

Birth of Biopolitics

Chapters 9-12

Outline by John Protevi

LSU French Studies

www.protevi.com/john/Foucault/biopolitics9-12.pdf

protevi@lsu.edu

Permission granted to copy and distribute for academic use with proper attribution.

Lecture 9: 14 March 1979

- I) Context for American neo-liberalism
 - A) Shared with German neo-liberalism
 - 1) Opposition to New Deal / Keynesianism
 - 2) Post-war socialization / interventionism
 - a) "Social pacts" w/ working class rather than international pacts with allies
 - b) Fighting in war traded for social security (in broad sense: full employment, etc)
 - 3) Social programs up through Johnson's Great Society
 - B) Unique features of American neoliberalism
 - 1) American liberalism was foundational from beginning of nation, back in 18th C
 - 2) Liberalism has been heart of political debate in US for 2 centuries
 - 3) Thus Keynesianism can appear as extraneous and threatening
 - a) Appearing as "socialist" to the right
 - b) And appearing as "imperialist and military state" to the left
 - C) Thus American liberalism is not just a new theory, but a whole historical way of life
 - 1) It's a relation btw governors and governed rather than a technique of governors
 - 2) Thus liberalism appears as / exists as working out of problem of freedom
 - a) Ambiguous, global claim for both right and left
 - b) Utopian focus constantly revived (e.g., Hayek [later Nozick])
 - c) Method of thought / grid of economic-sociological analysis
- II) Theory of human capital as extension of economic analysis into previously unexplored [but still economic] domain [labor]
 - A) Abstract labor
 - 1) Classical political economy didn't really explore labor [vs land and capital]
 - a) Smith and Ricardo just reduce labor to time (= "neutralization" of nature of labor)
 - b) Thus in Keynes labor is a passive factor awaiting activation via adequate investment
 - c) And although the neoliberals never argue with Marx
 - i) Because of "economic snobbery" ("minor post-Ricardian" etc.)
 - ii) If they did, they'd see the same neutralization of labor
 - (a) Abstract labor = labor power measured in time
 - (b) Logic of capital is what reduces concrete labor to abstract labor to labor power
 - 2) Neo-liberals claim abstraction of labor

- a) Is not due to "real capitalism"
 - i) But only to economic theory of classical economics
 - ii) In other words, there has never been a truly economic analysis of concrete labor
 - b) Thus a whole [Marxist] "anthropology" and "politics" of labor fills the void of what a truly economic analysis of concrete labor would have been
 - B) So neoliberalism = "essential epistemological transformation" changing domain of economics
 - 1) Classical economics analyzes mechanisms of production / exchange / consumption
 - 2) Neoliberals analyze "substitutable choices" (= scarce means w/ mutually exclusive ends)
 - a) It's thus not analyzing relations btw things or processes
 - b) But analyzing rational structure of a form of individual human behavior
 - 3) So what is neoliberal / "scientific economic" analysis of labor?
 - a) It's not seeing it as a factor of production in relation to capital
 - b) But it's asking how worker uses the means available to him
 - i) What is work as an economic activity, i.e., as a rational choice of means / ends
 - ii) That is, how do we take the perspective of worker as an active economic subject?
 - C) Kernel of theory of human capital
 - 1) If wage = income, and income = return on capital, what then is worker's capital?
 - 2) It's the set of physical and psychological factors of the worker
 - a) Worker now IS a machine for generating income
 - b) Worker's capital is inseparable from his person, so it's not like other machines
 - i) Opposed to labor power as commodity sold on market to enterprise capital
 - ii) Worker is now his own enterprise
 - D) A new form of *homo economicus*
 - 1) Difference btw classical and neoliberal conceptions
 - a) Classical liberals: *homo economicus* = man of exchange / needs-based utility
 - b) Neoliberals: *homo economicus* = self-entrepreneur [= self-capitalized machine]
 - 2) Consequences: universal production [no more exchange / commodities] (cf. *Anti-Oedipus*)
 - a) No more labor
 - i) You don't exchange [commodified] labor power for wage
 - ii) You produce a return on your capital
 - b) No more consumption
 - i) You don't consume commodities (gotten via exchange for wage)
 - ii) You produce satisfaction
- III) Theory of human capital as enabling possibility of economic analysis of what was previously thought to be non-economic [family time, genetics, education, etc]: imperialism of Economics
 - A) Innate elements [there are a lot of complex issues here; I'm just going to present what F says]
 - 1) Genetic analysis showing disease risk creates possibility that good genes are scarce resource
 - 2) And once we have scarcity, we can do an economic analysis of rational choices
 - a) Cost / benefit analysis of genetic screening
 - b) Qualifications on reproduction market (advertising your good genetic capital, etc.)
 - 3) So rather than / alongside traditional racism, we have economic / human capital analysis of
 - a) Selective abortion
 - b) Eugenics
 - B) Acquired elements

