

"Society Must be Defended"
Outline by John Protevi
protevi@lsu.edu

Lecture 1 (7 January 1976)

I. Introduction (1-3)

- A. Institution of the Collège de France
- B. Crowds at F's lectures
- C. "Scattered" nature of F's recent research

II. Recent social / intellectual history (since 1960) (3-12)

- A. "dispersed and discontinuous offensives"
 - 1) Sites of revolt: Anti-psychiatry; "sexual revolution"; Anti-prison movement; the book / event that was *Anti-Oedipus*
 - 2) Withering of global theories
 - a) Marxism and psychoanalysis only effective locally
 - b) When their global character has been checked
- B. "Insurrection of subjugated knowledges": "historical knowledge of struggles" (forecast of theme of lecture course) /
 - 1) Buried historical content
 - 2) Disqualified or nonconceptual knowledges
- C. "multiple genealogical investigations"
 - 1) played off against the discredited global theories
 - 2) against "centralizing power-effects" of institutionalized science
 - a) examples of Marxism and (later, p. 12) Soviet psychiatry
- D. Archeology = analysis of local discursivities; genealogy = use of desubjugated knowledges released by archeology

III. Question of power (13-18)

- A. "Economism" in theories of power
 - 1) Classical juridical / liberal theory
 - a) Power as commodity that is possessed
 - b) And can be transferred by contract to sovereign
 - 2) Marxism
 - a) Political power has its *raison d'être* in the economy
 - b) Perpetuate relations of production / reproduce class domination
- B. Not many available tools for a noneconomic theory of power
 - 1) Power as repression (Reich)
 - 2) Power as war (Nietzsche): inversion of Clausewitz's dictum ("war is politics by other means") into "politics is war by other means"
 - a) Social power relations anchored in a given historical war so that politics "sanctions and reproduces" the result of that war
 - b) Political struggles are continuations of that same war
 - c) Final decision that ends politics can only come in a final battle
- C. Recap of economism vs war-repression models
- D. F's recent work inscribed w/in struggle-repression model

- 1) F was forced to rethink this model and perhaps will have to abandon it
 - 2) F has always been suspicious of repression model
- IV. Forecast (18-19)
- A. War as model for power
 - B. Course outline:
 - 1) Dismissing "false paternity" of social war discourse: Machiavelli and Hobbes
 - 2) Racial binarism of social war discourse
 - 3) Racism and class struggle

Lecture 2 (14 January 1976)

- I. Triangle of "power, right, truth" (23-27)
- A. juridical thought centered on royal power as sovereignty since Middle Ages
 - 1) Either royal power was grounded in a basic right
 - 2) Or that it had to be limited
 - B. F's inversion of juridical thought: bypassing problem of sovereignty
 - 1) Stressing the fact of domination
 - 2) Showing how right is an instrument of domination
- II. Methodological precautions (27-34)
- A. Look to exercise of power at real extremities, not at formal center
 - B. Study the multiple peripheral bodies rather than the Leviathan at center
 - C. Look at how power circulates through individuals, constituting them as subjects, i.e., as "subjected to" and as "active subjects," rather than being applied to an inert substance (F as anti-hylomorphic)
 - D. Ascending analysis of power:
 - 1) Methodology of ascending analysis
 - a) begin with "infinitesimal mechanisms"
 - b) show investment by general mechanism and forms of domination
 - 2) Examples of vacuity of descending analysis
 - a) Bourgeoisie not interested in mad, sexual children, or delinquents
 - b) But in the mechanisms of power that control them and that yield
 - (1) Economic profit
 - (2) Political utility
 - E. Look to actual instruments of power, not their ideological trimmings
- III. Juridical theory of power and its relations to disciplinary power (34-37)
- A. "massive historical fact": sovereignty theory dates to Middle Ages
 - B. Four roles of this theory
 - 1) Referred to actual power mechanism of feudal monarchy
 - 2) Instrument to constitute and justify monarchical administration
 - 3) Became a weapon on both sides of Wars of Religion
 - 4) In 18th C, became alternative model to absolute monarchy
 - C. Birth of disciplines in 17th and 18th C incompatible with relations of sovereignty
 - 1) Disciplines as opposite of sovereign power
 - a) Exercised on bodies and capacities, not on land and its products
 - b) Minute calculation vs absolute expenditure

- 2) But sovereignty theory still organized juridical codes of 19th C
 - a) Permanent critical resource against monarchists
 - b) Allowed for
 - (1) concealment of mechanisms
 - (2) erasure of fact of domination
 - (3) the "democratization of sovereignty"
- IV. Right of sovereignty / mechanics of discipline (37-40)
- A. two limits to exercise of power
 - B. human sciences found at their intersection
 - C. conflict of disciplinary normalization and sovereignty-based rights
 - 1) recourse to sovereignty-based rights traps us in bottleneck
 - 2) we need a new, anti-disciplinary and non-sovereignty-based right

