I. Why Study Power?
   A. Neither a theory nor a methodology, but a history of "subjectification" [subjectivation], of the "objectification" [objectivation] that transforms human beings into subjects
      1) Sciences [OT]
         a) Objectification of speaking subject in linguistics
         b) Objectification of productive subject in economics
         c) Objectification of living being in biology
      2) Dividing practices [MC / BC / DP]
         a) Divided within himself or divided from others
         b) Examples: mad and sane / sick and healthy / criminals and good
      3) "Reflexive" subjectification [HS]
         a) how to turn yourself into a subject
         b) e.g., sexuality as your truth
   B. Conclusion: it is not power, but the subject with is theme of F's research
      1) However, we are lacking a good analytics of power
      2) What we need is a critical conceptualization of power
         a) Historical awareness of our present: what motivates our research
         b) What type of reality are we dealing with?
   C. An abstract investigation of "reason" is not useful
      1) The Nazis and the Stalinists used our own political rationality
      2) We'll just end up with the old rationalist vs irrationalist debate
      3) Following the Frankfurt School and investigating a general reason of the Enlightenment won't work either
   D. Rather, we should look at rationalities in specific fields in terms of strategies
      1) Madness, illness, death, crime, sexuality, and so on
      2) Use resistance as "chemical catalyst" to reveal power relations
   E. Characteristics of oppositional struggles
      2) Common points:
         a) Transversality: not limited to one country or form of government
         b) Targeting "power effects as such"
         c) Immediacy:
            (1) closest instances, not the ultimate source;
            (2) will not be put off by a revolutionary eschatology
      3) "Original" and "specific" points:
         a) against the "government of individualization"
            (1) right to be different and unique
            (2) but also attack on isolation and confinement to self
         b) against the "regime of knowledge [savoir]"
            (1) against the privileges of knowledge
but also against mystification

c) question of identity: "who we are"
   (1) against abstractions (class, nation) which ignore our individuality
   (2) but also against being determined in an identity by science or admin

4) summary: it's an attack on subjectification as technique or form of power
   a) categorization of individual in immediate everyday life as possessor of a
      truth that must be recognized by yourself and others
   b) two sense of being a "subject"
      (1) subjected to someone else's control [being subjugated]
      (2) tied to your own identity by conscience or self-knowledge

F. Three types of struggles: against domination, exploitation, subjectification

1) Historically, one might be said to prevail, although all occur at same time
   a) Medieval: struggles against domination
   b) 19th C: struggles against exploitation [Old Left]
   c) contemporary: struggles against subjectification [New Left]
      (1) Reformation period was also site of subjectification struggles

2) Economistic objection is always possible: subjectification is derivative
   a) Certainly we can't simply divorce exploitation from subjectification
   b) But we have to look at the "complex and circular" relations here
   c) [In other words, F is NOT claiming that exploitation is unimportant and
      that New Left can ignore it. He IS claiming that Old Left economism is
      inadequate and needs to be supplemented by New Left.]

G. Why subjectification struggles today?

1) State as new form of pastoral power

2) State power is both individualizing and totalizing

H. Remarks on pastoral power

1) Objective: salvation in next world
2) Potentially sacrificial
3) Individualizing and life-long
4) Produces truth of the individual via conscience

I. New form of pastoral power spreads throughout social field, regulated by state

1) Change in objective: salvation in this world
   a) Health
   b) Well-being
   c) Security
   d) Protection against accidents

2) Increase in the agents of pastoral power
   a) The state and state apparatures like the police (originally responsible for
      public health, hygiene, etc. as well as "law and order")
   b) Private ventures: philanthropists, social welfare volunteers
   c) Family was re-organized to provide pastoral functions
   d) Private-public fields such as medicine

3) Knowledge of man on two levels
   a) The population: globalizing and quantitative
   b) The individual: "analytical" knowledge
J. Kant's "What is Enlightenment" paper is a key: we must learn to ask, philosophically, not only universal questions, but also historically singular questions: what is our world here, now, today? How does it work?
   1) Our task: to refuse what we are (individuals with a truth produced by power)
      a) Not to free the individual from the state
      b) But to free ourselves from both the state and its form of individuality
   2) To promote new forms of subjectivity by refusing state-veridical individuality