- 1) Forms of these acquired elements of human capital
 - a) Educational investments
 - i) Broader than just schooling
 - ii) Thus also parental time investment (building qualitatively on *their* human capital)
 - b) Medical care
 - c) Mobility: cost / benefit analysis: migrants as investors looking to future returns
- 2) Consequences
 - a) Obvious political consequences F doesn't name, but we can
 - i) Privatization of public institutions in name of free choice
 - (a) School vouchers
 - (b) Health care, etc.
 - ii) Eliminating social analysis of bad outcomes (IOW, "blaming the victim")
 - (a) Poor individual choices regarding specialization
 - (b) Poor impulse control regarding current consumption vs investment for future
 - (c) Generalizable as "culture of poverty"
 - b) But F's real interest lies in analysis of innovation
 - i) Marx and others note the tendency of rate of profit to decline
 - ii) Schumpeter notes how this is continuously corrected
 - (a) Rosa Luxembourgh provides imperialism analysis here
 - (b) Schumpeter notes role of innovation
 - iii) Neoliberals respond
 - (a) We can't trust "innovation" as some ethical-econo-psychological characteristic
 - (b) We have to see it as return on investments in human capital
 1. Analysis of post-war American / European / Japanese economies
 2. Analysis of Third World economies
 3. Analysis of European economic takeoff of 16th / 17th centuries

Lecture 10: 21 March 1979

- I) German ordoliberalism and the ambiguous relation of society and economy
 - A) "Social policy": seemingly to protect fragile competitive market from society
 - 1) Objectives
 - a) Avoiding centralization
 - b) Encouraging medium-sized enterprises
 - c) Support for craft enterprises, small business, etc
 - d) Increase access to property ownership
 - e) Individual insurance
 - f) Environmental regulation
 - 2) "Economic-ethical ambiguity" of notion of "enterprise"
 - a) Generalizing enterprise form throughout social fabric
 - i) Thus individuals are not tied to one big firm ("company town" as extreme)
 - ii) But lives in a "framework of a multiplicity of diverse enterprises"
 - (a) Thus individual actions can be felt in those small firms
 - (b) And individual is no longer dependent on any one firm

