and more specifically, through temporal registers associated with ‘waiting.’ Waiting is the focus of this final chapter focusing on folds, where I unfold subjectification from its previous elastic and evental folds and machinic fractals, and refold it within phantasms, time, and physics. I draw on Deleuze’s (1969/1990) concept of the phantasm from his book Logic of Sense to think about folds in relation to time and discuss sensations that produce subjects in relation to environmental futures, as they wait. Waiting compels ENGOs and environmental activists to engage in media campaigns and educational activities that ask people to ‘occupy themselves.’ I show how ENGOs’ communication directors and campaigners think about the need to engage with the subjects (readers, viewers, publics, funders) of their communication practices and in turn, how people resist ENGOs’ chronologies.
Anticipatory phantasms, such as phantasms of upcoming pipeline decisions and phantasms of the apocalypse, work in the production of subjectivity through folding. My attention with this chapter turns to Deleuze’s (1988) fourth fold of subjectification, namely the “fold of the outside itself” (p. 104), or the way in which the subject orients to or “hopes for immortality, eternity, salvation, freedom or death” (p. 104). The fourth fold of subjectification—the fold of the outside and expectation—helps to consider how subjectification occurs through folding phantasms, or anticipations and senses of the future that are produced while waiting. Waiting functions as an interval, or a suspended state, filled with environmental education and political communication and campaigning activities that rationalize the waiting itself. Such persistent waiting produces anxieties that compel further activities for people to take part in, in that “those who wait must be given something to do” (Deleuze, 1993/1997, p. 41). I subsequently show that waiting, as an event of prolonged duration, frustrates and amplifies expectations of pipeline decisions and anticipations of anthropocentric apocalypse.

The future becomes something that is constantly strategized over and anticipated by ENGOs, yet also continuously deferred as imminent action becomes delayed through oil pipeline lawsuits and regulatory decisions at the provincial and federal levels. Waiting compels the production of technologies of the self that function as what I refer to as technologies of occupying time—in this case educational programs, and also, social media, online newsletters, clicking to donate ‘now,’ viewing documentary films—technologies of occupying the interval in which people are asked to constantly engage, so as to be ready for the realization of their educational and ‘political potential.’ These are also technologies rationalized by claims to education in relation to the ‘effectiveness’ of communication, something that further rationalizes problem/solution architectures.
I think with folds to mark a relation between ‘the fold of the outside’ and sensations of the future that propel educational phantasms, and how these operate in tandem with the language of ‘potential’ in education, which articulates subjectification as a constantly ‘post-postponed destiny.’ ‘Potential’ draws on developmental ideas that idealize the chronological unfolding of subjectivity through the fulfillment of one’s potential, or in other words, actualization as a subject. Such educational potential is, in turn, produced through the act of waiting. The language of potential produces the wait as a duration that becomes dreadful, horrific, and full of anxieties for both ENGOs and residents alike. Expanding on this fourth fold, my aim in this chapter is to show how subjectification involves the formation of an “interiority of expectations” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 104) in relation to political outcomes, ecological apocalypse, what different environmental futures look like, and what it will take to avert or support them—phantasms—that fold and produce subjectivity. I demonstrate how anticipatory phantasms, such as phantasms of upcoming pipeline decisions, and phantasms of the apocalypse, work in the production of political subjectivities through folding.

This chapter is organized in the following way. First, I introduce how sensations of futures currently appear in ecological literature. I then show how the fourth fold, as a fold of the outside and expectation, works in relation to phantasms (Deleuze, 1969/1990; 1993/1997). Here I draw attention to the non-representational dimensions of environmental and political education associated with suspension, delay, and anticipation, and less so with imagination or representation of hopeful environmental futures. Phantasms operate as ‘solutions’ to human species’ death in light of ecological collapse, as well as solutions to the death of the humanist subject, and even to environmentalism perhaps. Second, I show how eco-political education becomes one of the techniques of filling the wait-times that are produced by phantasms of the apocalypse and phantasms of pipeline decisions. Anticipatory dread
compels environmental educators to produce activities that will prepare people to realize ‘their’ potential, activities that I argue aim to produce ‘political subjects’ in a specific telos of humanist environmental education and instrumentalist understandings of environmental communication. Finally, I end on an interlude. An interlude enacts an interval that extends the event of subjectification. I discuss ‘the interval’ as a productive concept when fieldworking with textures. Here I show how my approach to political subjectification through educational phantasms is entangled with my focus on intervals and the uncertainty found in waiting for pipeline decisions arose from my own waiting for data, the productivity of playing with interval data, and my approach to decentering representational voice (Mazzei 2013, 2016; Mazzei & Jackson, 2012, 2017; St. Pierre, 2008). Interval data become a way for thinking with what might typically be seen as a kind of non-data, which can be very productive in a fieldwork in texturology.

Sensing/Waiting

You know, there is a certain part of me that no matter how much I believe in not having a pipeline, to me all this is like a little tempest in the teapot compared to what the major thing is going to be. I’m sort of waiting for the second wave. They can arrest all of these people there [protesting the Kinder Morgan pipeline at Burnaby Mountain] and then the second wave will come along. I guess I am a little willing to sort of sit back and observe what’s happening, and—like for instance, with the Enbridge [pipeline], I was all set to go up there if necessary to help for a blockade. However, the way things have transpired, the whole process has been stalled for years and I doubt that it will ever see the light of day. (…) I’m not necessarily wanting to put myself out there until I know for sure that that is the only way. – Kirstin (Vancouver Metro Area)

Images and discourses of oil pipelines, when encountered, result in sensations about the future, or phantasms, which “inspire in us an unbearable waiting—the waiting of that which is going to come about as a result, and also of that which is already in the process of coming
about and never stops coming about” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 211). Pipeline decisions and their continuous postponements due to environmental and Indigenous groups’ lawsuits and appeals to regulatory decisions, are events that continuously delay the future. Moreover, these events become “a part of” people like Kirstin, and produce a range of anticipatory sensations that accompany them during prolonged states of waiting, marked by feelings of indeterminacy and flux.

Mathews and Barnes (2016) argue that “environmental futures” range “from the apocalyptic to the utopian” (p. 9). While the ecological apocalypse feels urgent and horrific, Swyngedouw (2010, 2013) positions the apocalypse as a debilitating crisis for humans, which dissuades political action, especially as it is frequently depicted as manageable through techno-rationalist capitalist solutions. He suggests that the apocalypse is reproduced as an imaginary in which the gravitas of humankind’s collapse is “forever postponed” (Swyngedouw, 2013, p. 12) as humans continue to persevere through techno-rationalist resuscitations, despite end-of-civilization scenarios. Such an imaginary is fuelled through popular culture’s presentation of survival stories in dystopian post-apocalyptic afterworlds, as film and literature present numerous and different apocalyptic imaginaries.28 I propose a contrasting take to the claim that persistent imaginaries of human species’ survival (despite the ecological apocalypse) made possible through techno-scientific rationality and survivalist mentality, are detriments to political mobilization. I suggest that the apocalypse is directly related not to de-politicization, but to attempts to contrive ‘political subjects’ through

---

28 I am thinking here of films such as Children of Men (Shor, Smith, Smith, Abraham, & Newman & Cuarón, 2006), Elysium (Block, Blomkamp, Kinberg & Blomkamp, 2013) and Interstellar (Thomas, Nolan, Obst & Nolan, 2014) which highlight “survivalist imaginings” (Branston, 2016, p. 808). The growth of the climate fiction genre (cli-fi) such as Claire Vaye Watkins’ (2015) Gold Fame Citrus and Paolo Bacigalupi’s (2015) The Water Knife also leave the outer space and technologically utopian narratives of posthuman science fiction, and instead, focus on survival in post-disaster Earth and new imaginations of human life within. Zero K, by Don DeLillo (2016), for example, highlights the concern for human immortality that might extend life through cryonics until Earth stabilizes again, enough to sustain human life after the ecological apocalypse and the war and mayhem that may at some point accompany it, or already accompanies it.
organizing sensations of the future and rationalizing people’s engagements with anti-oil pipeline campaigns.

**Folding Phantasm of the Apocalypse**

The periods in which nothing happens don’t fall between two events, they’re in the events themselves, giving events their depth. (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 160)

There are intervals and empty spaces, but they are filled with immense visions, insane scenes and landscapes. (Deleuze, 1993/1997, p. 98)

Phantasms are different from imaginaries in that they are sensory extensions of bodies, rather than projections of the imagination, forming a sensory space between the body and its encounter with anticipated events, such as an ultimate pipeline decision or the ecological apocalypse, which accompany Kirstin and become a part of her. I want to take a different look at the apocalypse not as an imaginary that delays political action, but as a force of the outside or expectation that compels action, by drawing on Deleuze’s reflections on waiting. Deleuze (1993/1997) explains that waiting for the apocalypse involves substituting immanent action with a theatre of phantasms:

One is now faced with the task of filling up a monstrous and drawn-out time between Death and the End, between Death and Eternity. It can only be filled with visions...programming replaces project and action (p. 41).

Such visions of what action, and here, communication campaigns, can achieve, might be considered through the concept of the phantasm. Phantasms are neither illusions nor perceptions, but the effects of events (Deleuze, 1969/1990) that emerge from prehensions, or sensations described in Chapter Four. Persistent dwelling in the intermezzo, or in-between the An-
thropocene and a post-apocalyptic Anthropocene produces anxieties that compel communication campaigns and education, which function as what Deleuze (1993/1997) called programmes and are rationalized by, that “those who wait must be given something to do” (p. 41). Encounters with images and discourses of oil pipelines might be seen as amplifying sensations about the future, and also sensations of how to fill the intermezzo until the arrival of such futures. Such sensations might best be understood as phantasms.

Deleuze (1969/1990) argued that phantasms “inspire an unbearable waiting—the waiting of that which is going to come about as a result” (p. 211). Phantasms are the sensory versions of the stories we tell as we wait, and they also amplify the intensity of the waiting itself. He noted that “phantasms of the surface have replaced the hallucinations of depth” (p. 24) of the subject, travelling easily between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside,’ folding and bending a surface, as they produce the appearance of ‘self.’ They have “extreme mobility...travel in the atmosphere with agility...and belong to a line connecting and arranging the inner and the outer” (p. 217). The phantasm, a rearranging scrunched space between bodies and signs/texts/discourses of future events, enfolds to produce subjectivity. In other words, the political subject has no interiority, but exists as a folding between sensations of anticipation and waiting. It is this coextensive continuity and metamorphosis through different folds that produce the perception that there is interiority.

The sensory aspects of phantasms position them as more-than-representational, but less than ‘being.’ Foucault (1970/1977) highlighted Deleuze’s disillusionary approach to the phantasm, calling it “phantasmaphysics” (p. 172), due to its focus on sensation rather than illusions and representations. Phantasms “stick to” and “protrude” from people, becoming a sort of “floating epiderm” (p. 169), or a second skin. They are an “extra-Being” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 221) that form an incorporeal space between bodies and thought, and between
sensation and representation. As Foucault (1970/1977) argued, a phantasm “arises between surfaces, where it assumes meaning, and in the reversal that causes every interior to pass to the outside, and every exterior to the inside” (p. 169). In this sense, phantasms can be understood as the double—the outside of the inside.

Subjectification hence has a topological character as introduced in Chapter Three in relation to knowledge and *aporetic topologies* and in relation to the *geology of the subject* in Chapter Four. Subjectification’s topological character can also be seen in relation to Aionic time by bending Chronos or bringing ‘the future’ and ‘the present’ closer together or further apart by collapsing or entwining time. Subjects are produced in bending and folding time, rather than develop chronologically. Foucault (1970/1977) noted this topological aspect of phantasms:

phantasms form the impenetrable and incorporeal surface of bodies; and from this process, simultaneously topological and cruel, something is shaped that falsely presents itself as a centered organism...[phantasms] topologize the materiality of the body (p. 170).

Foucault equates Deleuze’s phantasms as a cruel force that topologically pleats and bends multiple, and competing futures inside the present, creating an intense space of waiting that is erratic and temporally dense. Later in this chapter, I discuss how such topologies emerge as problematic for ENGOs claiming to do public education, as their strategies have a teleological directionality that relies vastly on the discourse of ‘potential,’ which is based on chronological perceptions of time.

