Anatomies of the social and disciplinary body

Redefining disciplinary boundaries means to redesign the anatomy of the social body and its political economy. Disciplines are machines for the production of power strata. They produce the social organism as power machine, they produce the humanist fiction of the subject, with its mind-body split, its functional design in terms of reproduction, work, perception and understanding, it produces the very concept of logos, of rational thinking as prosthesis and the destruction machines through which it asserts itself as superior to other forms of intelligence or affect.

We are thus products of tecnopositivism: embedded still in the trail of the older disciplinary societies, the control society we live in must effectively produce life in all its strata in order to assimilate it in the economic apparatus. But in order to do so it must be quantifiable, it must be organised within an intelligible and fixed organism: the irreducible forces of reality are indeed impossible to govern completely, yet increasing ways of assimilating difference are constantly deployed by the marketing strategies.

Biopower needs to maintain disciplinary boundaries as the artificial boundaries, the phantom of a lost disciplinary society, which acts however as the seducing element on the surface of the otherwise empty market structures, they apparently fill the empty shell of the market with meaning. On the other hand the economy has been organised in terms of organisms, of blocking the uncontrollable proliferation of knowledges of realities, of setting boundaries to the flows and interactions between the bodies.

The epistemic gaps between arts practices and the sciences and industry are part of the humanist fiction of the subject and of the politics of knowledge: indeed the proliferation of non positivistic propositions would disrupt the quantifiable perspective inherent and necessary for contemporary economy to operate.
The two approaches for the opening of the transdisciplinary COMMON BODY/PUBLIC BODY:

- **the biocodes of the social body: from gender hacking to transdisciplinary hacking**: to write the genealogies of social constructs is to show the precise contingency of their construction and at the same time open the way for transformation. All the categories that constitute us as viable or abject, as legitimate and sovereign subjects or as matter for abjection, all the strata of our identities as individuals and groups, as bodies and territories, can be traced back in their emergence as complex constructs. It is like opening the codes of life as a whole: to reveal the texts, codes, constructions of our thinking and identity, and make them malleable. In transgender circles this is expressed in the term genderhacking: to hack, transgress, intervene in the codes that constitute gender binarisms, to break the binarism into multiplicities. We can further speak of hacking the codes of life and culture altogether: this would make an opportunity to share the common ground of our bodies, contexts and experiences as truly opensource codes and practices that constitute the COMMON BODY of our knowledge.

- **the body as intensity: knowledge as embodied and the social as field of forces – the non verbal**: The second approach I propose is to understand our embodied experience in terms of intensities, of communicating forces, of which matter and language are but sedimentation effects: non verbal communication as the essential embodied existence thus conforms a body and a self that is not centred and located in this body but which is in permanent flow, it is the body in between the bodies, the forces that are in permanent exchange, translation and transduction, that conform the social body. This account allows for a better understanding of the functioning of implicit power in latecapitalism, in terms of dissemination of non-verbal forms, as well a more flexible reconfiguration of the strata that result in the sedimentation process, which we can think of in terms of disciplines, and of transdisciplinary exchanges.

**What means transdisciplinary: in between, challenging political economies and power structures – transmedia** – Transdisciplinary means working in between, transgressing the anatomy of the disciplinary body. For instance the arts disciplines are based upon strict sensory anatomies, and obsolete ones, in which certain senses are thought of in isolated manner, when in fact perception is always cross-modal. In a transmedia context, thinking in between eventually means working in postcoreographic, postvisual, postmusical, postarchitectural context, in which the disciplinary and anatomical boundaries of the humanist subject fall apart: it is indeed enacting the posthuman with a new force that goes beyond the materialist notion of prosthesis. The post-self is the body that conforms itself in an explicitly contingent framework of interactions, of disciplinary fields in constant transformation.
Transdisciplinary eventually also implies transgender, since it means radically opening the lines of foreclosure that hold our embodied existence within specific strata of power, and redefining it as multiplicity of intensive anti-organs.

What we need:

- Transdisciplinary research groups, production, education and diffusion platforms: open platforms of TRANSLATION between disciplines. Example: The Workshop of the Technologies of the Body of REVERSO. Rethink financing and political economy: contaminating all spaces whilst retaining an independence.
- The production of specific and embodied technologies, as opposed to standard technologies that attempt to foster the fiction of the disembodied subject.

**A practical case study: Microdances**

A brief presentation of the project Microdances and the activity of REVERSO.

- [http://reverso.org/Antibodies-microdances.htm](http://reverso.org/Antibodies-microdances.htm)
- [http://reverso.org/Antibodies-DISSOLUTION.htm](http://reverso.org/Antibodies-DISSOLUTION.htm)