Lecture 3 (21 January 1976)

- I. Recap of previous lecture and last five years of F's work: "manufacture of subjects, not the genesis of the sovereign" (43-46)
- A. Presuppositions of theory of sovereignty ("juridical theory of power")
 - 1) subject-to-subject cycle
 - 2) unitary power as basis of transforming *puissances* into political *pouvoirs*
 - 3) cycle of legitimacy and law
 - B. F trying to analyze power outside the juridical / sovereignty theory
 - 1) Analyze power at points of exercise of domination
 - 2) Analyze field of real exercise of power, rather than its formal source / apex (F's anti-representationalism or his "nominalism")
 - 3) Identify the technical instruments of exercise of domination
- II. Preliminary sketch of social war discourse (46-52)
- A. Forecast of future questions
 - B. Clausewitz's principle:
 - 1) Not who inverted C's principle
 - 2) But who formulated the principle that C inverted?
 - C. In other words, "politics is war by other means" existed long before C
 - 1) Paradox: when war becomes monopoly of State, social war model arises
 - 2) History of key moments in social war model:
 - a) Bourgeois revolutionaries in English Civil War (1640s)
 - b) Rearguard struggle of French aristocrats against Louis XIV (@ 1690s)
 - c) Nationalist discourse during French Revolution (1790s)
 - d) Class struggle theories in mid 19th C
 - e) Racial purity and eugenicists in late 19th and early 20th C
 - 3) Content of the social war model
 - a) War presides at birth of States
 - b) War continues to rage beneath the law in all mechanisms of power
 - c) Binary structure of society
 - 4) Novelty of the social war model:
 - a) first historical-political discourse in post-medieval Europe

- b) perspectivalism: you have to be on one side or the other: no neutrality
 - c) singular rather than universal rights
- III. Epistemology of the social war model (52-59)
 - A. Questioning of identification of truth with peace or neutrality
 - 1) De-centering brings better ability to interpret truth, denounce errors
 - 2) Truth as a force to be deployed on basis of relation of force
 - 3) Speaking subject as one fighting a war
 - B. Inverts value of explaining from above
 - 1) Now we explain from below, on basis of what is confused and chaotic
 - 2) Thus war is supposed to explain peace
 - a) A series of brute physico-biological facts
 - b) A series of accidents or contingencies
 - c) A bundle of psychological / moral elements
 - 3) Rationality grows out of these elements
 - a) becoming more and more abstract and illusory as it grows
 - b) becoming more and more tied to cunning and wickedness of the victors
 - C. Develops solely w/in historical dimension
 - 1) Does not judge historical events by reference to an ideal standard
 - 2) But wants to "rediscover the blood that has dried in the codes"
 - D. Bound up with myths
 - 1) Lost age of great ancestors
 - 2) Imminence of the new times
 - 3) Millenary revenge
 - E. Hegelian-Marxist dialectic as philosophical colonization of social war discourse
- IV. Forecast (59-62)
 - A. Get rid of the "false paternities" of Machiavelli and Hobbes
 - B. Dual birth in the 1600s: racial struggle or even "race war"
 - 1) English revolutionaries in the 1630s
 - 2) French aristocrats in the 1690s
 - C. French revolution and nationalist history (early 1800s)
 - D. Two 19th C transcriptions
 - 1) Marxist / socialist inscription: class struggle
 - 2) Darwinist biological inscription:
 - a) Full bio-social racism: splitting of single race into super-race / sub-race
 - b) Race struggle becomes discourse of central State power: State racism
 - (1) Struggle against deviation from the norm
 - (2) Theories of degeneracy and eugenics: permanent purification

Lecture 4 (28 January 1976)

- I. Intro: in praise of discourse of race struggle (65-66)
 - A. Racist discourse is only a single episode in long history of race war discourse
 - B. Race war discourse as counterhistory
- II. History as justification and reinforcement of [monarchical] power (66-69)
 - A. Two purposes:

- 1) Recounting history to establish juridical link btw kings and power
- 2) Use intensity of glory of historical exploits to fascinate men
- B. Three traditional axes
 - 1) Genealogical: demonstrate ancient, uninterrupted line of sovereign right
 - 2) Memorialization: each act of king a law and an obligation
 - 3) Exemplification: examples as "glory made law"
- C. Two aspects of power map onto Indo-European binary representation
 - 1) Juridical: power binds into a unity by oaths, bonds, law
 - 2) Magic: power blinds and petrifies by dazzling displays
- III. Race discourse as anti-Roman history, as "counterhistory" (69-73)
 - A. No more link btw people and king / nation and sovereign (binding)
 - 1) Sovereign no longer binds into a unity
 - 2) Instead it enslaves
 - 3) Heterogeneous histories
 - B. No more continuity of glory (dazzling)
 - 1) Light is now divisive: it illuminates and it darkens
 - 2) Counterhistorical is a disruption
 - 3) Appeals to a prophetic rupture
 - C. This anti-Roman history looks like mythico-religious history of the Jews
 - 1) Bible as weapon of poverty and insurrection
 - 2) Biblical form of prophecy and promise
 - D. New function of memory
 - 1) Disinter something that has been hidden bcs of deliberate misrepresentation, that is, the origin of States in war
 - 2) Show that "laws deceive, kings wear masks, power creates illusions, and historians tell lies"
 - E. An attack on power and a demand
 - 1) Power is unjust bcs it does not belong to us
 - 2) Declare war by declaring rights
- IV. Summary hypothesis (73-76)
 - A. Roman sovereign history now constrained by Biblical history;
 - B. Discourse of rebellion and prophecy that challenges Roman legacy
 - 1) Counterhistory seeks to unmask Rome as new Babylon
 - 2) Rome had been constant presence in Middle Ages
 - a) National myths of Trojan descent: all are brothers of Rome
 - C. New European historical consciousness
 - 1) new beginnings in war and conquest
 - 2) new peoples: Franks, Gauls, Celts
- V. Comments (76-80)
 - A. Race discourse is not necessarily that of the oppressed
 - B. "race" is not simply biological in this discourse
 - C. Two great forms of historical discourse
 - 1) Roman style: sovereignty and Biblical style: servitude and exile
 - 2) Intersection of those styles provided discursive explosions
 - a) English Civil War: Saxons vs Normans
 - b) French aristocracy vs absolutist monarchy

- c) 19th C: history of peoples vs that of regimes
- D. Idea of revolution
 - 1) Its origins and content still enigmatic
 - 2) Cannot be separated from the practice of counterhistory
 - 3) Provides clue why historical discourse becomes problem in 19th C
- VI. Birth of racism (80-83)
 - A. Thiers transformed race struggle into class struggle
 - B. At same time race in bio-medical sense is born
 - 1) Evolutionary sense of struggle for existence
 - 2) Society as biologically monist
 - a) Foreigners have invaded / infiltrated
 - b) Deviants are produced w/in society as degeneration
 - C. State plays new role
 - 1) No longer instrument of one race against another
 - 2) But now protector of integrity, superiority, purity of the national race
 - D. Racism as inversion of revolutionary discourse
 - 1) Race discourse had been weapon against State [Roman] sovereignty
 - 2) Racism now used by State to protect its sovereignty via medical normalization
 - E. 20th C transformations of racism
 - 1) Nazi state racism
 - a) inscribed in prophetic discourse from which race struggle once emerged
 - b) Nazi myths of popular struggle:
 - (1) Germans victimized by Versailles treaty
 - (2) Awaiting new Reich: apocalypse, end of days
 - 2) Soviet scientific racism
 - a) Class enemy becomes biological threat
 - b) Medical police eliminates class enemies as if they were bio threat

Lecture 5 (4 February 1976)

- I. Prelude: question of anti-Semitism (87-89)
 - A. race struggle discourse not related to medieval, religious anti-Semitism
 - B. anti-Semitism does enter the picture in 19th C in State racism
- II. criticism of view that Hobbes belongs to social war discourse (89-99)
 - A. What is Hobbes's war of all against all? (89-93)
 - 1) Presupposes equality: differences would preclude or rapidly conclude war
 - 2) Theater of war: interplay of will & representations: "primal diplomacy"
 - B. And how does it found the State? (93-97)
 - 1) Types of sovereignty:
 - a) Institution: sovereign represents by taking the place of individuals
 - b) Acquisition: vanquished agree to obey; will to prefer life to death
 - c) Familial sovereignty: child consents to mother's sovereignty to save its life
 - 2) Form of sovereignty: will to live of those afraid for their lives
 - C. What is Hobbes's object in this discourse? (97-99)
 - 1) To erase the reality of war as historical base of sovereignty

- 2) Rather, sovereignty can be deduced by reason
- 3) Basically, Hobbes wants to eliminate recourse to fact of the Conquest
- III. Norman Conquest (99-109)
 - A. The Conquest was manifest in a variety of ways (99-101)
 - 1) Royal rituals invoking sovereignty by right of conquest
 - 2) French language of law
 - 3) Conflict of legends: Saxon vs Norman (rehabbed Celtic legend of Arthur)
 - 4) Historical memory of rebellions
 - B. Social war discourse circulated among both Saxons and Normans (101-109)
 - 1) "discourse of the king": use Conquest as legitimation
 - a) By right of conquest: king is owner of England and possessor of right
 - b) "boomerang effect" of colonization: Normans colonized Saxons
 - (1) CLR James: Black Jacobins radicalized the French Revolution
 - (2) Plantation work system fed back into European discipline
 - (3) If Saxons took this up, they would have to see themselves as savages?
 - 2) Parliamentarians: begin by denying Conquest
 - a) If William is legitimate heir to England, he is bound to Saxon law
 - b) The Conquest comes later, as the other Normans usurp Saxon rights
 - c) Saxon right sees leader as elected war chief rather than divine king
 - d) Saxon right becomes expression of human reason; "foundational utopia"
 - 3) Radicals: Levellers and Diggers
 - a) Primary theses:
 - (1) Levellers: [unjust] Conquest means invalidates all current law
 - (a) Law as mere instrument of power
 - (b) Current property regime is unjust
 - (2) Diggers: rebellion is our response in an ongoing war
 - b) Developments:
 - (1) Bring back Saxon laws bcs they are laws of nature
 - (2) But aren't Saxon laws themselves based on war and conquest?
 - (3) So all power is domination
- IV. Summary: social war model as "political historicism" is Hobbes's adversary (109-11)