Rather than illusions or perceptions, phantasms are sensations that fill the topological space and time of an encounter between signs/images/texts and bodies (Deleuze, 1969/1990). Additionally, phantasms are sensations that form in the encounters between bodies and material worlds. For instance, Weszkalnys (2016) suggested that environmental conflict is often
marked by atmospheres or “resource affects” (p. 127): sensations emerging from people’s encounters with materials labeled ‘natural resources.’ These encounters produce affects that can be poignantly seen in, for instance, the atmospheres associated with gold rushes in North America in the 19th century, marked by speculation, abundance, adventure, shared purpose, hope, risk, and uncertainty, as well as in present-day events, such as the anticipatory and uncertain futures that are described and claimed in response to the dearth of oil and the troubles faced by the oil economy (Weszkalnys, 2016).

In the anti-oil-pipeline movement, despite multiple delays, stalls, and deferrals of pipeline decisions, including challenges to those decisions, participants like Kirstin often sensed an impending and ultimately negative decision that would result in the approval of the pipeline—a sensation that became “a part of her.” The phantasm of the pipeline decision propels the sensation of further phantasms, such as the phantasm of political subjectification, or the sense that the anti-pipeline movement would reach a moment when the developmental and slow accrual of the social movement would amass in political actualization. Sensations of what will happen in the future—phantasms—are used to constitute a duration—the wait—that folds political subjectivity.

In the Meantime: Postponing Destiny Through Virtuous Busywork

Within oil pipeline conflicts, the sensation of the protracted wait for inevitable but unknown oil pipeline decisions affects educational communication campaigns. A communication director working for a large ENGO in Vancouver explained that his organization’s goal is “finding your righteous people as quickly as possible, and then giving your righteous people

---

29 I parenthesize ‘natural resources’ to highlight the constructed nature of this phrase, and the often made assumption that it is somehow natural to think of materials in/on the planet as existing for the purpose of human use through mass excavation, processing and manufacturing.
something that they can do” (Tobias). ENGOs want the public to engage in preparation, and in doing so produce educational phantasms as preventative measures to oil spills and an apocalypse and articulate productive ways to spend time waiting for pipeline decisions. The micropolitics of waiting and dwelling in the intermezzo in states of suspension, contribute to the production of political subjectivity that is continuously deferred through delayed pipeline decisions, as decisions move between regulatory bodies, provincial and federal governments, and legal battles and appeals organized by environmental and Indigenous groups.

The political subject therefore has a continuously “postponed destiny” (Deleuze, 1993/1997, p. 40) as it is produced as a duration in the prolonged interval of waiting. Despite an apparent state of emergency and urgency, phantasms of the apocalypse compel the introduction of phantasms that fill the wait, such as educational and communication phantasms, which become the e/affects of anticipations of eventual pipeline decision and phantasms of the apocalypse. In other words, phantasms of the apocalypse amplify phantasms of the pipeline decision and, consequently, give rise to the urgency for increased presence of media activism and public pedagogy practices, which in turn teach how to ‘wait,’ ‘not lose hope,’ and ‘stay mobilized.’ The environmental apocalypse is not an abstract imaginary against which pipeline debates take place. It is rather a future event that produces temporal logics that actively shape phantasms about what educational programming can and should achieve.

**Filling the Wait Time with Anticipatory Dread**

For environmental activists and educators, waiting becomes a source and fear of silence, as silence produces feelings of stagnation, passivity, and impatience. The sensation that environmental and political education and communication efforts might be failing, as marked
through silence, creates a sense of urgency to fill the space of dread, dread that in turn produces sensations of urgency. People working or volunteering in communication positions in ENGOs (campaigners, directors of communication, directors of audience engagement strategy) view their mandate as that of environmental educators, part of which at times involves being “a morale coach” (Tobias). Morale is the need to sustain a sense of optimism, motivation, hope, or belief in a goal for an outstretched period of time—the duration of waiting.

Anticipation of the pipeline decisions and the environmental apocalypse produce dread to the point that education is seen to constantly need to fill any silent space that might indicate any collapse of educational phantasms, as well as phantasms about the effectiveness of campaigns and representational strategies (i.e., more and effective representations of the issues, actors, and urgency).

Suspected death of the efficacy of campaigns and the belief in educational phantasms becomes intolerable, and waiting is therefore consistently filled with recurring infinitive extensions of the phantasm about what environmental communication campaigns can and ought to achieve, as explained by a campaigner working in Northern British Columbia:

It needs to be constantly reiterated that this pipeline is never going to be built. So that people feel empowered and don’t just then sit on the couch and think, ‘oh, it’s done. It’s going to happen anyway.’ Well actually there are still things you can do.

ENGO campaigners produce expectations about the future as ‘not-yet’ through educational phantasms, namely that through their own work, they can lead people toward the realization of ‘their political potential,’ and also the realization that there is still time for self-work and self-transformation. ENGOs therefore accentuate a postponed future (e.g., one where it has not yet been decided to build the Northern Gateway oil pipeline) whenever they intuit a breakdown in educational activities and media practices and encourage an infinite rebirth of
the phantasm (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 215) in singularized expressions and pleasures of the oil-event.

To use a theological example, Guattari (1990) makes a useful observation that the church facilitates ongoing engagement with an afterlife through the purposeful production of space in which to enact prayer. For instance, the primary purpose of icons in the church is not to represent saints, but to produce a space for the enactment of the belief in the afterlife through prayer, a mechanism for participating in this belief. We might in this way see the organization of protests, workshops, and other spaces, as the production of territories for ongoing reaffirmation of the phantasm of political subjectivity through educational practices in the wait. These practices make the wait more bearable, but they also risk becoming disciplinary in the sense that the phantasm of the apocalypse compels educators to compel people to continuously take part in them. In turn, waiting produces ‘political potential’ into an object of ownership and control over future outcomes, echoing Protestant Christianity’s emphasis on hard work and ‘work ethic’ as a means to salvation and ecclesiastical absolution.  

Speculation about the inevitability of a pipeline approval decision or engagement with the apocalypse suggests a failure of hope and the foreclosure of political actualization, and prompts organization of more communication, education, and activism activities, even if their effectiveness is not immediately clear or determinate. As one communication director at an ENGO explains:

First we ask them to organize their friends and family. And people who do that successfully, then we ask them, “Are you willing to do that?” And they raise their hand. If they raise their hand they get a phone call from one of our volunteer organizers who said, “Oh, you raised your hand. You know,

30 I will draw on Deleuze’s and Guattari’s many ecclesiastical examples in order to illustrate an emerging parallel between how phantasmic of the effectiveness of ENGOs’ media work and public pedagogy campaigns occupy the duration of ‘waiting’ for pipeline decisions and ecological apocalypse, and the way in which Christian-
we’ve got training coming up, or there’s this meeting, or whatever you can do.” Then they’re usually given a fairly simple task of doing something: “Here, go take this petition and sign up your friends.” And if they do that really well, then we say, “OK. Then now we want to get you into training. We’re going to invest in you.” You need to make them stretch beyond where they can stretch, and they have a little bit of a loss, and you go, “Oh, what do we learn from that?” Because you learn more from losses. “What do you learn from that?” And then, ok, now they’re depressed. So maybe they need to have a victory. So the victory can be a small thing, like, you know, getting a meeting can be a victory. Right? (Tobias)

Environmental and political education in the anti-oil pipeline movement mimics and presupposes formal education activities, as noted by the language of “raising your hand,” starting off with “simple tasks first” to see if people “do that really well,” “helping people understand” and reflecting by asking “what did we learn from that?” Here, education is accentuated by synonyms of ‘training,’ ‘preparing’ and ‘investment.’ The implication of filling the wait time with activities that mimic school-based education is that these echo the discourse of education as an investment that helps to actualize pupils’ potential (to become more fully human and rational citizens). The capacity to meet one’s potential is constantly deferred through the changing succession of new tasks that people are encouraged to take part in, demonstrate proficiency in, and master.

My argument is that the wait is filled by instrumentalist and transformation-oriented educational phantasms. Such phantasms are sensations that emerge between (delayed and uncertain) environmental futurities and environmental activists’ belief that ongoing media activism will prepare them and others to deal with phantasms of the pipeline decisions. These phantasms are justified through phantasms of the apocalypse. It is through these phantasms that political subjectification might be understood as an interval, relating to ideas about how to spend the time ‘waiting’ productively. Phantasms of the apocalypse and the pipeline chan-
nel people’s desire for environmental change into engaging in various media practices (becoming better informed, attending workshops, writing letters to the editor, etc.) that fill the wait.

**Waiting in Horror/Averting Death**

Horror is one of the impending sensations that does not quell activism. Horror works in tandem with a desire to fill the wait for the pipeline decisions with action. The authentic faciality enactments of environmentalism described in Chapter Four have a particular way of projecting ‘horror’ onto temporality. Indeed, “the face is a horror story” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 168), as is its production, in that it projects an identity that people can associate with, as well environmentalism as a ‘solution’ for the future, in order to continuously justify its existence. The phantasms I just described operate as “an instance of solution to the specific problem...the problem of death” (Deleuze, 1969/1990, p. 215), taken here both in terms of species extinction and the death of any meaningful notion of the signifier ‘environmentalism.’

In the anti-oil pipeline movement, phantasms of the apocalypse are the effects—solutions—of imagined horrific futures, which form through encounters with techniques of anthropocentric measurement and predictions, and results of grim reports such as those produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Transformative educational approaches are justified through phantasms of the apocalypse in order to avert ecological death, as well as the death of the ‘face’ of environmentalism grounded on humanist ideas of the subject and its political subjectification.

Deleuze (1993/1997) notes how in the history of Christianity, the creation of the concept of the apocalypse meant that “waiting now becomes the object of unprecedented and maniacal programming” (p. 40). Waiting for death is filled with a menace of activities that
might let a righteous soul prove its worthiness of resurrection upon the return of Christ, for example. Waiting hence also becomes a mode for differentiating between those who spent their time waiting righteously, as evidenced through various repetitive anticipatory practices aimed at preparing the soul for the resurrection, and the sinners who failed to live their lives in accordance with the promises of that resurrection. The resurrection, or the apocalypse, postpones the destiny of the subject, its day when it becomes ‘saved’ or actualized, to something that occurs after death. Apocalyptic horror names the sensation of the difficulty of thinking about a world-without-us (Thacker, 2011), and is an effect of an encounter with the future apocalypse as an event. Horror weighs heavily between the body and its encounter with information, signs and narratives about the collapse of the Earth as an ecosystem that can sustain human life.

For Colebrook (2016), the Anthropocene, as concept, draws attention to the anthropogenic present as well as a post-Anthropocentric future, at once horrifying and productive of a calls to action, that is, a mechanism for dealing with these sensations of the future. The Anthropocene, as a concept, acts performatively because it produces “a series of diagnoses that generate imperatives” (Colebrook, 2016, p. 82) for environmental activism, while stirring nostalgia about what has never been; a symbiotic, chaos-free Gaia in which humans and ‘nature’ can co-exist in symbiotic ways and in solipsist calm. Such a landscape demands being constantly filled with phantasms not only of the future, but also of a past that can extend into the future. The sensation of a foreclosed future and death of the human species incites renewed belief in humanism amongst environmental educators, which, even if reimagined through a more eco-friendly iteration, risks being constituted with fuller force, speed, and intensity, through a threat to its very existence.
As pipeline decisions appear to be continuously delayed, an oil spill appears to be inevitable, and the ecological apocalypse seems imminent, people encounter ENGOs’ campaigns through phantasms that rationalize public pedagogy and the participation in ENGOs’ knowledge practices. In other words, despite the sensation that political activism is ‘dead’ or offers little hope in light of capitalism and corporate greed, phantasms of the possibility of ‘political subjectification’ persist and rationalize waiting itself.