- iii) Thus the individual becomes himself a "permanent and multiple enterprise"
 - b) But all this is done in order to compensate for "cold" / mechanical competition
 - i) Extending economic model supports "warm" cultural values
 - ii) = *Vitalpolitik* or "life policy" (vs cold, mechanical competition)
 - B) Conclusion: ordoliberal ambiguity = social policy for *and* against market
 - 1) Protect market from state intervention done to respond to social pressures
 - 2) Protect society from fragmentation via cold mechanism of competition
- II) American neoliberalism is much more radical
- A) Generalized economic analysis as grid of intelligibility of [traditionally non-economic] social relations / individual behavior
 - 1) Human capital and mother / child relations
 - 2) Birth rate as related to investment in human capital
 - a) Compare neo-Darwinist discussion of different species "reproductive strategies"
 - b) E.g., low investment / high birth rate vs high investment / low birth rate
 - 3) Marriage as savings on transaction costs of individualized actions
 - B) Economic analysis as test of government action
 - 1) American Enterprise Institute and cost-benefit analysis of public action
 - 2) Analogy with positivist critique of ordinary language [bit of a *tour de force* here]
 - 3) Contrast with classical liberal laissez-faire
 - a) Classical liberals: market should be isolated from government interference [via rights]
 - b) Neoliberals: market should constantly judge government
 - 4) IOW, protect market from government AND refuse to protect government from market
- III) Becker et al's analysis of criminality as example of these two analyses
- A) Looks at first like a simple return to 18th reformers who also did cost / benefit analyses
 - 1) 18th century reformers did a utility calculation and offered a legalistic solution
 - a) Law reduced transaction costs and so was cheapest way of punishing people
 - b) So we had overlap of *homo penalis* (exposed to legal punishment) and *homo economicus*
 - 2) 19th century notices a paradoxical effect
 - a) Law only sanctions acts or crimes but it's the criminal who must be punished
 - b) Thus human science creation of *homo criminalis* and drift away from *homo penalis*
 - 3) And so we have an "anthropology of crime" replacing mechanics of law
 - B) Neoliberal analysis: stick to *homo economicus* as subject of crime
 - 1) Hypothetical neoliberal analysis of 18th C reformers: don't assume utility calculus can be done w/in a legal framework
 - 2) Neoliberal analysis of crime
 - a) Definition: crime = action that make individual run risk of penalty
 - i) This is close to French penal code (objectively defined in terms of act)
 - ii) But neoliberals adopt subjective perspective: what is rationality structure of choices?
 - b) This subjective perspective
 - i) Not psychology / anthropology
 - ii) Just grid of intelligibility of individual qua *homo economicus*
 - 3) What does this mean about *homo economicus* as subject / object of economic analysis?
 - a) Doesn't mean we consider whole subject as nothing but *homo economicus*
 - b) But it means we can analyze rationality structure of any human action

- c) And thus individual becomes "governmentalizable" via economic analysis
- C) Consequences of neoliberal analysis
 - 1) Regarding crime
 - a) No qualitative difference in crimes (parking infraction vs murder)
 - b) No interrogation of criminal for moral / anthropological traits
 - c) Criminal is just an investor / entrepreneur accepting risk in expectation of profit
 - d) So the system doesn't deal with criminals, but acts on supply of crime
 - 2) Regarding punishment
 - a) = means employed to limit negative externalities of certain acts
 - b) 18th C tried to connect
 - i) Civil reparation
 - ii) Individual correction
 - iii) Prevention
 - c) Neoliberals: two-fold aspect of law
 - i) Prohibition with a certain cost of uttering it
 - ii) Enforcement as providing "negative demand" to supply of crime
 - (a) Quantity of punishment
 - (b) Apparatus for detecting crimes
 - (c) Judicial apparatus for convicting criminals
 - (d) Speed and severity of judgment
 - (e) Effectiveness of penalty
 - (f) Modifiability of penalty
- D) Analysis of "law enforcement"
 - 1) Supply of crime is not indefinitely or uniformly elastic
 - a) Shoplifting
 - i) Easy to get some reduction
 - ii) Very hard to get reductions past a certain point
 - b) Crimes of passion
 - i) Some would disappear w/ easier divorce
 - ii) Others wouldn't be affected by divorce
 - 2) Enforcement itself has costs and negative externalities
 - a) Cost: law enforcement investment means less for other options
 - i) 18th C aimed at total disappearance of crime
 - ii) Neoliberals just want efficient intervention in crime market
 - (a) Society is "consumer" (= producer) of conforming behavior
 - (b) So we just want to balance supply and negative demand curves of crime
 - b) Negative externalities:
 - i) Neoliberals do not want / need elimination of crime
 - ii) So they do not want / need exhaustive disciplinary / Panoptical society
- E) Concrete example of drug market
 - 1) Previous policy was to reduce drug supply
 - a) Increased price of drug
 - b) Favored monopoly / oligopoly effects of big dealers
 - c) Pushes addicts to crime bcs of inelastic demand for some drugs