Lecture 6 (11 February 1976)

- I. Origin myths as lessons in public right [= constitutional law] (115-124)
 - A. French are descended from the Trojans:
 - 1) Elides history of conflict between Rome and Gaul
 - 2) French are rightful heirs to Romans (as younger brothers)
 - a) Rights and powers of French king are those of a Roman emperor
 - b) French have same rights as Rome
 - (1) French are in no way subordinate to the Germans (Habsburg emperors)
 - (2) Colonization of Gaul by Rome had to be elided
 - (3) Frankish invasions had to be elided
 - B. "Germanic thesis"

- 1) Circulating at time of Wars of Religion (1570s)
 - 2) Proposes subordination of French to Habsburgs
 - C. Francois Hotman (1573)
 - 1) Political historicism: no more continuous genealogies of royal sovereignty
 - 2) Juridical / limited government as point of story
 - 3) Hotman's story:
 - a) Gauls and Germans [Franks] are brothers
 - b) Germans [Franks] come to rescue of Gauls and expel Romans
 - c) Ancient German law entails popular sovereignty
 - 4) Hotman does not tell a binary story, but one of original unity
 - D. "Radical Gallo-centrism": Gauls as motor of history
 - 1) Original Gauls spread out throughout Europe
 - 2) The returning Franks were simply then coming home
 - 3) In doing so, they reabsorbed Gallo-Roman absolutism
 - a) King grants fiefs to his warriors in gratitude for their bravery
 - b) Thus "property" of nobles due to act of royal will; king is real owner
- II. These stories are related to English developments in political historicism (124-27)
- A. Commonality:
 - 1) invasion is historical / juridical-political issue: basis of public right
 - 2) contra Hobbes and the other philosophers of contract
 - 3) Clovis et al are now figures of rupture, not continuity
 - 4) "nos ancêtres les Gallois" as a lesson in public right
 - B. Difference:
 - 1) English begin with story of social heterogeneity
 - 2) But idea of French unity only ends at end of 17th C
- III. Problem of political pedagogy / State knowledge (127-133)
- A. Boulainvilliers
 - 1) condenses massive report of state of France for prince
 - 2) puts forth theses favorable to the nobility, etc.
 - 3) but most importantly, he criticizes circular State power-knowledge
 - 4) proposes historical knowledge instead: equity of nobles and king
 - B. Two enemies of nobles' historical knowledge
 - 1) Juridical knowledge:
 - a) flattery of king's pretension to absolute power
 - b) to be challenged by history of royal betrayals of noble peers
 - 2) Administrative knowledge:
 - a) flattery of king's wealth
 - b) challenged by history of unjust robbery of nobles via war, church, etc.
- IV. New form of history (133-138)
- A. New subject of history: the "society" or "nation"
 - 1) New speaking subject
 - a) Previously, only the royal flatterer
 - b) Now the nobility sees itself as separate nation from others in the State
 - 2) New subject of history
 - a) That is, new objects of historical analysis
 - b) Group conflicts; history of betrayals

- 3) A new pathos: (birth of what becomes French right-wing thought)
- B. Aim of this new form of history
 - 1) Challenge administrative power-knowledge
 - 2) Get between the king and his ministers
- C. In response, royal power attempts to organize historical knowledge
 - 1) Creation of what amounts to a ministry of history (1760 onward)
 - 2) History as a weapon: ministry of history
 - a) Acknowledges constitution, i.e., historically basic laws of the nation
 - b) But attempts to control that knowledge

Lecture 7 (18 February 1976)