In an excerpt below, Cameron, an outdoor enthusiast from the Metro Vancouver area, who is also a long-time member and subscriber to various environmental groups in British Columbia, notes how horror fills the space between the present and the future, yet does not prevent him from continuing to be busy. He partakes in various media practices, such as informing himself about how to become an intervener, attending public protests, and reading about environmental issues in newsletters sent out by environmental groups, despite being aware that the process of the protracted and slow ecological ‘death’ has been taking place since industrialization:

I get horrified easily. So when I take a look and see what’s going on now, I don’t see huge differences [between now and] in terms of spreading industrialization, faith in industrialization, and its consequences on the natural world. So I guess I’m using a kind of really old term [horror] in the environmental discourse. Edward Abbey and all the rest of them are part of that rhetoric…. I wouldn’t be doing what I’m doing if I thought that there was no point, [but] do I have much faith in things happening? None whatever. (Cameron)

Phantasms might therefore be seen to operate as accomplices, becoming extrabeings that accompany people as an attachment in the form of “cruel optimisms” despite diminishing conditions of possibility (Berlant, 2006). For Berlant (2006), cruel optimisms operate as ‘solutions’ to neoliberal capitalism which functions on the endemic promise of ‘making it’ if one
While for some, awareness of the Anthropocene produces sensations of the phantasm of the apocalypse that incites political action, for these participants the phantasm of the apocalypse becomes an e/affect of the sensation of an impending doom. In the excerpt below, Gordon and Emma, two hikers and outdoor enthusiasts living in the North, speak of the indeterminability of whether the wait for the apocalypse will be swift (10 years) or prolonged (200 years).

Waiting in itself becomes a feeling; a suspenseful, or even an exciting time that includes anticipatory jouissance, or the “fascination with climate change, anthropocentric knot of catastrophe, condemnation, and paralysis” (Dean, 2016, p. 4). Gordon and Emma sense that environmentalists have lost the overall struggle against large corporations and climate change, regardless of the specific pipeline decision against Enbridge. Regardless, they continue to fill the unbearable time of waiting for the ecological apocalypse through the production of phantasms, and enactment of themselves as ‘political subjects’ through these phantasms, in ways that enable them to continue living. These phantasms include the phantasm of political subjectification, which despite believing in the inevitability of the ecological apocalypse, Gordon and Emma use to enable themselves to cope with the indeterminable timing of its arrival and possibly a protracted wait:

31 Dia Da Costa (2016) rightfully observes that affective dimensions of ‘waiting for belonging’ and taking part in ‘the good life’ promised by capitalism are experienced differently by the subaltern and marginalized. In In the Meantime, Sarah Sharma (2014) also notes the way in which experiences of time are not univocal across race, class, ethnicity, and gender. In writing this chapter, I became increasingly curious in what ways temporal affects (engaging with ‘ecology’ through deep time, or not having enough time for ‘environmental issues’) have resulted in a study in which all my participants were white. While this question of the intersections of temporality, environmentalism and race is outside of the scope of this chapter, it would make fruitful topic for future research.
**Gordon:** It’s knowledge that the overall system is flawed. You’re not just fighting Enbridge. Eventually you have no clean water left to drink. You’re wrecking your source. It’s not sustainable. Our system is very flawed. We’re on a route, and maybe it will be 10 years, or maybe it will be 200 years, but we’re on a route of destruction here. It’s not going to stop. The only people that are going to do that are the ones in the bunker.

**Emma:** They have the ones where they can store all their stuff for a year.

**Gordon:** There are scientists that have been talking 10 years ago about greenhouse effects and global warming and all that kind of stuff, but you know why you don’t hear them anymore? They know it’s too far so what they’re doing is they are investing in time for their own safety, and they’re building their own bunkers and building their own systems.

**MP:** Survival mechanisms at this point?

**Gordon:** Yes, because we’ve gone too far. They actually say that if you stop every car, every vehicle, ever fossil fuel, kill every cow, you know, got rid of all the greenhouse gas, the ocean is still going to go up. It’s already too far. The ocean is going to die no matter what.

**MP:** Don’t they say that if by 2030, we go back down to the 1970s level of…(interrupted)...

**Gordon:** It’s never going to happen. What we put into our environment will take 1000s of 1000s of years of not doing anything to fix it. Take every person on this planet, leave it alone for a 1000 years… It’s doomed. There are a lot of people that crunched those numbers. It’s a sad state and a lot of people know the mechanisms and know it’s finished. So they turn to themselves and make sure they have their little garden and then they don’t fight that much.

**MP:** But it sounds like you’re still active.

**Gordon:** Well, I’m still going to fight as much as possible because I don’t want my granddaughter, when she is hooked in to some kind of machine to say ‘where was my grandfather?’ I want her to say: ‘Yeah, you remember him? He was saying this all along.’ That’s my own hope in life. Because I don’t think we’re going to change anything. (…)

**MP:** This is a doomsday scenario.

**Emma:** But it is.
Sensorial aspects of the phantasm indicate that political subjectivity is produced in the less-than-rational space/time of waiting. Gordon and Emma feel that even if the oil pipeline projects can be averted, the ecological apocalypse is inevitable. They fill the extended wait for the apocalypse by participating in the phantasm of political subjectification, as it allows them to confront the anticipation of guilt. For Gordon, this guilt is manifested in an anticipatory encounter with his granddaughter in an undisclosed future, when he anticipates she will be “plugged into machines,” questioning her grandfather’s failure to actualize politically. Gordon’s encounter with the prospect of the end of the world-for-us produces additional phantasms, namely the phantasm of ‘political subjectification,’ or the idea that continuing to be active in overtly political activities, even if not successful, might reprieve him from guilt in a nearly ecologically devastated future.

Deleuze (1985/1989) noted the intensive operations of memory: “it is in the present that we make a memory, in order to make use of it in the future” (p. 52). The various simultaneous temporal registers of awaiting the looming apocalypse indicate that subjectification does not occur in chronological time, but rather, one that is intensive (Boundas, 1953/1991; Colebrook, 2002; Coleman, 2014). Hence, it is through the constitution of a memory in the present moment that Gordon is ‘absolved’ of his guilt. Conceived chronologically, the future is a marked moment in time that always comes after the present moment, yet when reconsidered intensively (Boundas, 1953/1991; Colebrook, 2002; Coleman, 2014), the future produces a set of “concerns about what the future might be if the self/body is not transformed [which] are required to be acted on now” (Coleman, 2014, p.40). Subjectivity then, is not a state or being, but a duration that has been bent and folded in a cruel topology by anticipation.
Sense, a passion that engages with a future, is a mode of relating to a hypothetical “‘situation’ of what may ‘eventually’ befall a subject” (Miller, 2007, p. 84). In the form of anticipatory phantasms, the fold of the ‘outside,’ which Deleuze (1988) also called the fold of the “interiority of expectations” (p. 104), produces, in ongoing ways, a dimensionality or volume to subjectification, where the focus is not on actualizing an eventual being, but rather on the practices of becoming that constitute this intervallic fold. Returning to Deleuze’s example of Christianity, Christians who believe in eternal life after death are not saved through one confession, but through ongoing practice of repentance and prayer. The uncertainty of the resurrection (“Keep watch because you do not know the day or the hour” – Matthew 25:13), only serves to intensive and amplify the need for recursive phantasms that fill the wait—the belief in repentance, and other technologies of the Christian self.

**Technologies of Occupying Time**

The phantasm of the apocalypse and the pipeline decision introduce a host of programming activities in the form of educational campaigns, even if this education does not result in immediate action and categorizes participants into those who have the capability to actualize as ‘political subjects’ in the image associated with ‘activists,’ ‘organizers,’ and ‘protestors’ and those who do not. Education fills the wait times as ENGOs claim a moral duty to educate people to fulfill their full potential, in anticipation of pipeline decisions. Environmental educators and activists feel compelled to produce educational phantasms as solutions to phantasms of an eventual oil spill, showing how important it is to fill the time of waiting through virtuous busywork, akin to Christian preparation for apocalypse through prayer and work ethic as a means to avoid moral guilt and sin. For people figuring themselves in the phantasm of the pipeline decision (that there will be an ultimate decision that will require people
to actualize politically), education includes attending workshops on how to avoid being arrested while protesting, attending open houses to learn more about the oil pipeline issues, going to town hall meetings to learn about new developments, and seeking out news sources such as by subscribing to local Indigenous groups’ social media accounts, and attending speaker events.

ENGOs strategize how to keep the public’s attention through a series of specific technologies of occupying time—technologies of the self that people are asked to engage in. Technologies of occupying time animate and sustain people’s anticipations of a future need to become political by asking them to engage in activities in the meantime, such as donating online ‘now,’ engaging in ‘hope’ through art-making, attending kayak flotillas, responding to requests for signing urgent petitions, going to documentary film screenings, attending events where they help recruit new members and so on—all considered traditional sites of social movement learning (Hall 2004, 2009; Flowers & Swan, 2011).

The micropolitics of waiting contribute to the production of political subjectivity that is continuously deferred (postponed actualization) through delayed pipeline decisions, as decisions move between regulatory bodies, provincial and federal governments, legal appeals put on by environmental and Indigenous groups. ENGOs respond to the phantasm of the pipeline decisions by filling the wait through training, assessing and investing in people. The phantasm of the pipeline decision means that it becomes vital for ENGOs to program activities that fill people’s time so that they are productively figuring themselves as political subjects and engaging in environmental faciality enactments described in Chapter Four, rather than being idly consumed by the phantasm of the apocalypse:

You need to give them something to do. Get a big wide tent, get as many people in, try to give them—and ask them to do a series of things... it’s where we sort out for our really hardcore organizers and activists... So the
bigger the tent, the more you get… Occasionally we ask those people to mobilize and do something. (Tobias)

Much like streaming or tracking practices in formal schooling, people who do not demonstrate a nascent potential to be organizers or activists, but who care deeply about the pipelines are ‘sorted’ out, possibly excommunicated, and left to fill their time with attending other educational activities. The consequence of such sorting during the wait, is that as Lewis (2016) argues, “the self is, simply put, pathologized, when it is not functioning according to expectations or not actualizing itself as it should” (p. 348). Lewis (2016) argued that the concept of potentiality has been given a deterministic tone, in which “potentiality is put in the service of actuality so as to be made more determinant or to develop into what it can and ought to become” (p. 341). Education, when treated as an “investment” as described in the excerpt earlier, signals that education today affects people’s potential capacity to actualize as political subjects when they are needed, tomorrow. Attaining one’s potential is constantly deferred through the production of a succession of new tasks to be accomplished, where action today, is replaced with strategic education for ‘the future tomorrow,’ akin to the discourse of being trained for ‘jobs of tomorrow.’

The developmental machine (Lewis, 2017) positions subjects’, and in Lewis’ case children’s ontologies in relation to “chronological unfolding of ‘not yet’ into ‘must be’” (p. 82). Deleuze (1995b) notes how “the realization of the possible always proceeds through exclusion, because it presupposes preferences and goals that vary, forever replacing predecessors” (p. 3). The developmental machine might equally be observed within environmental movement education with adults as the language of potentiality draws on developmental ideas of subjectification found in adult learning in environmental movement literature. The danger of developmentalist logic is that it reduces intervallic states of suspension (Lewis,
2016; Lewis & Friedrich, 2016) such as waiting, into activities aimed at actualization according to preconceived images of environmental activism and is deeply imbued with chronological time rather than intensive multiplicities.

**Exhausting Time**

Residents concerned about the development of the pipelines expressed tiredness of being constantly engaged in educational practices that fill the wait of continuously deferred and uncertain pipeline decisions. They were particularly distraught when they realized that the educational programs fail to teach them anything new. This realization is pronounced for those who have been waiting for a long time for a slowly materializing and impending apocalypse. Being continuously engaged by or encouraged to participate in ‘the resistance’ via social media, documentary films, door-knocking, email newsletters, and other communication practices, become dreaded activities. For instance, Arthur, an avid cyclist and alpinist in his sixties, despite having belonged to various environmental organizations throughout his life, debates his need to continuously turn to environmental groups educational materials to consider himself political:

> I am a member of groups like Wilderness Committee and Greenpeace, but I have to admit that I find that virtually everything they have to say, I already know it. I became sort of bored with what they have to say long ago, despite the fact that I agree with them entirely. It's just that I've heard it all before. I don't need to read the same thing over and over and over. (Arthur)

The language of potential establishes becoming in relation to a subjects’ capacity to actualize according to facialized images and representations, whereas instead it is only once the language of potential, and potential itself, are exhausted, that one can renounce the preconceived
organization of potential and realization of (others’) goals and dreams: “You no longer realize, even though you accomplish” (Deleuze, 1995b, p. 4). People who fail to ‘actualize’ or ‘stall’ are in a way deemed as having failed to have become functional, or to have realized their potential. Preconceived images and conceptualizations of ‘political subjectivity’ as developmental and achieved through persistent educational self-work ultimately flatten topologies that demonstrate how subjectification is already multiple, resistant, aporetic, fractal, and temporally dispersed rather than chronological. In a way, they form the pragmatic practices through which subjectivity is maintained within/as problem/solution architectures.

