

*Discussione*

## **D. J. Haraway, *Manifestly Haraway*** University of Minnesota Press 2016

Helah Milroy e Ziggy O'Reilly

*Manifestly Haraway* is a timely addition to Donna Haraway's *Cyborg Manifesto* and *Companion Species Manifesto*. Alongside the inclusion of these two manifestos, *Manifestly Haraway* has the extra addition of *Companions in Conversation*, which captures a conversation between Cary Wolfe and Haraway during the conference *The Anthropocene: Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. It is a conversation which discusses and clarifies the progression of Haraway's thought surrounding the *Cyborg Manifesto*, the *Companion Species Manifesto*, and her latest book *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Age of the Chthulucene*. The *Cyborg Manifesto* was a controversial piece published by the Berkeley Social Review Collective in 1985, during the early Reagan-Thatcher era which saw a decline of leftist politics. Through the ironic and contradictory figure of the Cyborg, Haraway created a political myth which served as a critique of socialist and Marxist feminism, alongside Capitalist hegemony.

The *Companion Species Manifesto* was written nearly fifteen years later, and was published in 2003 when the discipline of Critical Animal Studies was still in infancy. This manifesto's focus on shared histories and companion species with the figure of the Dog makes Haraway a significant contributor to Critical Animal Studies. The personalised tone of *Companion Species Manifesto* allows Haraway to discuss her nuanced biopolitics and encourage shared vitality through the accommodation of an attitude of play in engagement with significant others. *Companions in Conversation* re-opens the «time capsules» (p. 250) of the *Cyborg Manifesto* and *Companion Species Manifesto* in order to expose and clarify the implications of these two manifestos with regards to present political and biopolitical frameworks. Furthermore, *Companions in Conversation* introduces *Staying with the Trouble* as a new narrative through which we can think and act with collective agency in the future.

The following is a discursive review which took place over the Christmas break and into the new year of 2017 by two Biological Arts Masters students from Symbiotica, at the University of Western Australia: Ziggy O'Reilly and Helah Milroy. Both students possess highly divergent worldviews. Ziggy O'Reilly is a

Psychology graduate and believer in techno-science and human-tech ingenuity, while Helah Milroy is a Philosophy graduate with Indigenous heritage, who holds a belief in the power of non-violence and has recently been baptised a Christian. This review focuses on the often-overlooked theological aspect of Haraway's work, the formation and clarification of Haraway's biopolitical position, and its affirmation of the necessity of adopting a narrative that facilitates both Living and Dying well together in the face of potential global environmental catastrophe.

## 1. Conversation Begins

Helah Milroy: In *Companions in Conversation*, Donna Haraway argues against the narrative of autonomous agency presented through the figure of the masculinized vision of the Anthropos, which she views as being promulgated in the term Anthropocene (pp. 238-241). She points out that the empirical evidence does not support the idea that the Anthropocene is an autonomous species act, but is the result of a complex set of actions resulting from historical narrative (p. 237). In this respect, Haraway argues that the Anthropocene is more accurately categorised in terms of being a Capitalocene (pp. 237-238), which figures the subject differently, and allows for a greater cast of characters of involvement than does the Anthropocene (pp. 239-240). According to Haraway, the 'Anthropocene' will be a boundary event rather than an epoch (p. 296), for we cannot deny that we are living in a time of extinctions and human and nonhuman genocides (p. 231). Haraway predicts that the 'Anthropocene' will end with either:

multispecies entities, including human people, allied in the nick of time [...] to power resurgence and partial healing in the face of irreversible loss, so that rich worldings of old and new kinds [take] root,

or, with mass extinction (p. 296). Concerned with the possibility of extinction for human and nonhuman species alike, Haraway argues that the fundamental liberal pluralist model is an unviable tool for reaching consensus regarding the common good, though its abandonment will have serious ramifications (pp. 285-286). To remedy this situation, Haraway ends her conversation with Wolfe with a vision of a new epoch: the Chthulucene, distinct from the figure of 'Cthulhu' of H. P. Lovecraft. Through a Deconstructive Structuralist<sup>1</sup> framework inspired by Alfred Whitehead, Haraway's multispecies figure of Chthulu overcomes essentialist notions of identity and representation of the 'wholly other', including holist accounts of Gaia, or Mother Earth (pp. 278, 281, 294). Through the analogy of the chthonic tentacular ones (the

---

<sup>1</sup> Christian revisionist theologians have especially relied upon the resources of the process thought of Whitehead and Hartshorne, hermeneutical theory, deconstructive structuralism and various schools of ideology critique in an attempt to formulate a reconciliation and critical correction of both modernity and the Christian tradition.

