



Karen Bray is an Assistant Professor of Religious Studies and Philosophy, and the chair of Religious Studies and Philosophy, at Wesleyan College. Her research areas include continental philosophy of religion; feminist, critical disability, and black studies; and queer, political, and decolonial theories and theologies. Her work has appeared in such journals as the *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy*, *The Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, and *Palgrave Communications*, and several edited volumes. Her book on political theology, affect, and counter redemption, tentatively title

Unredeemed, is forthcoming from Fordham University Press.

Selected Works

“On Ignorant and Insightful Chickens: Why Žižekian Post Secularity Needs Halberstam’s Shadow Feminism.” *The Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* (2017).

“The monstrosity of the multitude: unredeeming radical theology.” *Palgrave Communications* (2015).

“If its power comes from the very value held so dear by neoliberalism—that of productivity—can the ‘multitude’ as conceived by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri ever fully resist the neoliberal Empire? Engaging the Autonomous Marxism of Franco ‘Bifo’ Berardi, I argue that continued philosophical and theological emphases on productivity resonate with a soteriological narrative embedded in neoliberalism’s promise that work is redemptive. As both counter and supplement to such emphases, this essay offers an alternative reading of Hardt and Negri’s multitude through the lens of crip (disability) theory. In *Sex and Disability* crip theorists Anna Mollow and Robert McRuer argue that counter to Joseph Conrad’s assertion that “A man is a worker. If he is not then he is nothing,” a crip politics says, ‘fuck employability: I’m too sick to work’ (25). To embrace the stigma of sickness is to question the demands of productive labour on offer by society. A similar crip politics, one that tells the Empire it is too sick to work and too slow to be efficient, might loose the multitude from its redeployment in the very technologies of power Hardt and Negri hope to counter. Looking to figures of monstrosity, I argue that productivist tendencies within radical theology betray the field’s crip potential. Ultimately, this essay seeks to recover the multitude’s monstrosity from within Hardt and Negri’s corpus. A return to its monstrosity returns the multitude to its unproductive potency, that which wanders away from demands of social cohesion, and thus resists redemptive wholeness. This article is published as part of a collection dedicated to radical theologies.”

“A Pantheology of the (Im)Possible: Reading Deconstruction in Ecstatic Naturalism and Ecstatic Naturalism in Deconstruction.” *American Journal of Theology & Philosophy* (2013)