- I. Introduction: recap of previous lectures (141-144)
 - A. Two novelties in historical discourse (contra "Roman" praise of royal power)
 - 1) A new object breaks historical continuity: the Germanic invasion
 - 2) A new speaking subject: multiple "nations" begin to speak
 - a) *Encyclopedia*: "statist" concept of "nation": a people founds a state
 - b) Nobles wanted a heterogeneous collection of nations w/in the State
 - B. Comparison of English and French political historicism
 - 1) English system was a simple binary opposition of Saxons / Normans
 - 2) French nobles fought on 2 fronts: against monarchist and bourgeoisie
 - a) Against monarchists, nobles claim [ancient Germanic] freedoms
 - b) Against bourgeoisie, nobles claim rights based on victory in invasion
- II. Boulainvilliers (144-155)
 - A. What did Franks find in entering Gaul?
 - 1) Gaul had been conquered and a foreign (Roman) absolutism imposed
 - a) Romans had disarmed the native Gaulish aristocracy
 - b) Romans used equality as despotic trick to ally themselves w/ the people
 - c) Romans then create an administrative, not warrior, aristocracy
 - 2) Franks thus found the Romans had to pay mercenaries
 - a) This necessitated monetary taxes
 - b) Creating an inflation ("devaluation")
 - 3) B's question is economico-political, not one of public right
 - a) Not, did Franks abolish Roman sovereignty?
 - b) But, why were the Romans defeated?
 - B. Who were the Franks who invaded Gaul?
 - 1) Warrior aristocracy = Frankish people itself
 - 2) Two leaders, both elected. Not necessarily the same person
 - a) Civil magistrate for settling peacetime disputes
 - b) Warlord, only in times of war
 - 3) Warrior freedom: the "blond beasts"
 - a) These free warriors would never let warlord become an absolute monarch
 - b) Thus each warrior directly benefited from invasion by claiming land
 - 4) Vase of Soissons: Clovis as civil magistrate could only distribute booty
 - 5) How did Franks succeed? (portrait of ideal feudalism)

- a) Isolated warrior caste w/ monopoly of weapons
 - b) Demanded only payment in kind from supporting peasants
 - C. What happened to the Frankish warriors vis-à-vis the monarch?
 - 1) Nobles become caught btw monarch and people (qua mercenaries)
 - a) Military success of invasion required a permanent war footing
 - b) Thus dual system of warlord and civil magistrate collapses
 - c) King thus had to recruit mercenaries to battle recalcitrant nobles
 - d) Nobles now caught btw monarch and people he recruits as mercenaries
 - 2) 2nd part of the Soissons vase story
 - a) Clovis strikes down the challenging noble
 - b) Absolutism: Clovis's military power settles civil [property] dispute
 - 3) Monarch forms a second front against the nobles
 - a) Monarch's alliance w/ old Gaullish aristos, now become Churchmen
 - b) "language-power" system: Latin, Roman law, State
 - c) Other-worldly Church seduces Frankish warriors
 - (1) They become (Crusading) knights
 - (2) While at home the Churchmen and monarchs plot to steal their lands
 - D. What does B want the contemporary nobles to do?
 - 1) To become scholars of political historicism
 - 2) And thus insert themselves into the historical-political struggle
- III. B establishes war as grid of historical intelligibility (155-163)
- A. War and foundations of right:
 - 1) Natural right is freedom and equality together
 - 2) War "conceals" such a right by showing it is unreal, abstract, fictive
 - a) Historical:
 - (1) There's always another war to be found
 - (2) Or the inequalities resulting from a war
 - b) Theoretical
 - (1) Freedom essentially entails freedom to dominate
 - (2) So freedom is essentially opposite of equality
 - (3) Freedom only is real in a real relation of unequal forces
 - c) Historico-theoretical
 - (1) So any putative natural right is an abstract fiction
 - (2) That is inevitably defeated in any real historical setting
 - 3) History (unequal forces) always stronger than nature (theoretical equality)
 - B. War and battle form
 - 1) Unequal forces that decide war already established in structure of military
 - 2) Military-industrial complex is the key to analysis of society
 - a) Heavily armed warriors support themselves (feudal land ownership)
 - b) King can however afford an army of foot soldiers (central taxation)
 - C. Invasion-rebellion system
 - 1) Dialectic of forces (how strong became weak and weak became strong)
 - a) Victorious and strong Frankish warriors
 - (1) Isolated on their estates and concerned only with war
 - (2) They became separated from king
 - (3) And neglected their education, Latin, etc

- b) Vanquished and weak Gaullish aristocracy
 - (1) Are driven into the Church
 - (2) Where they become learned in Latin and law
 - (3) And thus become the king's councilors
 - 2) War as permanent state of society
 - a) Multiple social struggles: no longer two armies, but now many groups
 - b) Real war, not Hobbesian pseudo-war
- IV. Conclusion (163-165)
 - A. War becomes grid of intelligibility for social analysis
 - 1) That is, B's discourse has a truth value for our regime of truth
 - 2) Whereas myths of Trojan descent do not (they are neither true nor false)
 - B. B is able to recuperate Machiavelli's discourse
 - 1) For M, relationship of force is a political technique of the prince
 - 2) For B, it is a historico-political object: formation of historico-political field
 - C. B is origin of idea that war is historical discourse's truth-matrix
 - D. Rather than ascending bourgeoisie being fathers of historical rationality, it was the dispossessed aristos of B's group
 - E. Clausewitz could produce his dictum by inverting B's discourse

Lecture 8 (25 February 1976)