Chthulu – note the different spelling), Haraway's Chthulucene epoch embodies an increased awareness of the interconnectedness of the material, spatial and temporal world, through sensitive engagement with human and nonhumans alike, who acknowledge that they are at risk to each other's survival (pp. 280-296). Haraway argues that as a narrative, the Chthulucene accommodates indigenous histories and in so doing serves to protect the ongoingness of our shared futurity – the ongoing survival of emergent human and nonhuman entities alike (pp. 261, 281, 284, 289, 296).

Haraway argues that for the Chthulucene narrative to emerge, the practice of joy and play is critical (pp. 253-254), as we deconstruct our worldviews together with collective sensitivity in order for new visions emerge (pp. 99, 143-144, 253-254, 266). However, putting Haraway's ideas into practice is no easy task, for Haraway asks us to confront the question of who lives, who dies and what it means to be a companion species at this juncture of history, where we face the possibility of mass extinction (pp. 215, 232, 236). In doing so, she argues that we must acknowledge our use of language which denies the significance of lives lost (pp. 215, 233-236), and accept our lack of innocence as we face the violence we are implicated in (pp. 235-236). As an example, she points to the use of the term «invasive species» within environmental management (pp. 235-236), while urging us to accept the necessity of culling certain species for the successful implementation of species recovery plans and habitat regeneration (pp. 215, 232, 236). And while Wolfe points out that both *Cyborg Manifesto* and *Companion Species Manifesto* are linked by the idea that a sense of joy and play is required for serious political discussion (pp. 253-254), he also draws our attention to the fact that her question relates directly to biopolitical discourse concerning race relations (p. 260), and her view of the Anthropos as a destructive species (p. 237). These are difficult questions to answer at this juncture of our history; however, given the threat of extinction, for the sake of our futurity will you *compost* with me?

Ziggy O'Reilly: Sure, Haraway's theory of 'composting' (p. 261) is a striking and relevant idea. It is an interesting metaphor for it can mean the literal recomposition of bacteria to generate fermentation, shrinkage of your carbon footprint for environmental protection, and/or the theoretical deconstruction and recomposition of worldviews in a way which is free from the bondage of constructs. Through the metaphor of compost, Haraway advocates for a process which species barriers between animal, machine and human are recomposed to allow for the generation of new frameworks to emerge (pp. 296, 206). As you mentioned, Helah, for the sake of our futurity – let us explore the recomposition of our worldviews, for perhaps within this space of blurred boundaries we may find novelty and inspiration.

Haraway's poetic use of metaphor alongside the precision of her critical analysis are among the factors which have contributed to her academic success. Her critical approach enabled her to investigate the complex dynamics between

organism (human-animal) and machine in the *Cyborg Manifesto*, but also allowed for new theoretical understandings of multispecies relationships within the *Companion Species Manifesto*. The *Cyborg Manifesto* was written with strong bravado, and was unyielding in the critique to the politics of the time, whereas the *Companion Species Manifesto* was written with intimacy and personal exposure. Haraway explains in *Companions in Conversation* that her style in the *Cyborg Manifesto* was necessary to provide alternative ways of viewing the socialist-feminist, marxist-feminist and science and technology politics of the 1980s (p. 202). She admits that the *Cyborg Manifesto* was written more from a place of rage than love (p. 219), and indeed this manifesto does have strong components of feminist anarchy and even advocates for a feminist science (p. 44). The *Companion Species Manifesto* however, was written in response to a different cultural climate, where Critical Animal Studies were still in their infancy (p. 214). The *Companion Species Manifesto* shifted more towards personal affect and love, which is a natural consequence of the focus on Haraway's relationship with her dog, Cayenne (p. 219). Haraway's personal methodology of reflection in the *Companion Species Manifesto* is still critical, but it's been re-directed to explore the inter-relationality between humans and dogs, as intimate experience can be the best teacher.

