

## **No Bodies**

Curtin 939

Panel Chair: William Bristow

**Nicholas Anthony Eppert** (New York University)

“Against Conscious Experience: Towards an Immanent Praxis of the Mind-Body Gap”

In the proposed paper, I take up a negative position against the “philosophical decision” that is the convertibility of conscious and bodily *experience* in favor of the maintenance of the mind-body gap. Drawing on the traditional mind-body problem as well as the work of Catherine Malabou, Saidiya Hartman and Sylvia Wynter, I show how problems of post-Fordist ideology, race and spectatorship simultaneously relies on and fosters the absolute convertibility and exchange between conscious and bodily experience, and leads, paradoxically, to a paralysis or pessimism of valid political action. It relies on the impossible—the bridging of the mind-body gap. I again take up Malabou’s work in arguing against conscious experience by withdrawing from it towards the negativity of the gap between the mind and body by maintaining its irreducibility and non-convertibility in a Laruellian vein. Since we cannot rid ourselves of this convertibility completely however, I argue for immanent praxis of dispossession using the work of Fred Moten, Francois Laruelle and the example of John Brown. In this way I gesture towards immanent theory of non-consciousness or non-experience using the work of Francois Laruelle that would use the convertibility of conscious and bodily experience as material for “remaining in the hold” as Moten would put it, or a non-synthetic commonality.

**Joseph Giardini** (Johns Hopkins University)

“Separation and Withdrawal: Refusal in Diane di Prima and Phyllis Webb”

In *Revolutionary Letters*, her long poem about preparing for revolutionary struggle, Diane di Prima implores “forget to negotiate, forget how / to negotiate.” In my paper, I explore how such an active dismissal of strategic compromise fuels the utopian prospects of a variety of 60s poets—especially in the work of Phyllis Webb. In Webb’s *Naked Poems* and much of di Prima’s work, however, more normative combative politics are complicated, inasmuch as they neglect the practical activities and gendered labour which underly projects of opposition or refusal resist notions. The renewed interest in Marxist Feminist theories of how feminized labour is crucial to social reproduction provides an opportunity to reread these texts. Both reject notions of the home as a space where one can recuperate or strategize, and instead conceptualize it as one assaulted by pervasive oppressions (Webb: “The waves of Event / [...] / break down at my window: / I also hear those waves”), but within which one can prepare and experiment with varieties of resistance (di Prima: “are you prepared / to hide someone in your home indefinitely”). This figures struggle as something which must necessarily be fought on multiple scales, and poses the question of whether the rejection of dominant political ideologies is at all compatible with strategies of withdrawal, separatism, or inaction.

**Cameron Kunzelman** (Georgia State University)  
“No Further Interaction: Video Games That Refuse”

*Abstract not available.*