- I. B establishes "historico-political field" by taking "nations" as object (167-172)
 - A. New speaking subject of history: the vanquished have a voice
 - 1) History could now become history of the people / peoples
 - 2) [Royal] power is now only one force
 - a) A paradoxical force, one w/o force, but only power
 - b) Against the primal force of the people
 - B. B defines the relational character of power
 - 1) Challenging juridical theory of sovereignty by showing relations of force
 - 2) B takes over from Machiavelli
 - a) For M, history is only examples for the political technique of prince
 - b) For B, relations of force and power are what history is
 - C. We thus see a "historico-political continuum" or "field"
 - 1) What did B want?
 - a) B wanted a critique of King's administrative knowledge
 - (1) He shows contemporary admin issues at work in history
 - (2) He thus uses State's "managerial rationality" as historical grid
 - b) B had a specific political goal in mind in using history as weapon
 - 2) B's discourse thus constitutes a historico-political field
 - a) History is thus the medium and weapon of political (war) struggle
 - b) Just as politics as war is the lens w/ which to read history
- II. Remarks on "historicism" (172-178)
 - A. Historicism has always been abjured by philosophers and human science
 - 1) "Historicism" is simply the war model of history
 - a) History finds nothing but wars

- b) And history writing is a weapon in an ongoing war
- 2) "Platonism": knowledge / truth only in peace / order, not war ("objectivity")
 - a) State has reimplemented this idea in its disciplinarization of knowledge
 - b) So "historicism" is now outlawed as "circular" or "biased"
- B. An objection: "history writing we now have is not simply power's song to itself"
 - 1) Tragedy as ritual for discussing public right
 - a) Shakespearean historical tragedies used real figures
 - b) French classical tragedy used ancient / mythic figures
 - (1) For reasons of political prudence
 - (2) Monarchic right was represented as direct descendent of ancients
 - (3) Courtly tragedy articulated with court life as another drama of power
 - (a) Tragedy undoes and recomposes courtly ritual
 - (b) Tragedy shows the shredding of person of public right
 - (c) So that he is only a man of passion
 - (d) But then the king can be reborn out of that destruction
 - c) So it makes sense that Racine was official historiographer of Louis XIV
 - 2) System: absolutism, display of public right, tragedy, history of king
 - a) Racine was first example
 - b) Jacob-Nicolas Moreau: historiographer to Louis XVI in 1780s
 - (1) Scholarly defender of an embattled king when history has become medium and weapon of political struggles
 - (2) In charge of central ministry of history
 - (a) Arm the king in these historico-political battles
 - (b) Establish an enforced peace in this war by coding historical discourse so it could be integrated into State practice

III. Genealogy of knowledges is not the history of science (178-185)

- A. Genealogy of knowledges
 - 1) Cannot think in Enlightenment terms
 - a) Progress toward truth
 - b) And increase of knowledge vs ignorance
 - 2) Rather, it must see a field of battle btw multiple knowledges
- B. Examples
 - 1) Technical knowledge in 18th C
 - a) Existence of multiple local knowledges
 - (1) Limited
 - (2) Held as secrets
 - (3) Knowledges producing wealth
 - (4) And guaranteeing independence
 - b) As productive forces develop
 - (1) These local knowledges
 - (a) Become more expensive
 - (b) And the struggles over secrecy / independence intensify
 - (2) Processes develop whereby big industrial knowledge can take over
 - c) State intervention to produce disciplinarization of knowledge
 - (1) Four processes
 - (a) Eliminating and disqualifying uneconomic knowledges

- (b) Normalizing them to make them interchangeable
 - (c) Hierarchical classification of knowledges
 - (d) Pyramidal centralization
 - (2) Variety of practices, projects, institutions
 - (a) *Encyclopedia* and other surveys of knowledges
 - (b) Founding of *grandes écoles*
 - (c) Corps of inspectors
- 2) Example of medical knowledge
- C. Disciplinarization of knowledge produces "science" in the singular
 - 1) Before, multiple sciences:
 - a) Philosophy as foundation / principle of communication
 - b) *Mathesis* as project of universal science
 - 2) In new system, we have only singular science and philosophy as handmaiden
- D. Disciplinarization of knowledge enables us to understand
 - 1) Transformation of university and its new disciplinary role
 - a) Selection, classification, normalization, centralization of knowledge
 - b) Disappearance of the amateur scholar
 - 2) Change w/ regard to dogmatism
 - a) No more need for dogmatic control of content
 - b) Now that there is a disciplinary control of "enunciatory procedures"
 - (1) That is, who gets to speak, when, on what topics
 - (2) Thus we move from "orthodoxy" to "orthology"
- E. We now see that discipline can be applied to knowledges as well as to bodies

IV. Conclusion (185-186)

- A. Moreau: tries to discipline history as historico-political field of struggle is formed
- B. But we see perpetual struggle
 - 1) Between disciplined State history
 - 2) And polemical "political historicism"

Lecture 9 (3 March 1976)