The inclusion of *Companions in Conversation* with the two manifestos has certainly helped me to de-tangle the nuanced progression of Haraway's ideas over time. For example, in *Companions in Conversation* Haraway points out that, although both manifestos tell technological and evolutionary stories of pleasure and intimacy, the balance is different (p. 251). The *Cyborg Manifesto* uses irony as a fulcrum for serious play, whereas personal tales of intimacy and joy are the essence of the *Companion Species Manifesto* (pp. 5, 244). This personal lens in the *Companion Species Manifesto* was constructed from inclusivity and cooperation and ultimately culminated in Haraway's recent slogan «*make kin not babies*», which advocates for a greater focus on kinship rather than sexual reproduction (p. 224). In *Companions in Conversation*, Wolfe highlights how the *Companion Species Manifesto* begins and ends with Haraway's personal tales exploring nonreproductive sex (p. 224). The first scene of the *Companion Species Manifesto* begins with the intimate colonisation of Haraway's cells by her dog Cayenne's velvety tongue, «a sure case of what the biologist Lynn Margulis calls *symbiogenesis*»<sup>2</sup> (pp. 93, 192). The final scene of the *Companion Species Manifesto* ends with the purely «*polymorphous perversity*» of sexual play between the neutered Cayenne and fellow dog friend, Willem (p. 191). Although Haraway's interspecies cell colonisation is confronting, it succeeds in portraying the complexity of interspecies connectivity, and when coupled with the final scene serves as an example of how play is a way of navigating the complexities of our fleshly inheritance. Likewise, the erotic tale of mutual dog sexuality in

---

<sup>2</sup> Symbiogenesis is an evolutionary term which relates to cooperation between species for positive mutual evolutionary outcomes of survival.

the final scene successfully captures the essence of pleasure in a different manner than the *Cyborg Manifesto* and serves as a good example of what it might look like to engage in the practice of becoming-with (p. 221).

Helah Milroy: Indeed, Haraway's use of the figure of the dog to explore interspecies connectivity and the inheritances of the flesh is confronting. Regardless, her use of the dog as a metaphor is deeply significant with regards to our fleshy heritage and how this connects to the politic of the pure-breed, alongside multi-species relationships, colonisation, immunity and overheigenization as a biopolitical tool of racial oppression in the name of security (pp. 221, 246, 248-249). However, Haraway's emphasis on pleasure, alongside her self-proclaimed blasphemy and hatred for the Church (pp. xiii, 266), has me troubled. In 2 Timothy 3:1-4, it says that the last days will be perilous as there will come proud blasphemers who are unthankful and unholy, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God (2 Timothy 3:1-4, KJ21). Given that Haraway admits that it was the teachings of Catholicism which led her to her naturalist thinking today (p. 274), I find her hatred of the Church a strange stance to take.

Interestingly, Wolfe notes that the theological aspect to Haraway's writing is often overlooked (p. xii), and serves as a «counterlogic to a hegemonic matrix of secularism, Protestantism, [and] capitalism» (pp. xii-xiii). Likewise, that it signals the return of religion in contemporary theory and philosophy (pp. xii-xiii). Both Wolfe and Haraway agree that her theological position is all the more faithful because of its blasphemy, which is distinct from apostasy – the abandonment or renunciation of religious belief or principle (pp. xiii, 5). The blasphemy embedded within both *Cyborg Manifesto* and *Companion Species Manifesto* is motivated by Haraway's desire to avoid idolatry and her love of nature (pp. 141, 265). This is clarified within *Companions in Conversation*, which explains the nuances of Haraway's theological position and blasphemy through her interpretation of the Catholic doctrine of Real Presence and its relation to transubstantiation – the transformation of the bread and the wine into the body of Christ in the Eucharist (p. 107).