Foucault (1970/1977) explained that phantasms “cut them [subjects], break them into sections, regionalize them, and multiply their surfaces” (p. 169), not unlike the creases of the fractal face. ENGOs and campaigners ignore, avoid or neglect the presence of phantasms, flattening topologies of subjectification in efforts to avoid cutting, breaking, or bifurcating humanist and transformational ideas of the humanist political subject and education’s role in its emergence. Such ‘flattenings’ deflate ontological space. They are reductions that produce stress amongst people living in oil pipeline areas who are already engaged in various forms of environmental activism, as they are torn between continuing to do educational busy-work to fill the wait, and being perceived to be unmobilized, or worse, apathetic. These ‘failures’ are indicative of phantasmaphysics, or the way in which the weight of phantasms, understood here as ‘solutions’ to impending ecological futures, cut and break subjects, as they produce them.
**Interval as a Mode of Inquiry**

Something nonetheless happens in the interval, a substance or flow. (Deleuze, 1993/1997, p. 49)

I indulge in an interval that curiously appears at the end of this chapter, rather than as might have been more appropriately (to its name) placed in its middle. This is because an interval has a way of extending the event—the event of subjectification—giving it another moment and another fold. It is my way of delaying the end, which by virtue of the linearity of this textual format is inevitable, by just a little longer. This interval explains how my turn to the concept of phantasms and ‘waiting’ emerged. The space of the interval, of waiting, is important to how folding functions. As I engaged in empirical fieldwork, I noticed that people’s engagement with normative conceptions of becoming ‘political’ appeared to predominantly relate to the past and the future, but rarely to the present. I found myself ‘waiting’ to see what would emerge from my encounter with such a vacuous temporal space, and at times ‘unproductive research space,’ and how such waiting in turn became productive in the shift to recognizing the phantasmic aspirations that researchers, including myself, often have of ‘data.’ I attuned to this shift away from actualized states of either subjects as well as of ‘data’ as something given, to the productive aspect of ‘waiting.’

Thinking with ‘waiting’ and phantasms has implications for inquiry and is entangled with my aim to decentre representational voice (St. Pierre, 2008; Mazzei 2013, 2016; Mazzei & Jackson, 2012, 2017). It invites openings to think about the process of subjectification as emerging from temporal folds, suspension and intervals, and hence complicate the notion of subjectivity as something derived from ‘a person’ and its individuation and consequently, its accompanying voice. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) exclaimed that “the interval takes all, the
interval is substance” (p. 478). I concur. Intervals prolong the event—the event of subjectification—and delay the illusions of clarity and solutions. The interval characterized the prolonging of an event—subjectification—rendering the intermezzo itself worthy of inquiry. The interval is particularly interesting to me as a fold is always already an interval, between things, between states. Its composition is uncertain, and its temporality is dense, laden with memory and with a virtual future, uncertain how it will unfold.

My alignment with a posthuman orientation to the treatment of participants’ voices (Mazzei 2013, 2016; Mazzei & Jackson, 2012, 2017; St. Pierre, 2008, 2009), posed a challenge to treating voice as representative of sense. Sense does not belong to an individual but is an entanglement between a body and its encounter with signs, materials, and texts; and, furthermore, may not be expressed accurately or adequately through oral language. This is why this chapter does not focus on how people experience apocalyptic representation, for instance. Experience speaks to the interpretation and representation through thought, and subsequently its material expression in voice, of what a person believes has happened to them through recognizable concepts. Woodward (2010) describes this by suggesting that thought, or “understanding spontaneously moulds erratic sensory data into recognizable object-images” (p. 323). This is something I wanted to avoid; summarizing how people experience education in the anti-oil pipeline movement in language familiar to them, such as the language of normative politics defined through activism, protesting, voting, and petitioning.

While hesitant to use the term ‘data’ given its uses in positivist research and how I explained the term is used in a fieldwork in philosophy, interval data has become a useful way to think about the ‘data’ of a texturology, as that which is produced in the in-between-states, intermezzos, and intervals that intrigue researchers. I briefly outline three characteristics of interval data that emerged in my own process of inquiry.
First, interval data arouse out of a hesitation about what might be considered ‘good data’ and the subsequent wait that ensued as I looked out for data that I had expected to bring me closer to explaining what ‘political subjects’ are or are not—in this case, data about how ‘political subjects’ might become actualized, mobilized, and emerge from a relation to education. I turned to writing about the sense that participants have of pipeline decisions and of the apocalypse only after my disappointment with representational research and after attuning to the fact that I had expected a lot from voice, and to some extent, I had, initially perhaps, expected my interviews to generate the voice of ‘political subjects.’ As I entertained my own initial frustrations with this non-data, with the speed and duration (slow and seemingly infinite) with which I was hoping to hear ‘actual’ ‘political subjects’ in my research (rather than people who were waiting, reminiscing or being doubtful), and interpreting how this ‘lack of data’ would materialize in a chapter, I began to pay attention to was being produced in the intervals of subjectification, and the uncertainties of my own research as I ‘waited.’

Second, interval data engages from research events that pose challenges to chronological time, and invites into play various other temporalities, such as intensive time, namely how the future, present, and past are experienced simultaneously, something that I discussed in this chapter and which I discussed in Chapter Two. Interval data does not refer to what occurred between point A and B (past and future), as these points themselves do not exist, but are iteratively produced depending on what occurs in the interval itself.

Third, and related to this previous point, interval data brings attention to the sensations of interval durations, and their multiple and often contrasting affective states, such as hopes, doubts, anticipations, dreads, and intermezzos associated with processes of becoming.

32 Deleuze (1988) refers to the interval between seeing/hearing and speaking as thought. Perhaps these thoughts in my research emerged in the temporal distance of failing to speak/articulate subjectivity. I refused to ‘make sense’ of the event of subjectification by listening to humanist ‘voice’ in my interviews and hastily ‘speaking’ it, giving it voice by representing it, in humanist terms.
more so than with accounts of being. This third point is important, as it highlights ‘waiting’ as a duration that becomes a valid focus of analysis, without demanding that attention focus on the development of a ‘beginning’ and ‘the end’ or an ‘between’ as ‘potential’ that in its lack is seen as pathological. What I mean by this is that ‘waiting’ and states of suspension in the process of becoming subjectification became important and enough in themselves. Interval data hence functions as a trope for thinking about how educational programs are anticipated, sensed, dreaded, used for ‘hope,’ or speculated upon, features of a non-representational approach to inquiry. I approach subjectification as having the capacity to expand, delay, defer actualization, or alternatively, treat ‘subjectification’ as well as research as an “infinite expectation of an event capable of filling up the intervals” (Deleuze, 1993/1997, p. 11), and producing ever more intervals. In other words, one of the productive forces of a fieldwork in texturology is that it produces ever more folds and intervals that become interesting interstices for research.
7. Conclusion: The Fold is Always in the Middle of Becoming Something Else

In *When the World Screamed* (Doyle, 1928), after Earth had been drilled to elicit a scream and draw attention to humankind, the crowd that had gathered to observe the event, uncertain of what to make of it, was riddled with questions: What was it that just happened? What had occurred? And, how had it come about? Uncertain of what to make of this unprecedented event, they quickly attributed it to the creative genius of super scientist Professor Challenger alone. Earth, discontent in being portrayed as the object and spectacle of scientific experimentation, went about marking the event in new ways and new expressions—as erratic, uncoordinated explosions of a series of volcano eruptions in Iceland, Italy and Mexico.

Oil is a recurring event, and while we do not know what kinds of future events oil will be expressed in, Arthur Doyle’s speculative realism helps to imagine the limitations of past thinking in currently situating oneself within rapidly and dramatically accelerating ecological destruction and humans’ increasingly ambiguous role as agent/victim/saviour and doer/observer. Perhaps science, and the scientific method as personified in the figure of Professor Challenger, provide some comfort in how to ‘cut through’ the chaos and orient as ‘subjects’ within these chaotic events, but instead, I want to draw attention to Deleuze’s (1969/1990) advice to channel this unknowing into creating concepts so as to “become worthy of what happens to us” (p. 149). To ‘become worthy’ by way of concept work is a way of not giving up on environmental education and media practices in environmental movements. Rather, it is a way to recast their relevance through new concept work and of giving them a new event—even if the humanist subject is no longer a centre of this project, but at an
ambiguous margin—one whose phantasmic presence continues to animate knowledge practices and everyday media practices, yet is not, or perhaps has never been, the primary force that affects subjectification, or even thought and thinking.

The need for conceptual work about subjectification in relation to intensifying attempts to ‘reach,’ ‘mobilize,’ and ‘transform’ people in ecologically perturbed times through campaigns and other media work, often under the auspices of education, and in relation to the numerous actual everyday media practices through which people already engage with them, is particularly necessary. A germane point in my research has been that subjectivity is produced not always, and only ever partly, as a result of ENGOs’ media work, ‘their’ image events, campaigns, and ‘their’ knowledge practices. Subjectivity emerges, temporarily, as a folded inflection, an arrangement, and is not something linked to an individual or to ENGOs’ intentions. Ecological politics, environmental education, and environmental communication require a nuanced conception of subjectivity that incorporates the conditions that produce subjectivity variably amongst shifting relations to knowledge, matter, force, and ‘the outside’—including anticipations of an eco-apocalypse, extinction, and death. The need for concept work on subjectivity in ambiguous times is important because there is a need to think about human activity, including the media practices through which humans try to ‘make sense’ of geological and political chaos, in a way that defies the anthropocentrism that got us here in the first place. In the parting pages of this dissertation, I situate the aporetic media practices described in previous chapters of the ‘four folds’ in relation to the limits of thought, and hence as fruitful for concept development.
Uncertainty in the Anthropocene: Media Practices and the Limits of Thought

The Northern Gateway and Trans Mountain oil pipeline conflicts offered numerous possibilities to examine subjectification as something multiple, ontologically distributed, a process, and topologically continuous between human and more-than-human expressions. A key aim of the dissertation has been to argue that thought and thinking, and as demonstrated through its uptake in media practices, both pleasurable and horrific, is not entirely human, but something emerging from encounters with shifting arrangements of force, time, matter, and the ‘unknown.’ Sensations and aporetic orientations to ‘thought’ and media practices often had little to do with self-work of individuals or the immediate and specific intentions of ENGOs, and the educational intentions embedded in their campaigns. Media practices of residents living in the oil conflict areas were ambiguous and aporetic and directly related to uncertainty and the limits of ‘knowing,’ despite a proliferation of data practices, representations, rhetorical strategies, etc. Subjectification was therefore in part a product of, yet not an effect of ENGOs’ claims to education found in campaign work. Despite this, the activities are still products of those campaigns, and while this work is not empirical in the traditional sense—its aim is not the interpretation and representation of human experience—it was nonetheless concerned with the way in which residents in oil conflict areas related to or were folded within intensive folds of more-than-human subjectification. Media work, the kind that ENGOs engaged in, produces affects, even it does not produce ‘effects.’ It is not that subjects are produced and engage in these practices despite ENGOs ‘failures,’ but because of the aporetic, intervallic spaces that emerge through tensions of ENGOs’ attempts to fold ‘political subjects’ and narrate chaos in relation to an ‘outside’ that keeps shifting and inflecting subjectivities that are more-than-human arrangements.
Subjectification, as an object of inquiry, was ephemeral, phantasmic, suspended in an interval, and impossible to know through a positivist and humanist ontology. It kept transforming in non-linear ways in the many intensities of the fold, yet never transforming so as to actualize according the educational intentions of activists. Few residents agreed with the knowledge practices found in ENGOs’ media work in attempts to subjectify them, yet they would draw on them to sense ‘themselves’ and be produced as a ‘self’ within the oil-event. Few found that the numerous circulating images, documentaries, texts, social media feeds, etc., helped to explain the event, yet they contributed to producing such artifacts and representations to contribute to its memory of geo-archeology. Few wanted to partake in the recursive and enduring requests to ‘learn more,’ ‘not lose hope,’ ‘follow us on social media,’ and ‘donate now’ yet they did, seduced by and reluctant to let go of educational phantasms that are rationalized by phantasms of the apocalypse, and vice versa. Subjectification occurred within these fractal folds and under the weight of phantasmaphysics. Many also refused to subscribe to ENGOs’ campaigns as sources to learn more about oil pipelines and how to become ‘political’ but engaged in learning even more about the detriments of oil pipelines on their own, asserting their ‘selves’ through this process of independent learning, as resistance. Subjectification took on strange directionalities produced by diverging tendencies, concurrent multiplicities, fractal forces, and intense temporalities.