I. Forecast (189-190)

- A. 18th C generalization of historico-political discourse (e.g., Boulainvilliers): discursive weapon
- B. Three directions / battles / tactics (cf. Order of Things)
 - 1) Nationalities / languages / philology
 - 2) Social classes / economic domination / political economy
 - 3) Races / biological specification and selection / biology

II. Tactical generalization of historical knowledge (190-197)

- A. Reasons for this generalization
 - 1) National duality as principle of intelligibility of history (Boulainvilliers)
 - a) Find the initial conflict / basic struggle as strategic thread
 - b) Trace betrayals / alliances / "line of ethical divisions"
 - c) Demonstrate a certain relation of force as both right and fair
 - 2) B's search = "rediscover state of affairs / state of force in primal rightness"

- B. Constituent point of history:
 - 1) Order of force as "stable dissymmetry / congruent inequality"
 - 2) Revolution as re-establishment of force relations (not as reconstitution of laws)
 - 3) Cyclical history as condition for revolution as reconstitution of force
 - C. The barbarian, not the savage
 - 1) Savage
 - a) For jurists, exists before history (and comes to exchange rights to found social body)
 - b) For economists, man w/o history, motivated only by self-interest in exchange
 - 2) Barbarian
 - a) Essentially historical: always in exterior relation to civilization
 - b) Essentially dominating: takes and enslaves rather than exchanges
 - c) Essentially free: never trades freedom for security
- III. The problem of "filtering" barbarism to find right economy of it and revolution (197-207)
- A. Monarchists: eliminate barbarians from history: Franks as allies; Clovis as Roman emperor
 - B. Dissociate Germanic freedom from aristocracy: Frankish horde as democratic
 - C. Distinguish two forms of barbarism: Germanic = bad; Gauls = good; town freedom
 - 1) Bourgeois interest in Romans
 - 2) Great extension of historical field:
 - a) Now no longer point of invasion, but 1500 years
 - b) Many different players
- IV. Why give all these details? (207-212)
- A. Methodology:
 - 1) Tightly woven field at level of basic propositions
 - 2) Allows different tactics / positions / subjects
 - B. Fact: bourgeoisie only lately becomes historicist
 - 1) Bourgeoisie tended to be in favor of enlightened despotism: technical reason
 - 2) Escape from historicism by demanding rational constitution: natural right (Rousseau)
 - 3) Two forms of historical reactivation
 - a) Reactivation of Rome
 - (1) Roman city as republican and virtuous
 - (2) Charlemagne as both Germanic king and Roman emperor
 - b) Execration of feudalism
 - (1) Inversion of Boulainvilliers's invasion thesis:
 - (a) Invading Franks as drain on nation
 - (b) Reinterpretation of political struggles of 18th C in terms of history of races
 - (2) Context for gothic novels

Lecture 10 (10 March 1976)

- I. Forecast of next two lectures: Self-dialecticalization of historico-political discourse: embourgeoisement as retreat from historical war to internal biological threat (215-216)
- II. Sieyès's discourse on the Third Estate: political reworking of the nation (217-222)
 - A. Contrary views: context of Sieyès

- 1) Monarchist view:
 - a) nation as group of individuals does not exist:
 - b) the body politic is the body of the king;
 - c) individuals become political only in relation to the king's body
 - 2) Nobiliary reaction: king as instrument one nation uses against another
 - B. Sieyès: double definition of the nation: reverses direction of previous analyses
 - 1) Conditions
 - a) Formal condition: nation as juridical state: requires common law and legislature
 - b) Substantive / historical conditions of existence:
 - (1) Works (for us, "functions"): agriculture, handicrafts / industry, trade, liberal arts
 - (2) Functions (for us, "apparatuses"): army, justice, church, administration
 - 2) 18th C: bourgeoisie fulfills historical conditions, but is denied formal status of nation; thus it is "a" nation, capable of being "the" nation
- III. Nationalist discourse (222-225)
- A. Political implications
 - 1) Particularity and universality
 - a) Nobiliary reaction: extracted singular right of nobles from totality of social body
 - b) Third Estate: we are only a particular part, but we are capable of Statist universality
 - 2) Temporal inversion
 - a) No longer based on a past right
 - b) But on a present potential to direct the future
 - B. Theoretical implications: nation defined in relation to the State
 - 1) Nation defined not by horizontal relation w/ other nations but by vertical relation
 - a) Between body of people capable of constituting a State
 - b) And actual existence of the State
 - 2) Strength of nation not its physical vigor but its potential to form a State
 - 3) Essence of nation not its domination of others, but its ability to control the State
 - C. Historical implications
 - 1) 17th C had State's discourse of self-justification and nobiliary anti-State reaction
 - 2) 18th C has discourse sympathetic to State:
 - a) History of relations of nation and State
 - b) From national totality to universality of State
- IV. War of domination btw nations becomes civil struggle w/ State as object and space (225-236)
- A. Can we understand struggle not in terms of war but in terms of economic-political struggle
 - B. Two grids of intelligibility for history
 - 1) Rightist: Starting point is ancient relation of force qua war, battle, invasion, conquest, etc
 - 2) Liberal / bourgeois: Starting point is present
 - a) Rather than negative moment where primitive war had become confused / hidden
 - b) Present is now the point of greatest intensity, when "universal enters the real"
 - C. Real history writing must use both grids
 - 1) Montlosier: right-wing example

2) Augustin Thierry: liberal / bourgeois example

V. Conclusion (236-237)

- A. War becomes curtailed: no longer privileged grid of historical intelligibility
- B. Fundamental relation of groups is now longer domination, but the State
- C. Possibility of a dialectical philosophy of history: what in the present is the agent of universality?