In *Companions in Conversation*, Haraway defines herself as a Secular Catholic (p. 267), explaining that this position emerged as a result of her Catholic upbringing in the era of the Space Race and the first artificial satellite: Sputnik (pp. xiii, 203). It was an era which ushered in a globalist perspective. Although Haraway opposes Protestant hegemony, she finds Protestant inspiration in Susan Harding's writings<sup>3</sup> on the importance of the various modes of Protestantism

---

<sup>3</sup> Susan Harding's *American Protestant Moralism and the Secular Imagination: From Temperance to the Moral Majority* («Social Research», LXXVI, 2009, 4, pp. 1277-1306), discusses the dynamic tension between Catholic, Protestant and Secular (nontheistic/science based) ideology in the formation and development of the American State body politic. Harding argues that the Protestants sought to keep Church and State separate while defending American-style liberties in an effort to reform American society to fit the image of God according to Biblical scripture, and used the idea of the separation of Church and State to gain political power over the Catholics who sought a unified Church and State opposed to American-style liberties. The Secular

and the co-constitution of religion with the secular (p. 267). As a measure of clarity, Haraway explains that her theological position opposes the hegemony of both secular secularists and separatist Protestants (p. 267). Haraway argues as a Christian Revisionist against the notion of God as 'Wholly Other'. In doing so, she promotes a Negative Theology which asserts the idea that the character of God cannot be defined in words, as God exceeds all possible specification (pp. 227, 267, 278). Accordingly, Haraway considers naming itself as idolatrous, and argues that any effort to produce a Positive Theology fails as a result of this (pp. 227, 267, 278). However, Haraway's Negative Theology is distinct from other forms in that she applies the Negative Way of Naming to the issue of finitude, rather than to the infiniteness of God as traditionally done in Theology (pp. 141, 267, 278).

Haraway's theological interpretation of the doctrine of Real Presence is explored through the figures of the Cyborg and the Dog, which bear witness to the carnality produced by the material semiotic of Catholicism as it applies to John 1:14, «the word was made flesh» (pp. 268-270, John 1:14, KJ21). Haraway argues against the separation of the signifier from the signified and explains to Wolfe that the Word is not made *manifest* in the flesh, for semiosis and flesh are not one, not two, but something existing at a level deeper than symbol which cannot be named<sup>4</sup> (pp. 276-278). In doing so, Haraway provides a concept of the Holy Trinity which is embedded solely within the material world, albeit a deeply complex one. This view seems to run contrary to the Positive Theological assertion that the Bible is the word of God, which testifies to the character of God through the prophecy, testimony of God's plan through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; who is the Word made flesh mentioned in John 1:14. As such, the Positive Theological position seems to be providing a concept of the Holy Trinity which affirms the unification of ontologically distinct categories through God (the Word) becoming flesh (Jesus Christ) and dying on the cross so that he may be raised again and we can be redeemed to the 'living God' (Hebrews 9:14, KJV) and therefore able to participate in his Spirit.

However, in addition to the separation of the signifier with the signified, Haraway's argument against the Positive Theological interpretation of John 1: 14 centres around its anthropomorphism and her contention that the image of God has been constructed out of a projected image of Man (pp. 5, 55, 141). In order to overcome this, Haraway offers us the Cyborg as an alternative figure to Jesus Christ and in doing so maintains her faithfulness to feminism, socialism and

---

Secularists maintained the view of separation of Church and State and cast the Protestant Moralists as the irrational 'other' who could not participate in the necessary rational discourse required for the governance of public life. It was the hope of the Secular Secularist's that the Protestant Moralists would eventually disappear. However, they have remained a potent political actor and in so doing has confronted the Secular imagination with the question of who the 'we' that we are is.

<sup>4</sup> Haraway's negative way of naming applied here avoids her breaking a biblical precept, for Matthew 12:31-32 states that every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven except that against the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:31-32, KJ21).

materialism within her theological thinking (pp. 5, 55, 141). Wolfe states that Haraway's theological position is not without ethical, political and biopolitical ramifications (p. xii). However, the possibility of there being spiritual ramifications with regards to the carnal nature of her position goes unaddressed. Easily overlooked is the sexual ethic embedded within Haraway's work, which gains further clarity through her introduction of the term 'composting' in *Companions in Conversation*, which she links to questions of ingestion, digestion, indigestion within the carnality of Catholicism (pp. 268-270). Haraway explains to Wolfe that the material semiotics of Catholicism (symbolically expressed through the sacrament of the Eucharist) are «overwhelmingly about a shared meal, in and of the flesh» (pp. 267-270). Wolfe highlights that good faith in this respect is captured in Haraway's assertion of the importance of «messmates», a concept she articulates in the *Companion Species Manifesto* through the loyalty of her nonreproductive, yet pleurably intimate relationship with Cayenne (pp. 219, 269). This feature of Haraway's writing is confronting, for in her rejection of heterosexual hegemony it seems she is encouraging a politic that views bestiality as a norm (pp. 11, 191-193).