In the introductory chapter of the dissertation I situated this project within ambiguous times requiring ambiguous concepts that stay open to attuning to the multiplicity of strange orientation and aporetic spaces of subjectification; however, my research showed that ENGOs were uncomfortable with the different immanent productions of more-than-human subjectification and resistance to knowledge practices, and strived for their familiar, anthropocentric recurrence. In other words, ENGOs were ill-equipped to engage with the topological
character of environmental movement media practices and the sensations these directionali-
ties and contortions evoked. How might one think about these diverging tendencies of resi-
dents’ media practices and ENGOs’ reluctance to engage with them? As Deleuze (1988)
noted, there is comfort in “reinforce[ing] the doublings from snag to snag, and surround[ing]
ourselves with foldings that form an ‘absolute memory’ in order to make the outside into a
vital, recurring element” (p. 99). ENGOs in British Columbia demonstrated desires to rein-
force the snags of inherited folds and concepts, to take up familiar ideas about transformation
and subjectivity, rather than question the epistemological and ontological assumptions
through which these were made and continued to recur and persist. Subjectification, as im-
manently and continuously rearranged, and as a pliable ontological process, posed difficulty
for ENGOs and their claims to education in oil pipeline conflicts in BC and the practices
through which they tried to contrive ‘political subjectivities.’ ENGOs involved in anti-
Enbridge and Kinder Morgan oil pipeline activism made claims to education, position and
positioned their work—including their media practices—as forms of education. Such prac-
tices positioned their intended ‘audiences’ or ‘students’ (i.e., in this case residents living in
the oil pipeline conflict areas, although ENGOs can have multiple audiences, including poli-
ticians, other ENGOs, etc.) within recurring problem/solution architectures. In some cases, it
created another dualism between inside and outside—those whose attention was worth their
educational efforts, and those whose was not. I characterized this tendency to excommuni-
cate those who are deemed to have exhausted their potential as a feature of dark media, and
in this case as media practices related to (non)communication between different ontoepiste-
mologies. Furthermore, ENGOs’ educational efforts were in constant tension with the cha-
otic affects produced in the oil-event, often outside of the parameters of ‘oil pipeline politics’
and their responding ‘activist movements.’ Residents’ practices were also in tension with the
accelerations of militaristic speeds through which ENGOs’ campaigns try to devise ‘political subjectivities,’ and perhaps rationalize problem/solution architectures. Such practices were inflected through hypomnemata, anticipations, and phantasms.

ENGOs’ teleological ideas about subjectification as transformation that results in actualization did not account for the non-Euclidian shapes that subjectification would take, ignored them, flattened them, or refused to engage with them. The geometric arrangements perhaps dwelled too long in intervals, in the twists between a chaotic ‘outside’ and the limitations of thought and thinking, were too weighed down with the phantasmaphysics of phantasms, or remained within, and did not ‘transcend’ the topological spaces of aporias. However, the intervals and snags, turns, and knots of topological spaces pulsate with vitality and productivity of subjectivity, even if they do not actualize.

My politics has been to argue for a non-reductive, non-essentializing approach to subjectification, that examines what happens and what is produced between/by way of those ambiguous folds, rather than what failed to happen (e.g. representational failures to educate, motivate, produce reflexivity). My inclination towards the productive rather than ‘lack’ of actualization emerges in the belief that we do not yet know what contortions and arrangements subjectivity will take. This vitalism however shows how subjectivity is produced as a momentary derivative or product of dark conditions such as ‘not knowing,’ chaos and the infinity of oil as event, hypocrisy, and waiting/extinction/death; it is not the joyful production of subjectivity associated with agentic forms of resistance.

Decentering analysis of everyday media practices in environmental movements away from specific media formats or content by examining inflections is one way to expand on the move from textuality to texturology that Conley and Dickinson (2010) advocated for. This
move focuses on the immanent multiplicity of processes of subjectification that are not already reflected in assumed relations between campaigns and their ‘audiences.’ This approach, I believe, challenges the preoccupation with ‘effects’ and the instrumentalism found in the preoccupation with ‘content’ and representational practices in environmental activism as modes of inquiry that bring us closer to political mobilization. Rather, it shows that subjectification emerges in part from the affects that are generated inside/between/through folds: phantasms, prehensions, sense, ambiguities, anticipations, etc. Subjectification was produced throughout the oil pipeline conflict in BC; however, its enactments were distributed across practices and sites, human and non-human forces, images, death, temporality, memory, concepts, etc. Concepts developed in this dissertation contribute to decentred modes of media analysis by showing how research into subjectivity shifts when the ontology of what is typically conceptualized as ‘media users’ (or audiences, publics, end-users, etc.) is produced affectively between audiences, and campaigners’ and corporate advertisers’ communication strategies and material practices, and particularly as affected by non-human forces.

I have argued for examining users (readers, viewers, followers, makers) of environmental campaigns from a post-experience perspective, focusing on how subjectivity is produced in the entanglements of human education and media practices and forces outside the human, and does not precede them. I hence argued for an approach to subjectivity in which individuals and ‘their’ transformation is no longer the key unit of ontological inquiry. Instead, the folds and relationships between inside/outside, their topological continuity (albeit contorted in various arrangements), and sense and prehensions, become units of inquiry. A post-‘experience’ mode of inquiry is important to understand how media practices are taken up not because of human intentionality or desire for critical transformation, but as practices
taken up in a relation to an ‘outside,’ that is, the limits to knowing, the circulation of force itself, matter, death, and the Aionic forces of time. As Deleuze (1988) argued, “the intentionality of being is surpassed by fold of Being, Being as fold” (p. 110). Rather than intentionality, a focus on sense has been a productive notion through which examine folded encounters, as sense is something external to individuals, which circulates and precedes them. Activities such as donating online, reading (or choosing not to) campaign newsletters, going to protests, recounting historical campaigns, taking activism selfies at marches, writing comments on anti-oil pipeline blogs, following ENGOs on social media, and signing online petition, are all modes of engaging with oil, and also modes of engaging with pre-individual sensations, for example, urgency, horror, pleasure, anticipation. The aporetic dimension of media practices has to do with the limits of thought, uncertainty and the discomfort of ‘not knowing,’ and the sensations and pursuits of knowing these evoke. The folds of the subject emerge from the limits of ‘thinking’ the outside and therefore the limits to thought and education itself. ‘The subject’ exists only in as far as it is produced at the interstices of problematizations of ‘thought’ and educational intentions, a kind of emergence at the interstices of the limits of thought—even as subjectification entailed vigorously engaging in knowledge practices, attempts to ‘know’ and ‘to be known’ to others or oneself perhaps at a future, unmarked time (geomnemata).

**Folds-Yet-To-Come**

It is not enough to oppose concepts to know which is best; we must confront the fields of problems to which they are an answer, so as to discover by what forces the problems transform themselves and demand the constitution of new concepts. (Deleuze, 1988b, p. 112)

We should certainly be asking ourselves whether ‘knowing’ is the metaphor that we need.

(Law, 2004, p. 3)
The need to develop new concepts has been an important argument of this dissertation, and both mode and aim of its inquiry. This research refolded subjectification across each chapter, proliferating folded concepts and developing folded modes of inquiry in relation to conundrums in fieldwork. My approach to concept work drew on other scholars who have also asserted concept development as a means to continue to stay open new ways of thinking and resist representational modes of thought. Colebrook (2002) has argued that the aim of concept work is to resist “reductive and generalising tendency by expanding difference” (pp. 16-17). Mariam Fraser (2006) has also argued for a conceptual practice where the very task of concept development is to extend events, that is, to give them another event. I do not think we are ‘done’ with the subject, but rather with approaches that cast subjectification within unhelpful problem/solution architectures and humanist frameworks laden with the language of individual agency as well as potential. This is not a judgement, but a critique (Butler, 2001) of an episteme that has structured ways of thinking, but inadequately engaged in a pedagogy of concepts to explain the conditions and methodologies that justify the enduring use of such concepts. Concept work will continue to assert environmental education, campaign work, and environmental communication as useful spaces for thought in as far as it engages with limitations and seductions of knowing, the ‘mess’ of uncomfortable junctures, glitches, the problematic of compulsory hope, and new non/human thresholds, contradictions—a dark(er) education and communication philosophy.

I proposed a mode of inquiry called *fieldwork in textures* as a specific way to approach concept work. A fieldwork in textures argues for empirical examination of how something, an ‘object of research,’ can be folded in multiple ways, and itself contain multiple folds. This move to textured thought, as that which is folded in multiple ways, enacts a posthuman ethics to engage with the productivity and yet-unknown-folds that occur within
abstruse spaces of the Anthropocene. A fieldwork in textures does not seek coherence, and rather devises a geometric methodology that recognizes how objects of research can be concurrently multiple and folded in multiple ways. As Colebrook (2002) notes, “a concept is not a word; it is the creation of a way of thinking” (p. 2). Such concepts begin with problems that emerge from epistemological orientations used in research, in other words, problems encountered or created in the process of inquiry. Such concepts describe a different ‘image of thought’ than one that aims to ‘represent’ the object of research in order to describe ‘solutions.’ Deleuze (1968/1994) described ‘the classical image of thought’ as one aimed at knowing ‘the truth’ with the ‘good intention’ of being capable of ‘serving as answers’:

By this I mean not only that we think according to a given method, but also that there is a more or less implicit, tacit or presupposed image of thought which determines our goals when we try to think. For example, we suppose that thought possesses a good nature, and the thinker a good will (naturally to ‘want’ the true); we take as a model the process of recognition - in other words, a common sense or employment of all the faculties on a supposed same object; we designate error, nothing but error, as the enemy to be fought; and we suppose that the true concerns solutions - in other words, propositions capable of serving as answers. (p. xvi)

Contrary to this classical image of thought that opposes ‘error’ of the faculties, I have tried to depict a different ‘folded’ image of thought that stays and ‘plays’ with the conditions of the ‘fold.’ conceptualized as ‘threshold’ and the ‘undecidable,’ and as one emerging from the ‘problems’ of research, that is, its alleged errors. Concept development is inseparable from the conditions through which such concepts are developed, or in other words, how philosophy and research inflect each other in a fieldwork in philosophy (Bourdieu, 1990; Heimans, 2016; Lather, 2014; Mol, 2002; Rabinow, 2003; Rabinow & Rose, 1994).

The politics of a fieldwork in textures lie in its anti-universalizing and non-representational orientation, and also in its focus on staying with the ‘messy’ and engaging with its
productive, if sticky textures. The politics of this practice requires giving the object of research a new event and using ‘subjectification’ as a thinking device to examine the conundrums and aporias of educational practices and media practices and ways of thinking in the Anthropocene. Subjectification, rather than a representational concept, becomes a tool to think with. Braidotti (2017) for instance described how for her the ‘posthuman’ became a “conceptual persona, that is to say, a theoretically powered navigational tool that helps us think along and across the complexities of the present” (p. 84). In my dissertation, ‘subjectification’ similarly functioned as a term to think with across the complexity of unprecedented conditions where human/non-human relations are undergoing profound transformation. It also functioned to traverse the folds of currently unconversant fields of environmental communication and media studies and environmental education. I argued that subjectification, media practices, and claims to education are arranged in manifold ways, and that these arrangements are ontogenetic and teeming with activity that cannot be grasped through enduring, representational concepts.