Lecture 11 (17 March 1976): Biopower and Racism

I. Biopower (238-247)

- A. Sovereign power as "kill or let live"
- B. Biopower as "make live or let die"
 - 1) Transformation in theory of right: life must remain outside contract as its basis
 - 2) Emergence of body-centered techniques of discipline: individualizing
 - 3) Emergence of biopower applied to man-as-species: "massifying"
 - a) Addressed to set of processes:
 - (1) Relation of rates of birth, death, illness, etc
 - (2) Forms an "Idea" in Deleuze's sense
 - b) Medicalization of the population
 - c) Mechanisms of insurance, savings, safety measures to address accidents
 - d) Concern with human environment: urban problems
- C. New elements with the emergence of biopower
 - 1) Emergence of the "population" as new object
 - 2) Characteristics of new phenomena treated by biopower
 - a) Collective phenomena that exert their economic / political effects at mass level
 - b) Aleatory at individual level, but displaying constants at mass level
 - c) Serial phenomena: must be studied over time
 - 3) New "security" mechanisms:
 - a) Forecasts, statistical estimates, regulations aiming at mass level
 - b) Aiming at a social homeostasis

II. Excursus: changing relation to death (247-249)

- A. Privatization of death
- B. Individual death as limit of biopower, which can only control population mortality rates
- C. Symbolized in death of Franco
 - 1) Exercised old sovereign power of death
 - 2) Trapped by new biopower of life

III. Comparison of discipline / biopower in context of demographic explosion / industrialization (249-254)

- A. Different times:
 - 1) First, disciplinary detail
 - 2) Then, biopower mass / population
- B. Different registers: discipline in institutions, biopower at State level
 - 1) But this is not a complete dichotomy
 - 2) Discipline can achieve a State dimension (apparatus of the police)
 - 3) While biopower can work at sub-State level (volunteer / philanthropy / insurance)

C. Different levels, but can be articulated w/ each other

- 1) Planned towns
 - a) Disciplinary mechanisms for control of bodies: visibility / normalization
 - b) Biopower regulatory mechanisms:
 - (1) Savings to buy houses
 - (2) Insurance / pension schemes through town organizations
 - (3) Hygiene rules
 - (4) Effects on sexuality (ratios of male / female, young / old people)
 - (5) Child care and education facilities
- 2) Sexuality at intersection of disciplined bodies and regulated population
 - a) Theory of degeneracy (individual perversions have population effects)
 - b) Medicine becomes "political intervention-technique" applied to body and population
- 3) Normalization as operating at both levels of body and population

D. Paradoxes of biopower pushed to its limits

- 1) Nuclear arms: MAD: sovereign power to kill individuals in war becomes threat to life itself
- 2) Bioengineering / biological weapons: make life, but a life that destroys other life

IV. Racism (254-263)

A. Modern racism as State power mechanism: needed to justify violence of biopolitical State:

- 1) Allows violence to be employed along break in biological field, in continuum of biopower
- 2) Establishes positive relation between death of others and life of protected group
 - a) Not an old-fashioned military relation of kill or be killed
 - b) But a biopower relation: the more inferior species dies, the stronger my species becomes
- 3) Not just direct killing, but the "indirect murder" of increasing risk of death or exiling someone

B. Social Darwinism as biopower doctrine

- 1) Justifies genocide in colonization
- 2) War as defeating enemy race as a biological threat AND as regenerating your own race
- 3) Justifies death penalty or incarceration
 - a) For degenerate races involved in crime
 - b) For the mad, sick, perverted, etc.

C. State biopower racism is not old-fashioned mutual contempt or ideological deflection

D. Two examples

- 1) Nazism: sovereign power / disciplinary power / biopower racism taken to the maximum
 - a) Destroy other races
 - b) Expose German race to purifying violence of war / struggle to make it the master race
- 2) Socialist racism: socialism takes over State techniques of capitalism
 - a) It makes no critique of biopower, but takes over biopower management of life
 - b) Soviet socialist racism

- (1) Is not ethnic, but evolutionary / biological
- (2) Targeting the enemies of the State as mentally ill
- c) 19th C socialist projects (before era of social democracy and Dreyfus affair)
 - (1) Are not racist when considering economic reform
 - (2) But are racist when considering concrete class struggle