Ziggy O'Reilly: Woah...

Helah Milroy: Perhaps I am being a bit overactive here, however through her encouragement of duty, responsibility and *alertness to the other* (pp. 141, 172, 227), Haraway seems to indicate that implied consent is a sufficient form of governance around such practice. The carnal ramifications of Haraway's love of nature and desire to think with and through this, as a motivation for her negative way of naming and materialist semiotic is starkly apparent in this regard (pp. 141, 265). However, I will grant that Haraway's argument is more nuanced than the vulgarity of these ramifications suggest, for her love of Cayenne is not simply characterised by the pleasure of their connection (which is nongenital), but by an understanding of herself as the trainer and responsible authority within that relationship (p. 227). Therefore, while Haraway opens the boundaries of moral acceptance, she links the playful nature of such acts with an evolutionary process of learning (pp. 97, 116).

As a measure of clarity and perspective regarding Haraway's biopolitics and how it pertains to our lack of innocence, Wolfe raises the figure of Hannibal Lecter to exemplify «bad faith» (pp. 269-270). For Haraway, Hannibal represents the potentially horrific consequences of separating the signifier from the signified and epitomises the claim of innocence she resists (p. 269). Her contention lies with Hannibal maintaining a clean conscience while he overlooks the specificity of that which he eats, be it human or animal he sees no distinction (pp. 269-270). The example has merit, however such a view excludes the possibility of the existence of a spiritual realm which is ontologically distinct from the materiality of the flesh, which the Bible as the word of God and gospel of Jesus Christ testify to, as a way of providing salvation through guiding and facilitating people away

from a meal in and of the flesh. In this respect, the adoption of a materialist semiotic to theological understanding is not without ramification. However, I believe the point Haraway is trying to make is that salvation from carnality is achieved by learning responsibility through emergent experiences, rather than through striving to meet the characteristics outlined in a construct.

Ziggy O'Reilly: I find it quite interesting that you could construct a theological interpretation from *Manifestly Haraway*. I didn't think Haraway adopted a theological position, but a position of absolute criticism, especially in the *Cyborg Manifesto*, where she «*refused a nothing-but-critique approach*» to the vast topics which needed serious critique (p. 211). Nevertheless, our unique interpretations are a testament to her striking ability to write to a wide range of perspectives. As Wolfe points out, *Manifestly Haraway* can indeed be appropriated by a diverse audience, even those which are outside of feminism and Marxism (p. 208). I place my hope in the Cyborg for future survival whereas you place yours within the word of God/Jesus Christ, and I think both our worldviews found synergy within *Manifestly Haraway*. However, I think your perspective on bestiality is a bit excessive, after all Haraway's kiss with Cayenne was nongenital! Instead I would argue that this nonreproductive kiss with Cayenne was a strategically placed story of kinship, which is necessary to cement Haraway's notion of becoming-with<sup>5</sup> in practicality (p. 221).

Helah Milroy: Yes, there is certainly room for divergent interpretations here. However, while her emphasis on the importance of ethical relating between species hints at the difficulty of obtaining consent from animals, it does not deny that implied consent may be given, which would still constitute becoming-with in practice... I think the key point to remember here though, is Haraway's affirmation of learning.

Ziggy O'Reilly: Yes, and I think that resonates with both of us as insatiable students, and that is why I admire Haraway for her persistent and bold questioning. For example, Haraway's query in the *Cyborg Manifesto* led her to bravely contradict the science and technology demonology which was prevalent in the humanities in the 1980's; where science and technology were intimately linked in the broader criticism of capitalism... Within this context, the *Cyborg Manifesto* was unique in its reconfiguration of science and technology. Likewise, I think the *Cyborg Manifesto* maintains its relevance in the current information-saturated culture where responsibility within complex formations of capitalism and imperialism is still imperative for survival. To this day, the *Cyborg Manifesto* continues as a reminder of the importance of taking «responsibility for the

---

<sup>5</sup>Haraway's term becoming-with is an extrapolation from the evolutionary term symbiogenesis and describes interspecies cooperation from a more general perspective. We are complex sym-poietic systems; a system without boundaries, that self-organises but produces collectively and is constantly becoming-with.

social relations of science and technology» (p. 67), and serves as a warning of the dangers of binary thinking. The Cyborg embodies an alternative to «anti-techno-science-and-technology» standpoints whilst also refusing a «blissed-out *technobunny*» approach to technological development (p. 211), adopting these contradictions in its formation.