The generativity of ‘folded thought’ is in its production (rather than lack) within the everyday media practices that might be determined as ‘failures,’ such as intervals, temporal regressions, or staying ‘within’ a topology, etc. While I do not think my work will provide the types of ‘solutions’ that may be sought after, the folded concepts and folded thoughts (Nancy, 1991) which emerged in this dissertation can contribute to the ways in which people who are politically involved in environmental movements or concerned about environmental issues, or involved in media and public education practices, think about their frequently ambivalent practices and their onto-epistemologies. I make no pretence that thinking differently will produce any ‘solutions,’ anticipated or otherwise, to issues like oil spills or climate change, but it can help understand the ‘folds’ of subjectification in more-than-human times.
In this work, I have worked with Lather’s (2009) assertion that “qualitative research resist the siren call to socially useful research that positions it within repositivization and, instead, work toward embracing constitutive unknowingness, generative undecidability, and what it means to document becoming” (p. 354). Rather than solutions, the focus in my work has therefore been on what Rabinow refers to in Foucault’s work as the ‘diagnostical,’ that is: “the primary task of an analyst is not to proceed directly towards intervention and repair of the situation’s discordancy but to put forth a diagnosis of ‘what makes these responses simultaneously possible’” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 18, quoting Foucault). What thinking with folds makes simultaneously possible is the discordancy that subjectification in ecological conflicts comprises the human/non-human, craving for/resistance to knowledge, practices of the ‘self’/the chaos and geology an oil-event, an accelerating impending Apocalypse and an expanding intervalllic present, etc. Rabinow (2003) further shows that the diagnostical, or problematization is not concerned with synthesizing these discordances. Rather, it is concerned with experiments in methodological equipment: “the one thing we should not be doing is attempting to find a new, hidden, deeper, unifying rationality or ontology...we can direct our efforts towards inventing means of observing and analyzing how the various logoi are currently being assembled into contingent forms” (p. 15). Contingency, or the conditions within which, and how subjectivity is folded are constantly changing. Methodological experiments enable the development of concepts that are produced in relation to these contingencies.

I have thought alongside the contours of Deleuze’s fold to see where it would take me. The various textures that I have experimented with in this study have been an engagement into seeing what ‘thinking/doing with folds’ could do—treating the concept as method. The concept of ‘texture,’ as something that is folded in many ways, has generated several
concepts, and four key orientations to thinking about subjectification, conceptualized as a process of folding, rather than as a ‘being,’ though certainly there are many more, and these folds are more intricately entangled, not separated, as I have depicted them in the form of separate chapters. These conceptualizations of subjectification as through *aporetic topologies* and their *un(knowing) folds, evental folds, fractal faciality folds, and intervallic folds* are just some of the ways that subjectification is always multiple, virtual, continuously rearranged, and, concurrently marked by difference. These concepts are ways of engaging with the intensity of multiple tendencies of educational practices and environmental communication, though they can be, to follow Deleuze’s (1993/1997) idea of a ‘geometric method,’ taken up as modes of inquiry that stay with the curious, the undecided, that which can perhaps never be known, but only intuited.

33 A pedagogy of the concept is predominantly engaged in the production of concepts, and in lieu of ‘summarizing’ each of the chapters and all the concepts any further here, I have opted to present a brief ‘Index’ as a record of concept-work from the previous chapters in Appendix A. This brief index of concepts is also not intended to reduce or summarize, but to record an inquiry into folds and folding, akin to the way in which Raymond Williams (1976) argued that his keywords were not a ‘glossary’ but a “record of an inquiry into a vocabulary” (p. 15). These folded concepts are predominantly suited to thinking about media and public education practices in ways that are more-than-representational and non-teleological; topological, rather than typological.
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Appendices

Appendix A: A brief index of a few folded concepts

*Aporetic topologies*: Aporetic topologies is a concept that acts as a mode of inquiry. It is a mode of inquiring into diverging tendencies, vacillations, doubts, and ambivalences in knowledge, particularly by way of diagramming. Aporetic topologies does more than map out resistance to knowledge, or non-chronological knowledge practices. It becomes a way of sketching or mapping these inflections as undecidables, and considers how folds function in relation to Chronopolitics, especially, the urgencies at which knowledge aims towards ‘solutions.’ Aporetic topologies diagrams diverging tendencies are problematized in relation to the speed at which knowledge aims towards ‘truth,’ ‘certainty’ and ‘solutions,’ found in instrumentalist research approaches, particularly those that seek to develop research aimed at informing interventions or practice. I suggested that the very act of practicing aporetic topologies (concept as method) produces decelerations to problem/solution logics. In this dissertation, this has, I believe, taken the form of producing decelerations to the transformative and ‘effects’ aspects of environmental education and communication respectively, and problematizing how these position activities such as ‘self-work’ and improvements in the quality and quantity of representations, as responses to the speed at which the ecological crisis is advancing. An aporetic topology is attuned and part of dark(er) ecological thought because of its capacity to absorb aporias and indeterminacies rather than be fragmented by them.

*Educational phantasms*: Educational phantasms are sensations held about the possibility of educational programs to ‘counter’ impending sensations of immanent ‘problems’, in this case, ecological doom. Educational phantasms are justified by other phantasms, for instance,
sensations of the apocalypse. Educational phantasms are used to rationalize programs of ‘occupying time,’ and they produce an intervallic space of waiting and hope, but also horror and uncertainty.

**Evental folds:** Evental folds is a mode of inquiry into ‘things’ normally considered to be entities, as ‘events.’ Evental folds is used map the concurrently multiple and bifurcating, real and virtual expressions of one and the same event, consisting of many ‘folds’ in the same topology (a continuous surface originally theorized in terms of ‘rubber sheet geometry’). This concept extends Foucault’s eventalization (non-reductive thinking), especially his argument for research to retain the multiplicity of ‘an event’, by suggesting every event unfolds in various ways. The event of subjectification can for instance be diagrammed as the intense folds of a (k)not and as the intervallic folds produced by phantasms—both at once. This is because these are two ways in which the same event subjectification is folded. Evental folds are an indispensable practice to engaging in a fieldwork in textures—the way something is folded in many ways, because they focus on examining the various ways an event is expressed, including its various manifestations. In this dissertation the evental fold emerges from a specific concern, namely how to think about the multiplicity of media practices that make ‘the event’ of subjectification difficult to represent, and more importantly, how such practices are related to bending rather than a breaking human/non-human thresholds. As developed here, evental folds focus on the ability of a geological event to be at once the folds of matter in its multiple bifurcations and expressions of subjectification in which matter becomes enfolded through prehensions. Evental folds characterize the recursive production of difference of non-summarizable events as concurrent to the pleasures of subjectification that
are taken up in media practices, that try to deal with the event’s chaotic bifurcations, ‘grasp’ and represent it.

**Fractal faciality enactments:** Faciality enactments refer to the participation in incessant mechanism of reproducing representations of ‘identity’, particularly when identity is threatened. Faciality enactments occur through depictions of ‘faces’ which become falsely associated with individuation or authenticity. In contrast, faciality enactments are propelled by machinic forces that fold and refold faces along lines of in/authentic and in/credible through evaluative schemes. These folds organize other folds, creating a repeated mechanism, perhaps visualized as an in-coiling force, which is why they are referred to as ‘fractal’—building on Benoit Mandelbrot’s mathematical fractals. Such fractal faciality enactments, while appearing messy, have an orderliness to them because they systematically cut off and invest in various forms of desire and affect. Fractal faciality enactments contain within them the conflicting multiplicities of singular authenticities, and the multiplicities of enactments found in hypocrisy micropolitics. Fractal faciality enactment is also a mode of thinking critically about ‘authentic’ data, noting dispersed notions of subjectivity, rather than a focus on human voice as a source of an ‘account’ of experience.

**Fractal faciality portraits:** Fractal faciality portraits are visualizations of faciality enactments. They are often characterized by ‘close ups,’ and often depict striations produced by the faciality machine which blocks and releases flows of desire.

**Fieldwork in textures:** Fieldwork in textures is a mode of inquiry characterized by developing (and diagramming) conceptual folds used to inquire into how something functions, and
how it is folded in multiple ways. Also, fieldwork in textures is a specific type of fieldwork in philosophy (Bourdieu, 1990) concerned with events where thinking with ‘folds’ proliferates, including how fieldwork inflects, twists, folds and refolds concepts, and how concepts and methodology fold and implicate each other. A fieldwork in textures concerns itself with small and subtle inflections, and particularly an experiment in folds that present strange directionalities, which stretch, or become intense, or are recursive, and which inflect the teleological force of knowledge aimed at recognizing or representing events through preconceived concepts, thereby reducing their immanence, and multiplicity. The concept helps to conduct inquiry in a way that attunes to multiplicity and the capacity of things to be ‘event-like’ and folded in multiple ways across space-times.

**Geology of the subject:** A geology of the subject is ontologically continuous with the geology of oil. The phenomenon under study is precisely this continuity between expressions of subjectification and oil. My work argues that this continuity is possible if both are understood to be a part of the same event. Geology of the subject becomes a way to think about the material folds that comprise subjectification, particularly how such folds manifest in prehensions and practices. These material folds do not necessarily have a direct impact (e.g. being a victim of a landslide, or oil spill), but produce subjectification through how it engages with the abundance of ways in which geological events unfold—often chaotic, undocumentable, incomprehensible.

**Geomnemata:** Geomnemata extends Foucault’s hypomnemata for the Anthropocene. It particularly functions as a concept to help think about inscription practices as modes of subjecti-
fication in relation to the confounding bifurcating multiplicity of geological events. Geomnemata facilitate prehensions that fold between the ‘outside’ that is incapable of being thought, into the ‘inside’ which grapples with this multiplicity. Geomnemata are media practices through which subjects emerge alongside an intense pleasure of finding ‘themselves’, or rather being, produced as part of the event. The term ‘geo’ highlights hypomnemata as a practice related to geological events in which ‘individuals’ agencies, including the capacity to think the totality of the event is obscured. Geomnemata also become ways of stratifying or layering various expressions of a geological event and can be a way of enacting a geoarcheology.

**Hypocrisy Micropolitics:** The preoccupations with authenticity that are part of the politics of environmental movements. The concept was developed out of the conditions of trying to explore ‘authenticity’ and how it is enacted through enactments of ‘keeping face’ and (re)producing ‘the face’ of environmentalism (see faciality enactments). Hypocrisy micropolitics are concurrent to and affected by macropolitics of the relevance of environmentalism in oil pipeline conflicts, where ‘environmentalism’ becomes a contentious ‘surface’ that is folded and refolded in fractal ways.

**Interval data:** ‘Data’ that emerges from the pauses and intervals of research, especially those that emerge from hesitations in how to engage in research in non-positivist ways, i.e., a kind of non-data. Also, intervallic data refers to a type of ‘sense data’ associated with dwelling in temporal intervals; discomfort, anticipation, hesitation, hope, etc. As a concept, *interval data* emerged from research events that posed challenges to chronological time, and invited play
with various other temporalities, such as intensive time, namely how the future, present, and past are experienced simultaneously.

**Intervallic Folds:** Intervallic folds are a way of spacing that emerges from temporal folds. They are a way to think about subjectification as a process of folding sensations (of ecological jouissance or horror) of time into an intense space filled with memory and anticipations of the future. Intervallic folds are the pleats produced with texts and images of public education campaigns and human bodies, inflected by temporal phantasms. Intervallic folds crumpled productive research space when one waits for ‘data’ that might never come and the types of phantasms that are produced about what ‘data’ might achieve.

**(K)not knowing:** (K)not knowing is a type of un(knowing) fold. The (k)not functions as a mode of inquiry into layerings of different knowledge, different questions, and different forces that animate education, without trying to find ‘points.’ The (k)not articulates how EN-GOs’ knowledge practices become but one of the swarming forces that inflect how political subjects ‘know’; however, it positions these tendencies not in opposition to each other, but as intensities. Knotting is layering, rather than severing; attuning to richness rather than reduction.

**Phantasms of the Apocalypse:** Phantasms of the apocalypse are the effects, or solutions, of imagined horrific futures, which form through encounters with techniques of anthropocentric measurement and predictions. They are justified (reproduced) through transformative ap-
approaches to education, and other ways that maintain or reproduce faciality enactments. Phantasms of the Apocalypse, like other phantasms, are predominantly sensations, rather than thoughts or illusions.

**Re)turn:** The (re)turn diagrams recursivities, particularly as they function in relation to the tension of resistance to future-oriented knowledge practices. The (re)turn creates space where memory becomes an important production through which to encounter (uncertain) futures.

**Snag:** The ‘snag’ sets up a new orientation to environmental education and communication efforts—which can be sketched out or imagined as a fabric that is slightly pulled away but still attached. Uneasiness, uncertainty, and ambivalence to knowledge practices is found within people’s resistance to knowledge practices, yet also their concurrent pull to knowledge or seeking knowledge as a way to be produced as part of ‘the event.’ I suggested that snags for example, accentuate the need for attention to more recursive aspects of EN-GOs’ knowledge practices and campaign work. Just as with a piece of cloth hooked on a branch, a snag exposes an inner surface to ‘the outside’ in this case invaginating ‘knowing’ with the unknown and undecidable.

