

## **No Space**

Curtin 939

Panel Chair: Jocelyn Szczepaniak-Gillece

**Kai Parker** (University of Chicago) and **Ray Noll** (University of Chicago)

“Freedom as Non-Movement: Race, Religious History, and Carceral Ethnography in Chicago”

This collaborative paper draws from two current projects on Chicago in order to explore ideas and practices of non-movement that trouble discourses of politics and refusal. Through an interdisciplinary approach from scholars in different fields (History and Political Science/Anthropology), this paper harnesses two distinct methodologies and theoretical approaches in its examination of emancipatory forms of “staying put.” The first project is a cultural and intellectual history of how, from the Great Depression to the mid-1960s Chicago Freedom Movement, black Chicago Protestants expressed their faith in the presence of the potential for salvation through Jesus within a city seemingly incapable of moving toward racial equality. This faith refused prevailing conceptualizations of the black freedom struggle as movement: as migration, marronage, flight, racial uplift, and above all as movement from a space and time of slavery to a space and time of freedom. The second project engages preliminary ethnographic work with queer programming in a residential unit at Cook County Jail in Chicago, and explores understandings of “stuckness” as practices of political (in)action that refuse the invasiveness of the carceral system. Rather than countering the grasp of confinement through calls for *movement* - escape, getting out, uprooting - this project considers the ways in which different forms of dwelling and stasis while incarcerated contest the societal reach of captivity. Our attempt to read religion and incarceration together highlights often ignored and easily dismissed practices of already-inhabiting the potential for resistance.

**Hannah Hopewell** (Auckland University of Technology)

“Refusal, Minimum Procedures and Creative Powerlessness in Writing the Everyday Urban”

This paper traces waves of my creative practice PhD research that emerged from the philosophically grounded Marxist project of writing everyday urban practices. These practices, that take in a habituated mode of life, were conjoined with a desire to discover a path that composed urban thought without habits of anthropocentrism. The conflictual task aimed to realize an economy alternative to the discursive (urban) encounter-account relay relations that normatively ground writing the everyday, at the same time, evade staging any form exit from the disciplinary field. However, disregarding received urban codes and their attendant gestures of dissection, along with resisting the logics of critical reflection reduced the project to an almost silence, or non-productive practice alignment — a no end, a no means. What became evident through floundering works based on post-human and new-materialist investigations, was that a withdrawal from disciplinary authority and philosophical sufficiency was in force, and that its particular tone of refusal required foregrounding. Despite this insight, a state of powerlessness persisted until the research located a degree of buoyancy within terms and minimum procedures founded a non-standard generic orientation as posed by French thinker François Laruelle.

This paper discusses the research’s emergent approach and implications therein for writing the urban everyday. Firstly, an outline of refusals valency is given. Secondly, via the inventive ‘forcing’ of thought in relation to radical immanence regarded through non-philosophy founded on a superimposition of the Marxist urban everyday and non-standard ethico-aesthetics, a *philo-fiction* apparatus for writing that suspends normative ascendancies inherent in urban thought is reviewed.

**Kris Klotz** (Penn State University)

“Construction of Political Subjects: Disidentification in Honneth and Rancière”

Disidentification, or the refusal of the identity assigned to one by a particular normative order of recognition, occupies a central place in the political philosophies of both Axel Honneth and Jacques Rancière, as their recently published debate demonstrates. For both, collective political agency always requires this process of disidentification, as is evident in the primary concepts of both theorists: struggles for recognition in Honneth’s work and the construction of political subjects through disagreement (*mésentente*) in Rancière’s. In this paper, I examine Honneth and Rancière’s debate insofar as it illuminates the complexities of theorizing collective political agency, understood in terms of disidentification. I argue that we must adopt both theorists’ objections, to some extent. On the one hand, I suggest that Rancière is right to challenge Honneth’s overdetermined conception of the self, which – for Rancière – limits the possibilities open to collective political subjects. On the other hand, Honneth is right to challenge Rancière’s purportedly “empty” conception of the self. I argue, then, that this debate requires us to modify Rancière’s conception of politics in one of two directions: either Rancière needs a more robust conception of the self or he needs to limit his conception of politics to the modern context. For these reasons, their debate not only allows for the elucidation of the shortcomings of each of their positions, but also enables the further development of a theory of collective political subjects.