One common thread in *Manifestly Haraway* is the notion of boundary reconstruction, which originated in the *Cyborg Manifesto* and promotes a sense of continuity throughout the book. The *Cyborg Manifesto* opened this space for boundary dissolution through the tools of irony and contradiction. For example, Haraway draws on Zoe Sofoulis' argument of the Cyborg as a promising monster needed for our survival (p. 8), which simultaneously positions the Cyborg as both a threat and a solution. Here the Cyborg refuses a technology demonology and is instead non-simplistic in its representation of both/and possibilities. As the Cyborg defies category constraints, it is liberated from the narratives constructed by historical complexes of domination and control. The Cyborg is unconfined by political restraints, heterosexual norms and labour hierarchies. In this space of boundary disintegration, the Cyborg allows for awareness of partial otherness (p. 67); an awareness of the co-creation of identity through kinship with animals and machines (p. 15). This position of partial otherness, in combination with contradictory standpoints can allow for new visions which might have otherwise been unimaginable, to emerge (p. 15).

Reading *Cyborg Manifesto* alongside *Companions in Conversation* helps highlighting how Haraway's ideas of kinship, contradiction and partial otherness in boundary deconstruction have been prevalent in her thinking since writing *Cyborg Manifesto*. Haraway is a very complex and multi-layered author to read and these footholds of consistency help with the journey throughout *Manifestly Haraway*. However, on a more personal note, while *Companion Species Manifesto* addresses the importance of kinship with partial others, I much preferred her slogan: «cyborgs for earthly survival» (pp. 97, 228), and think that the Cyborg, has been unfairly neglected in *Companions in Conversation*, which seems to place greater emphasis on the figure of the Dog.

Helah Milroy: However, her conversation with Wolfe in its clarification of her relationship to technology has provided for some interesting insight regarding the future development of technology. While I understand your sympathy with the «cyborgs for earthly survival» slogan, it's important to note that Haraway is not doing away with her figure of the Cyborg but refiguring it within the context of finitude. Wolfe points out that while bio and techno are completely entwined in both the *Cyborg Manifesto* and the *Companion Species Manifesto* (p. x), the *Companion Species Manifesto* focuses on biopower and biosociality by emphasising the significance of history in naturecultures, including Haraway's own (p. xi). As Wolfe points out, this approach allows Haraway to address the complexity of embodiment within the material world in a way which cannot be

communicated through the metaphor of the circuit, the chip, or an algorithm (p. xi).

In the *Cyborg Manifesto*, the figure of the Cyborg stood outside of historical narrative; however, the insight Haraway gains through her relationship with Cayenne leads her to affirm the historicity of the Cyborg, and promote the view that «*cyborgs [are] junior siblings in the much bigger, queer family of companion species*» (pp. 103, 208, 207, 221). Although Haraway reconfigures the Cyborg as a member of the family, and therefore as having a narrative which is implicated by this relationship, she maintains her non-essentialist and co-constitutive approach to identity (pp. 208, 207, 221), thereby maintaining her feminist critique by excluding the possibility that the machine is *essentially* violent. However, as an older sibling to the Cyborg, Haraway places limitations upon it as an entity in and of itself when she declares that she is not a posthumanist (p. 261), and thereby denies the ascription of rights to technology in its own right.

Haraway clarifies that this shift in her position grew out of a greater awareness to the threat of extinction, which has led her to advocate for an affirmative biopolitics situated within the finite, yet regenerative, metaphor of our being 'compost' (pp. 227, 261). In contrast to pro-Life (with a capital L) attitudes that Haraway rejects, her biopolitics denies the assertion of our being innocent and remains optimistic towards mortality (pp. 227, 230, 236). In this respect, her question of how we might live and die well together, alongside our nurturing and killing the best we can (p. 227), has relevance with regards to our attitudes towards technology and her latest slogan «make kin not babies» (p. 255). This is evident in *Companions in Conversation*, when Haraway claims that the machine is the greatest source of violence on our planet, having a forced life which is primarily used for the purposes of slaughter and extracting value (p. 229). Through her comedic reference to the Borg queen of Star Trek (p. 226), Haraway highlights this danger by adopting the figure of the Borg as a representative of the Cyborg, which is governed by the exterminationist pro-Life ethos (pp. 216, 221, 227).