**Un(knowing) folds:** Un(knowing) folds refers to a practice of diagramming instances of ‘not knowing’, expressions of ‘doubt’, concurrent pleasures of and resistance to knowledge; aporias. They are folds one might find in *aporetic topologies* (see above). Un(knowing) folds relate profoundly to decelerations of militaristic logics and rhetorics that position knowing as a ‘solution’ to ecological crisis and as a mode to realizing the potential of ‘political subjects’,
that is their self-realization and actualization. In this sense, they are a way to note the way in which ‘subjects’ often attempted to be folded through specific knowledge practices that do not recognize the micropolitics of knowledge. Un(knowing) folds unfold linear (teleological) and instrumentalist approaches to research by showing how the relationship between knowledge and subjectivity takes on new shapes, especially using a topological approach. In this research, un(knowing) folds emerged from fieldwork on three different aspects of environmental communication and education, and most importantly from the tensions within how ENGO campaigns are conceptualized, their intentions, and how they are encountered in the daily practices of people engaging with environmental issues, like pipelines. While there are undoubtedly many forms these can take, three in particular are characteristic of aporetic topologies in environmental movements and in the Anthropocene more generally: ‘snags,’ ‘turns’ and ‘knots,’ all which denote some hesitation with ‘knowing.’ In this fieldwork, un(knowing) folds are indicative of not only of ‘not knowing,’ impasses and uncertainties that took place during the study amongst people living in the oil pipeline conflict areas, but also, on my part of engaging with somewhat darker and post-critical environmental thought that is attuned to hesitations about how political subjectification works—that of the residents living in oil pipeline areas in this study, and my own.
Appendix B: Organizations whom I requested to participate in this study

Organizations contacted to recruit participants who took part in environmental groups:

- Forest Ethics Advocacy (BC)
- Wilderness Committee (Vancouver)
- Georgia Strait Alliance (BC)
- Dogwood Initiative (BC)
- Douglas Channel Watch (Kitimat, BC)
- Kitimat Understanding the Environment (KUTE) (Kitimat, BC)
- North West Watch (Terrace, BC)
- Skeena Wild Conservation Trust (Terrace, BC)
- Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition (Hazelton, BC)
- North Shore No Pipeline Expansion (NOPE) (North Vancouver, BC)
- Burnaby Residents Opposing Kinder Morgan (BROKE) (Burnaby, BC)
- Stoney Creek Environmental Committee (SCEC) (Burnaby, BC)
- New Westminster Environmental Partners (NWEP) (New Westminster, BC)
- City Farmer (Vancouver, BC)

Organizations contacted to recruit participants who took part in outdoor pursuits:

- BC Mountaineering Club (BCMC) (BC)
- West Coast Paddler (BC)
- ClubTread (BC)
- Canoe Kayak BC (BC)
- Houston Hikers Society (Houston, BC)
- Kitimat Snowmobile and Hikers’ Club (Kitimat, BC)
- Bulkley Valley Backpackers (Smithers, BC)
- Terrace Hiking Group (Terrace, BC)
- Backroads Outdoor Club (Langley, BC)
- Meet Up: Vancouver Outdoor Club (Vancouver)
- Meet Up: Vancouver 20s and 30s Outdoor Club (Vancouver)
- Valhalla Pure Outfitters (Posters and flyers distributed in the Vancouver store)
- Mountain Equipment Co-op (Posters and flyers distributed in the Vancouver and North Vancouver stores)
Appendix C: The setting of the study

The texturology produced in the chapters in this dissertation and its micropolitical inquiry are inseparable from macropolitical politics and events. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) proclamation that all micropolitics is also macropolitics, necessitates ‘setting’ the study within some of these macropolitics to give a sense of the oil pipeline conflict to the reader. While in the previous chapters I engaged with the process of folding, refolding and unfolding intensities, desires, and sensations, that are anything but chronological, and intentionally avoiding representational stasis, in the section below I offer a brief and inevitably crude chronological representation of the pipeline conflict. It is awfully lean and lacking in adequate descriptions of the groups, people, events, and specific communication strategies and campaigns that were launched by environmental and Indigenous groups, and it also does not demonstrate the network of alliances, coalitions, and collaborations between activist groups, Indigenous groups, and local communities. This is for a few reasons. One is that historically accurate analysis was not an objective of this research, and neither was an encompassing description the evolution of groups, networks, and activities involved in the conflict. Any attempt to claim that I can do that now briefly, would do injustice to the events and the people personally involved. I will leave it to historians and other writers to contribute to a more accurate and detailed cultural memory. My purpose here, in the next few pages, is only to give the reader who may be unfamiliar with the conflict, a very brief orientation to the various twists and turns this conflict took.

My research ‘started’ in the middle of a brewing maelstrom of regulatory, federal, provincial, and municipal political decisions, activist-organized street rallies and protests, ENGOs’ door-to-door, television, and digital media campaigns, Indigenous group led declarations, protests, and lawsuits, and Enbridge’s and Kinder Morgan’s as well as the Canadian
Association of Petroleum Producers’ multi-million-dollar pro-oil pipeline advertising campaigns. Each group’s move as well as government and regulatory decisions generated news coverage, were circulated on social media, and caused attention to these two pipelines to profuse.

**Resistance to the Northern Gateway Pipeline and Enbridge’s Advertising Blitz**

Enbridge, a Calgary-based energy transportation company proposed to develop a pipeline between the Alberta Tar Sands and British Columbia’s coast on March 6, 2002 and submitted its application to build the pipeline to the National Energy Board in May 27, 2010. In anticipation of this, by December 2010, over 60 Indigenous groups in British Columbia had signed the *Save the Fraser Declaration* which declared opposition to the development of Enbridge and future oil pipelines on Indigenous territories as a manner of Indigenous law (Save the Fraser Gathering of Nations, 2010). To get buy in and sway public opinion, Enbridge launched a multi-million-dollar campaign called *It's more than a pipeline. It's a path to our future* in May 2012, which tried to position the pipeline as ‘good’ for Canadians in general, linking it to economic prosperity. The campaign generated substantial opposition via social media. However, it was a video on Enbridge’s website, depicting how oil tankers would traverse the Douglas Channel to and from the port in Kitimat that my participants cited as one of the key moments that engaged them and others in the issue. The graphic representation of the Channel in the video was missing about 1,000 square kilometres of islands. This omission generated incredulity in the company’s honesty and professionalism and created significant exposure to the ongoing conflict between environmental groups and Enbridge on local and national news.
Despite mounting resistance, in December 2013, the Canadian Environmental Protection Agency’s Joint Review Panel recommended that Enbridge be allowed to build the Northern Gateway Pipeline. This recommendation and the pipeline were rejected at the provincial level by the government of British Columbia the following spring in May 2013, when the Liberal government outlined five conditions, such as environmental assessments and consultations with Indigenous communities, which it would take to overturn that decision. In October 2013, Enbridge launched another advertising campaign called *Open to Better* on television and digital platforms, claiming to be capable of building a better, safer pipeline.

By this time, there were 13 active Indigenous and environmental group’s legal lawsuits in process in opposition to the pipeline (WCEL, 2014). Regional ENGOs had dedicated anti-Enbridge campaigns and organized many rallies and protests, both in the areas where the Northern Gateway Pipeline would pass and terminate (e.g., in Kitimat), as well as in the Vancouver Metro Area. Multiple films were made about the oil pipeline project, its threats, and

While initially environmental groups focused on educating people about the conflict, about bitumen and its relation to climate change, and on how to become involved in official political processes (by becoming interveners and writing letters to political representatives), after the approval by the Joint Review Panel, some campaigns turned to raise funds in support of lawsuits. For example, organizations such as the Raven Trust, which organizes legal defense funds for Indigenous groups, and the Sierra Club, an environmental conservation and public education group, organized the *Pull Together* campaign to raise funds for lawsuits led by Indigenous groups. These types of collaborations speak to the incredibly networked nature of ‘the movement,’ including street-based and online activism, and the prolific uses of digital media to disseminate information and updates and garner support for further campaign efforts.

In Kitimat, BC, the proposed terminus site of Northern Gateway oil pipeline, in which the city council initially took a ‘neutral’ position, people demanded a non-binding plebiscite to determine how the town felt about the pipeline. In anticipation of the vote, in the spring of 2014 Enbridge launched an advertising campaign to sway the people of Kitimat to vote ‘yes,’ aligning ‘yes’ with prosperity, jobs, and the ability for families to stay united in the town.
Local groups mounted a self-funded counter-campaign separate from support of larger environmental groups in BC and Canada, to avoid any accusation that they were receiving funding from ‘foreign funded radicals,’ in reference to the way in which ‘environmentalism’ had been coded to terrorism early on in the Enbridge conflict, especially when in January 2012, then Conservative Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver grouped environmentalist groups together with other “radical groups” accusing them of “undermining national economic interest,” and being “foreign funded radicals,” thereby Designating them as a terrorist threat. On April 12, 2014 residents of Kitimat, BC, the town voted against the pipeline in an non-binding plebiscite. Many Indigenous people from the Haisla Nation who live in Kitimaat Village were not allowed to vote in the plebiscite as the village is outside of the municipal boundary area of the town of Kitimat.
Collaboration between environmental groups were therefore not always amicable. When a larger ENGO from Vancouver wanted to launch a provincial referendum (which never materialized) on the pipelines, this was met with considerable critique from ENGOs and groups in the Kitimat, Smithers, and Terrace areas, where local groups did not want to take the risk of a province-wide referendum. Also, opposition to the Northern Gateway pipeline was not starting fresh, as the oil pipeline and tankers would traverse what is known as the Great Bear Rainforest, which spans a large portion of British Columbia’s North and Central Coast, and which has received considerable media attention, largely due to a significant Greenpeace campaign that started in the 90s.34 While some ENGOs connected the fight against Enbridge to the protracted struggle to protect the Great Bear Rainforest, the people I spoke with in Kitimat believed that this connection erased their local struggle by positioning the anti-Enbridge campaign as part of Southern narrative, which sees the Great Bear Rainforest as ‘mystical,’ and associates it with Kermode bears (also known as spirit bears), rather than as an issue of local fishermen, and protection of local rivers.


---

34 Greenpeace’s campaign to save the Great Bear Rainforest is fascinating and an interesting case of an ENGOs’ use of media to draw attention to and act on an important conservation issue over time. I am not able to get into this here, and instead recommend David Rossiter’s (2004) article The nature of protest: Constructing the spaces of British Columbia’s rainforests, for an overview of that history.
Super Tankers and the Twinning of Kinder Morgan’s Trans Mountain Pipeline

On November 29, 2016, the same day that the new Liberal federal government rejected Enbridge’s Northern Gateway pipeline, they approved Kinder Morgan’s Trans Mountain pipeline. The Kinder Morgan conflict began with an announcement of Kinder Morgan’s intention to expand the Trans Mountain oil pipeline, which runs from the Alberta Tar Sands to Burnaby, BC, on February 21, 2012. Kinder Morgan applied for a permit to the National Energy Board on December 16, 2013. The expansion of the pipeline, which was originally built in 1953, would increase from 300,000 barrels of oil each day to 890,000, and increase oil tanker traffic from 5 tankers to 34 per month.

Kinder Morgan was already on the radar of environmental groups and local communities, as a rupture of the oil pipeline in 2007 in the city of Burnaby, the terminus area of the
pipeline. In the Vancouver Metro Area, opposition mounted to the Kinder Morgan oil pipeline, and even before Kinder Morgan announced its official plans, in 2011, the Tsleil-Waututh Nation who are located in North Vancouver declared official opposition to the project. By September 2014, Kinder Morgan had launched a communication campaign featuring their employees to showcase ‘ordinary’ people who work and support the pipeline, in order to garner buy-in for the project. Mounting opposition to the Kinder Morgan pipeline included the establishment of local environmental groups, group coalitions, dedicated anti-Kinder Morgan campaigns by established environmental groups, and organization of many rallies, protests, and meetings. For example, the poster below depicts an invitation to one of the numerous rallies and flotilla by Burnaby Residents Opposing the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Expansion (BROKE) in collaboration with The Sacred Trust initiative of the Tsleil-Waututh Nation. The April 2014 flotilla was promoted by multiple ENGOs and local grassroots anti-pipeline groups, including the Wilderness Committee, North Shore NOPE, and Forest Ethics.
“The Pipeline Ends Here.” Design by Marten Sims. Commissioned by The People’s Procession Against The Pipeline (2014); Gabriel Saloman; in collaboration with Mariane Bourcheix-Laporte, Ruth Walmsley & Burnaby Residents Opposed to Kinder Morgan Expansion; Unit/Pitt Projects, Vancouver, Canada.

