

Introduction to MarxFoucauldian CripAnimal Studies: Capitalism, Animals, Disability

Balam Nedim Kenter

PhD Candidate, Humanities Interdisciplinary PhD Program, Concordia University, Montreal

balam.kenter@concordia.ca

Capitalism is often undertheorized in both Animal and Disability Theory, while critiques of capitalism typically overlook the apparatuses of disability and animality. Furthermore, Animal Studies and Disability Studies have a complex relationship. Animal Theory's reductive analogies between disabled people and animals contrast with the unexamined anthropocentrism in Disability Theory.

What would a MarxFoucauldian CripAnimal analysis of capitalism look like? This question can be expanded as follows: How could a nuanced understanding of capitalism transform animal and disability theory? How could insights from these fields transform systematic conceptualizations of capitalism? What implications do these transformations have for understanding how force relations and systems of oppression operate? What possibilities arise from studying capitalism, anthropocentrism, and ableism through a convergence of Marx and Foucault? These are some of the research questions I pursue in my dissertation, aiming to perform a MarxFoucauldian intervention into Critical Disability Studies and Critical Animal Studies to understand the intersection of anthropocentrism and ableism under capitalism.

One hypothesis is that problematic analogies at the intersections of animal and disability studies reveal the undertheorization of domination and capitalism in both fields. Another hypothesis, combining Intersectionality with a MarxFoucauldian interpretation of late capitalism (or globalized zoobionecrocapitalist coloniality), is that systems of oppression historically, materially, and discursively interact and co-evolve so that at the intersections, certain beings become "mutually addressable" (Boisseron, 2018; Bennett, 2020), even if not ontologically analogizable. At these junctures, ableism (the apparatus of disability) may act as a process of speciation, while anthropocentrism (the apparatus of animality) may function as a process of debilitation. Mutual addressability is key to understanding how animality and disability are (re)produced under capitalism, circulate within it, and interact with other systems of domination.

Elucidating the process of mutual addressability requires a robust understanding of capitalism coupled with a thick concept of power. I turn to a convergence of Foucault and Marx, as genealogists of zoobionecrocapitalism and theorists of a kind of power that produces both subjectification and subjection, capacitation and debilitation.

Genealogy's task within the articulation of the body and history as the work of exposing a body imprinted by history on the one hand and the process of history's destruction of the body on the other (Foucault, 1996, p. 148) maps onto the distinction between social construction of the

disabled bodymind and impairment as harm, as well as the distinction between the production of animal subjectivity and material destruction of animal bodyminds.

Drawing on the "Working Day" chapter and other passages in *Capital*, I argue that Marx, as an archiver of biopolitics, tracks the debilitating and animalizing effects of capitalism. I then turn to Foucault's notion of power, focusing on texts where he continues Marx's genealogy of capitalism and characterizes productive power as a Marxian legacy. Finally, I explore the problematization of population in their works, especially regarding surplus populations. This includes examining proletarianization/surplusization and rendering/enclosure pairs triangulated with processes of debilitation/capacitation.

Overall, relation and production emerge as principles of intelligibility in Foucault and Marx, making their combined analysis generative for studying capitalism at the nexus of animal and disability theory.

Key words: Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Disability, Critical Animal Theory, Intersectionality, Capitalism