In view of this threat to mortal ongoingness, Haraway notes the interplay between uncritical pro-Life attitudes, capitalism, environmental degradation and the breeding and killing of animals on massive scales within industrial animal agriculture, confessing to Wolfe that due to the threat of extinction her attitude towards the animal industrial complex has shifted (pp. 229-232). Your earlier comments regarding Haraway's confession about writing the *Cyborg Manifesto* from a place of rage and *Companion Species Manifesto* from a place of love is applicable here. For the *Cyborg Manifesto* advocates a militant attitude towards achieving a feminist re-coding of the historical narrative through the figure of the cyborg, which serves to deconstruct essentialist gender binaries in order to promote a theological image (the Cyborg) through which creation can be understood in terms of being collectively co-constituted (pp. 33, 68, 219). Whereas the *Companion Species Manifesto*, whilst maintaining the necessity of this deconstruction of binaries, places greater emphasis on the significance

and vulnerability of the individual (pp. 218-219). *Companions in Conversation* clarifies that, through the figure of the Dog, Haraway is drawing attention to the significance and vulnerability of indigenous peoples, with the view that we need to accept the inheritance of indigenous histories which challenge our notions of security and wealth at this time of multispecies, human and nonhuman genocides, by revealing that we are not innocent, but capable of murder (pp. 218-231, 282).

In this sense, the progression of Haraway's thought shifts her attitude towards the animal industrial complex because it leads her to the view that the specificity of multispecies, human and nonhuman is what counts with regards to the question of what it means to live responsibly now (pp. 230-232). However, given the further question of who lives, who dies and what it means to be a companion species at this conjuncture of history, Haraway qualifies the right to life with the statement that working lives, including those of animals, matter and deserve respect (pp. 230-232). In this respect, *Companions in Conversation* clarifies Haraway's earlier point in *Companion Species Manifesto*, that rights are not ascribable according to separate pre-existing category identities, but are reciprocal and relational between human and nonhuman entities (pp. 144-145). It is this premise of equity that Haraway employs as a tool for incorporating a larger variety of characters into her co-evolving family of companion species.

The clarification of the progression of Haraway's thinking in *Companions in Conversation* sets the backdrop for her latest book *Staying with the Trouble*, which employs the figure of the Chthulu to characterise the multispecies alliance of mortal beings that is required to ward off extinction (p. 296). In *Companions in Conversation*, Haraway prophesies that the coming Chthulucene epoch will see the resurgence of the Chthonic ones (the Chthulu), who are co-constituted multispecies allies, including the human and nonhuman (pp. 272-295). She argues that they stand outside of time but are situated historically within it, as they become-with, through thinking-together with full acceptance and awareness of their mortality and risk to each other (pp. 294-295). They are not autonomous agents, but a force of nature which exists within the human and nonhuman alike (p. 295). According to Haraway, the Chthonic ones are without hope, but demand response-abilities (p. 294), the ability to emerge spontaneously as they live and die well together. It is a narrative for the future which stands outside of the Positive Theological assertion of salvation offered through Jesus Christ – for the Chthonic ones exist outside of His-story.

However, embedded within the Chthulucene narrative, is Haraway's confession that the Chthonic ones, provoked by the arrogance of the industrialiser, supertransporters, and capitalisers will accelerate mass-extinction (pp. 294-295). Regardless of the risk, Haraway insists that the Chthulucene can still bring about a restoration of the environment (p. 295). She admits that the paradoxical nature of her thinking is the consequence of her thinking towards unknowing, and describes such thinking to Wolfe in terms of: 'both/and', 'yes/and', 'no/but', 'no/and' (p. 212). However, this same paradoxical thinking is apparent in her

image of the Chthonic ones who embody «the word made flesh through mortal naturecultures» (pp. 193, 274), for while Haraway seeks to overcome idolatry and salvation theology (pp. 7, 275-279), she characterises her unnamable God through vision of the Chthulucene, presenting us with an image of a Chthulu saviour. This causes me to question her understanding of love and humility, which she clarifies in *Companions in Conversation* as resting upon the premise avoiding negative naming which serves to avoid idolatry (pp. 275-279). For I would think that equally loving, humble and un-idolatrous is announcing the revelation of Jesus Christ as your Lord and saviour who is the way, the truth, the life (John 14:6, KJ21).