II. How is Power Exercised?
   A. Asking the "how" question brackets questions of power's substantial existence
   B. We must distinguish power relations (between [free] individuals) from
      1) Material "capacity" exercised on bodies
      2) Systems of communication that transmits information via signs
         a) Signs can have power effects, but these need to be analyzed as such; they are not simply aspects of communication
         b) [Background here includes Speech Act Theory, F's AK, DG's ATP, etc.]
   C. Power, capacity, and communication are all inter-related
      1) these relations vary from society to society and also within societies
      2) but there are "blocks" or "regulated and concerted systems" of power relations
      3) we can call these "disciplines" [cf. F's "dispositif" and DG's "assemblages"]
   D. "disciplining" of Europe
      1) does NOT mean we're simply more obedient
      2) but that an attempt has been made to have power relations [power "as such," capacity, communication] be more "controlled, rational and economical"

III. What Constitutes the Specificity of Power Relations?
   A. Power is specifically the action on the field of (possible) action of others;
      1) It does not preclude, but is not reducible to:
         a) Consenting to transfer of rights
         b) Violence directed to bodies
      2) Two suggestions for terms: conduct and government
         a) "conduct"
            (1) To lead others [e.g., a "conductor" of a train, or orchestra]
            (2) To behave [to conduct yourself, to exhibit good or bad conduct]
         b) "government"
            (1) not just political structures
            (2) but also direction of conduct of others: action on possibilities of action
   B. Power can only be exercised in relation to free subjects
      1) Thus we don't face the Spinozist question of voluntary servitude [cf. DG]
      2) Instead we see "agonism" or "mutual incitement and struggle"

IV. How is One to Analyze the Power Relationship?
   A. We can focus on institutions but we have to understand that
      1) This analysis poses a number of problems
         a) Many institutional mechanisms are designed to reproduce power relations rather than exercise power
         b) We are tempted to explain institutional power in terms of institutions
c) We might overly focus on the regulations or the apparatus of the institution and hence see the institution as only a mode of law [regulations] or coercion [apparatus]

2) We must see "point of anchorage" of institutional power outside institution
   a) Power relations are "rooted deep in the social nexus"
   b) So that a society "without" power relations is only an abstraction

B. Five factors in power relations:
   1) System of differentiations: status, wealth, social differences, expertise, etc.
   2) Types of objectives pursued by those acting on others' actions
   3) Instrumental modes of that action
   4) Forms of institutionalization
   5) Degrees of rationalization

C. In contemporary society, power relations have been "governmentalized"
   1) It's not that all societies are totalitarian [F hated it when the left would conflate the Western democracies and the Soviet bloc]
   2) But all dispositifs or ensembles of power relations refer to the state; they are, directly or indirectly, regulated by the state [e.g., you can't practice medicine without a license; you can home-school, but you have to meet government standards; employers have to meet minimum government regulations; etc]

V. Relations of Power and Relations of Strategy
A. Three uses of term "strategy" all revolve around "choice of winning solutions"
   1) Instrumental [means-end] rationality
   2) Game strategies: to gain an advantage
   3) Confrontational strategies to procure victory

B. But we can also talk about strategies in power relations: how to use and maintain power as ability to act on the field of possible actions of others
   1) Two end points in which power relations vanish:
      a) "Stable mechanisms" of domination [too little freedom]
      b) Reacting to moves of an equal adversary [too much freedom]
   2) Thus each confrontation of equals "dreams" of becoming a power relation just as each power relation tends to become a winning strategy [of domination]
   3) Thus we can [and even must] historically analyze same events as
      a) Struggle of adversaries
      b) Or as workings of a power relationship

C. Relation between domination and struggle is making manifest at level of whole society of the locking together of power relations and strategy relations