The ‘movement’ included countless of meetings, film screenings, performances, marches, which I cannot possibly describe here. Several notable events, such as the arrests on Burnaby Mountain in Burnaby, where Kinder Morgan tried to do test drilling in November 2014, large protests in January 2016 when the Kinder Morgan started its public hearings, another
flotilla in Burrard Inlet in May 2016, and a rally and march on November 19, 2016 in anticipation of a federal decision on the pipeline.

Photo: ‘Break Free’ by Zack Embree. Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 2.0

Rally and March on Burnaby Mountain, 2014, Photo by Author.
Despite the opposition, Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline was approved by the federal government on November 29, 2016, the same day that Enbridge’s Northern Gateway pipeline was rejected. The Liberal government in British Columbia, which had opposed the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion in January 2016, followed suit and approved it in January 2017, arguing that the pipeline has met its conditions and satisfied its demand for a CDN$1 Billion revenue sharing scheme. In March 2017, there were seven separate Indigenous legal challenges representing 15 Indigenous bands, and one from Raincoast Conservation Foundations and Living Oceans Society. In similar fashion to anti-Enbridge campaigning, many of the environmental groups’ media campaigns have and continue to focus on fundraising to support this legal work. The City of Vancouver, the City of Burnaby, and again, the Raincoast Conservation Foundations and Living Oceans Society have also launched lawsuits with the federal government (WCEL, 2017). Additionally, after the provincial Liberal government lost power in an election that resulted in a New Democratic Party and Green Party coalition, British Columbia’s government once again took the position of trying to stop the pipeline by becoming an intervener. Kinder Morgan voiced increased agitation with not being able to move ahead with the Trans Mountain pipeline twinning due to political instability and risk to shareholders. In an ominous move, the Liberal federal government purchased the Trans Mountain oil pipeline (as well as its twinning project) from Kinder Morgan for CAD$4.5 billion on May 29, 2018.

**Local Conflicts and the Global Anti-Oil Pipeline Movement and a War on Science**

The plethora of activities described and presented in a crude and significantly simplified chronology above, advanced at a pace that was at times rapid, and at times seemingly prolonged. These events occurred alongside mounting national and international focus on and
resistance to oil pipelines in general. In June 2010, an Enbridge owned pipeline broke and leaked 3,800 m³ into Talmadge Creek, a tributary of Kalamazoo in Michigan, drawing early attention to the company in Canada. Also, in the United States, protests in response to the Keystone XL pipeline, proposed to run from the Alberta Tar Sands to Nebraska, were and continue to be an important ongoing event weaving through the pipeline debates I have just described. The Canadian federal government launched a year long, CDN$24 million, taxpayer-funded advertising campaign in the United States in support of Keystone XL and the Canadian National Energy Board approved the pipeline in March 2010, despite President Barack Obama’s refusal to sanction it in the United States. The Keystone XL protests have drawn hundreds of thousands of people to rallies and marches in the United States and have generated continuous media exposure to oil pipeline conflicts throughout the time I was conducting research in Canada. Also, between April 2016 and April 2017, oil pipelines gained significant attention due to the Dakota Access Pipeline protests, where the #NoDAPL movement resisted the development of the pipeline that would cross the Missouri and Mississippi rivers and go straight through the Standing Rock Indian Reservation.
Keystone XL, #NoDAPL, the Kalamazoo spill in 2010, and events such as the BP Horizon oil spill in 2010, Royal Dutch Shell’s plans to drill for oil in the Arctic in 2015, and other important events such as the Idle No More Indigenous rights movement in Canada, Hurricane Sandy, United States’ withdrawal from the Climate Accord, and Hurricane Harvey, all contributed to, and flow through and enfolded the Canadian context of anti-oil pipeline movements.

Additionally, in 2012, the Canadian federal government allocated $8 million towards expanding monitorial activities of environmental groups, and specifically to conduct audits of environmental organizations with charitable status, which included several well-known organizations such as the David Suzuki Foundation, Tides Canada, West Coast Environmental Law, The Pembina Foundation, Environmental Defence and the Sierra Club. Non-partisan
political advocacy could comprise only 10% of activities taken up by organizations with charitable status in Canada. These audits circulated affects in which my conversations with groups pointed to people’s awareness of a ‘charity chill’ (Kirkby, 2014) even though only one of the environmental groups I spoke with was officially affected as a registered charity at the time. Prior to the 2015 federal election, the Conservative government’s liquidation of scientific research in Canada compounded the circulation of affects about a widespread disregard for environmental protection. The ‘War on Science’ (Turner, 2013), included not only cuts to research but also censorship of government scientists’ media engagements. The war on science, and the marching of scientists dressed in lab coats with ‘stop the war on knowledge’ signs (Turner, 2013) constituted part of the fabric of the environmental movement within which my research was conducted.
Appendix D: Consent form for campaigners/media practitioners at ENGOs

CONSENT FORM

Title of the study: Media and the Pipeline Debates: A study of advertising and news, and their impact on civic engagement in the environmental movement

Who is conducting this study? The Principal Investigator is Claudia Ruitenber, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia.

The study will be conducted by the Co-Investigator, Marcelina Piotrowski, PhD Candidate, Centre for Cross-Faculty Inquiry in Education at the University of British Columbia. This research is part of the co-investigator’s dissertation.

Purpose of this study: The purpose of this study is to learn more about the relationship between communication about environmental and social issues, especially the proposed development and expansion of the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipelines, and the effect of this information on audiences. As a media practitioner or spokesperson, you have been asked to participate in this study to share your perspective about your practices and views on the role of communication in reaching the public about these issues.

Interview Process: Interview will last approximately between 60 and 90 minutes. You will be asked a series of open-ended questions. The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed.

Study Results: The results of this study will be reported in a graduate dissertation and may also be published in journal articles and books.

Are there any risks to participating in this study? There is no risk of physical or psychological harm in this study. Permission to interview you has not been sought from your employer or the organization you volunteer for.

Are there any benefits to participating in this study? There are no direct benefits to your participation. You will provide valuable information for the research, which will inform the analysis of this study. You will not be compensated for your participation.

How will my privacy be maintained? Your confidentiality will be respected. You will be assigned a pseudonym that will be used in the transcript and all results of this study. Any comments you make will be attributed to your pseudonym, and/or you will be identified by general identifying characteristics. The organization for which you work will also be kept confidential, will be assigned a pseudonym or will only be described in generic terms. Information that discloses your identity will not be released without your consent unless required by law. All data from your interview (audio file and transcript) will be securely stored by a research team member at UBC.

Who can I contact if I have questions? If you have any questions or concerns about what we are asking of you, please contact the study leader or one of the study staff. The names and telephone numbers are listed at the top of the first page of this form.
Who can I contact if I have concerns or complaints about this study? If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, contact the Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8598 or if long distance e-mail RSIL@ors.ubc.ca or call toll free 1-877-822-8598.

Taking part in this study is entirely up to you. You have the right to refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part, you may choose to pull out of the study at any time without giving a reason.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.

Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study.

____________________________________________________
Participant Signature

Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name of the Participant Signing Above
Appendix E: Consent Form – Residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas

Consent Form

**Title of the study:** Media and the Pipeline Debates: A study of advertising and news, and their impact on civic engagement in the environmental movement

**Who is conducting this study?** The Principal Investigator is Claudia Ruitenber, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia.

The study will be conducted by the Co-Investigator, Marcelina Piotrowski, PhD Candidate, Centre for Cross-Faculty Inquiry in Education at the University of British Columbia. This research is part of the co-investigator’s dissertation.

**Purpose of this study:** The purpose of this study is to learn more about the relationship between communication about environmental and social issues, especially the proposed development and expansion of the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipelines, and the effect of this information on audiences. As someone who is interested in the pipelines, you have been asked to participate in this study to share your perspective about your views on the role of media communication (such as advertising and news) in reaching the public about these issues.

**Interview Process:** The first interview will be conducted one-on-one with the researcher, and will last approximately between 60 and 90 minutes. You will be asked a series of open-ended questions. You will be asked to attend a second interview, lasting 90 minutes, with other participants of this study in a group setting. You may choose to participate in only one or both of these interviews. The interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed.

**Study Results:** The results of this study will be reported in a graduate dissertation and may also be published in journal articles and books.

**Are there any risks to participating in this study?** There is no risk of physical or psychological harm in this study. Permission to interview you has not been sought from your employer or the organization you volunteer for.

**Are there any benefits to participating in this study?** There are no direct benefits to your participation. You will provide valuable information for the research, which will inform the analysis of this study. You will not be compensated for your participation.

**How will my privacy be maintained?** Your confidentiality will be respected. You will be assigned a pseudonym that will be used in the transcript and all results of this study. Any comments you make will be attributed to your pseudonym, and/or you will be identified by general identifying characteristics. Information that discloses your identity will not be released without your consent unless required by law. All data from your interview (audio file and transcript) will be securely stored by a research team member at UBC.

**Who can I contact if I have questions?** If you have any questions or concerns about what we are asking of you, please contact the study leader or one of the study staff. The names and telephone numbers are listed at the top of the first page of this form.
Who can I contact if I have concerns or complaints about this study? If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, contact the Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8598 or if long distance e-mail RSIL@ors.ubc.ca or call toll free 1-877-822-8598.

Taking part in this study is entirely up to you. You have the right to refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part, you may choose to pull out of the study at any time without giving a reason.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.

Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study.

____________________________________________________
Participant Signature
Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name of the Participant Signing Above
Appendix F: Semi-Structured Interview Guide - Campaigners/media practitioners at ENGOs

The interview format will be semi-structured. The questions below are sample questions, and may not be asked in exactly this order, depending the flow of the conversation, and the interviewee’s responses.

1. Can you describe your approach to communicating about the pipelines?

2. When you communicate about the pipelines, to what extent is your goal educational? If not, what is your goal?

3. Who do you have in mind as your audience when you create communication materials, or try to get your story into the news?

4. How did you arrive at that conception of your audience? How do you determine who your audience is?

5. What do you expect your audience (your readers, people who visit your website) to do?
   a. What specific activities would you want a reader/viewer to do as a result of reading/viewing something you produced about environmental issues in the news?

6. How is your choice of media related to the intended audience? (Why did you pursue some media sources or modalities over others?)

7. Can you describe some of the conditions (organizational, political, cultural), under which you do your work? How do these affect you?

8. I want to know a bit more about how your sense of personal identity affects your relationship to the environment and to the media work you do.
   a. If you had to describe yourself, how would you describe yourself?
   b. Can you tell me more about what you mean when you say _____?
   c. How does being a ________ influence your work, or your relationship to the environment?
Appendix G: Semi-Structured Interview Guide – Residents living in oil pipeline conflict areas

The interview format will be semi-structured. The questions below are sample questions, and may not be asked in exactly this order, depending on the flow of the conversation and the interviewee’s responses.

1. What you have seen or heard from various media about the pipelines so far?

2. How do you normally keep up to date on the issues going on related to pipelines in BC?

3. How do you judge or make up your mind about what you have seen in the media about the pipelines? Can you give a specific example?

4. Does what you see in the news or in some of the pipeline advertising make you want to do something about the pipelines? (Probe with examples: talk to your neighbours about it, vote, sign a petition)

5. How would you describe yourself and your relationship to the environment? (Follow up on any identifying terms/categorizing words that the participant uses to describe him or herself. I.e. Can you tell me more about what you mean when you describe yourself as ______?)

6. Based on how you just described about yourself, what do you do, or plan to do about environmental issues, such as the pipeline. (Probe for any tensions between the participant’s desire to act and how they think they ‘should’ act based on how they describe themselves).

7. Do you feel that media provide you with ideas about what you can do about the pipelines, as a ___________ (use descriptive terms from question 4)?

8. What is your sense of what other people are doing about the pipelines?

9. Do you think you would pay as much attention to the pipeline issues in the media if they were to be built somewhere else? Do you think their location matters?

10. What have you heard of about other pipelines around the world besides the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipelines? Do you follow those other stories in the media? How you relate to these other stories.

11. How do you feel about what is happening with the pipelines in general?

   a. Why do you feel that way about what is happening?
   b. Follow up on any specific terms used. (For example, why do you feel _____? Or, Why is it _____ for you?)