Haraway's decision to cast her lot with the «ongoing, unfinished, dreadful powers of the Earth, where risk, terror, and promise of uncategorizable mortal ongoing can still be found» (p. 274), signals trouble ahead. This has me concerned, for while her philosophy of staying with the trouble accommodates for wide variety of views (p. 96), I am unfamiliar with the theological nuances of Protestant Separatism. Interestingly, Haraway indirectly expresses her thanksgiving to the Catholic Church when she claims that her understanding of learning within emergent and evolving naturecultures occurred as a result of her Catholicism and her engagement with the mystery of the Trinity (p. 274). In this sense, her ironic use of alternative figures for salvation is appealing in its ability to include a wide range of voices whilst protecting Christian values in a more palatable framework for the non-Christian reader. However, the danger of Haraway's work is that it may inadvertently promote carnality as a way of life, which detracts from the power of her work in that it raises the very real question of whether or not endangered species (human and non-human) can be protected outside of state legislation. Interestingly, while Catholicism led Haraway to witnessing within emergent naturecultures, it was witnessing within emergent naturecultures which led to my discovery of Jesus Christ as the Word of God and value of the Church with respect to its guidance, protection and companionship with others who seek love and spiritual perfection through relationship with God. Unfortunately, the complexity of Haraway's work has left me wondering: how long can two sides of the same binary 'stay with the trouble'?

Ziggy O'Reilly: Certainly, *Manifestly Haraway's* coverage of politics in relation to feminist, marxist, religious and scientific implications are vast, and requires time and contemplation to comprehend. The level of detail which can be reached in analysis of Haraway's work is microscopic. There is space within *Cyborg Manifesto*, *Companion Species Manifesto* and *Companions in Conversation* for multiple interpretations, but perhaps it is here where the brilliance lies. The ultimate result of the journey through *Manifestly Haraway* with you, has been a complete remodelling of how I thought I exist in the world, coupled with the responsibility to consider how I should exist with my fellow companions, regardless of their faith, gender, species, or flesh. Haraway gave me the permission to think outside of binary constructs whilst also maintaining a sense of play

and joy. However, to intimately acquire the entirety of Haraway's thought, and understand the progression from *Cyborg Manifesto* to the *Companion Species Manifesto* is not a simple task.

Helah Milroy: Not simple at all. Indeed, the cognitive practice of manifesting Haraway is infinitely complex! (laughs).

## 2. Conversation Ends

While this review has allowed us to put Haraway's theoretical paradigm of 'composting' into practise, it has been an extremely challenging and confronting task. Our respective narratives led us to interpret Haraway in diverse and polymorphous ways. Likewise, regarding the protection of our futurity, a consensus of what constitutes a solution has not been reached. Helah Milroy is contemplating the ramifications of affirming Jesus Christ as the theological figure of «the word made flesh», versus the theological figure of a naturecultures Chthulu. While Ziggy O'Reilly maintains her interest in techno-science and human-tech ingenuity as solutions for survival. However, she is re-evaluating her response-ability within this context.

Certainly, *Manifestly Haraway*, with its inclusion of *Companions in Conversation*, has been essential for the elucidation of the progression of Haraway's ideas from *The Cyborg Manifesto* to the *Companion Species Manifesto* and leading up to her latest work: *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* (2016). Those who read *Manifestly Haraway* from beginning to end will come away from the intellectual endeavour with new idea formations of living in the present conjecture of history, and how to act responsibly to ensure future survival of humans and nonhumans alike. And those who are brave enough to engage others through Haraway's practice of composting will undoubtedly have the limitations of their worldviews and cognitive processing revealed to them.

Helah Milroy  
University of Western Australia

Ziggy O'Reilly  
University of Western Australia