- 2) Neoliberal solution: Free up supply of drugs
 - a) Analysis
 - i) Categories of buyers
 - (a) Beginners with elastic demands
 - (b) Addicts with inelastic demands
 - ii) Attitude of pushers
 - (a) Low prices for beginners
 - (b) High prices for addicts
 - b) Policy
 - i) Price manipulations
 - (a) Make new consumer price as high as possible to discourage consumption
 - (b) Make addict price as low as possible to limit crime to pay for drugs
 - ii) Targets: new customers, small dealers, small trade
- F) Conclusion:
- 1) Anthropological erasure of criminal
 - a) No analysis of the "born criminal," the "pervert," etc.
 - b) Every criminal is "responsive" to possible gains / losses [cf. "rational psychopath"]
 - 2) Type of society
 - a) Not a disciplinary / normalizing society
 - b) But a differential society
 - i) Fluctuating practices
 - ii) Minority individuals and practices are tolerated
 - iii) Action on rules of game rather than on players
 - iv) Environmental intervention rather than internal subjugation of individuals

Lecture 11: 28 March 1979

- I) Recap of last week: extension of object of economic analysis
 - A) From neoclassical: any form of allocating scarce resources to alternative ends
 - B) To neoliberal universality:
 - 1) From any employment of limited means to one end among others
 - 2) To any strategic choice / rational conduct whatsoever
 - 3) Or even, with Becker, to any action that "accepts reality"
 - a) That is any system that responds to environment in systematic way
 - b) Thus econ = study of systematic nature of response to environment
 - i) Integration with behaviorism and stimulus-response study
 - ii) F mentions Castel's *Psychiatric Society*
- II) Relation of government and *homo economicus*
 - A) Background suggests *homo economicus* as resistant to 18-19th C government
 - 1) For classical liberals, *homo economicus*
 - a) Pursues own interests which converge spontaneously w/ interests of others
 - b) Thus he must be left alone in order for the convergence of interests to work
 - 2) For neoliberals, *homo economicus*
 - a) As responsive to environment

- b) Is eminently manageable / governable
 - B) But F wants to show that *homo economicus* was correlate of liberal governmentality from start
 - 1) Theory of subject in English empiricism
 - a) Not defined by
 - i) Freedom
 - ii) Opposition of soul and body
 - iii) As source of sinful desire
 - b) But as subject of individual choices which are irreducible and non-transferable
 - i) Irreducible: there is an end point to analysis in preference for non-painful
 - ii) Non-transferable: choice made on basis of MY preference
 - c) That is, as subject of interest: immediate and absolutely subjective will
 - 2) Can this subject of interest be same as subject of juridical will?
 - a) They may not be able to be assimilated, but they can be reconciled
 - i) Social contract does this: interest is the empirical source of the contract
 - ii) So the legal subject is a "purified" (i.e., rational / calculating) subject of interest
 - b) Hume responds that this is confused
 - i) Subject of interest is irreducible to subject of right
 - (a) You enter the contract out of interest and you stay in contract out of interest
 - (b) Subject of interest is "permanent condition" of functioning of subject of right
 - ii) Logic of subject of right and subject of interests is different
 - (a) Subject of right
 - 1. Has natural rights; acquires positive rights on basis of renouncing rights
 - 2. He is thus a "split subject"
 - (b) Subject of interest is never split; never relinquishes his interest
 - 1. In fact only on this basis is there social benefit
 - 2. A "multiplying and beneficial value through intensification of interest"
 - 3) Thus the economic subject and subject of right have different relation to political power
 - a) So *homo economicus* appears in liberal governmentality
 - i) Via economic thought which delimits zone free from political interference
 - ii) That is, *homo economicus* is constituted by political economy critique of govt reason
 - b) Not in liberal political thought (social contract theory)
- III) Theory of the invisible hand as principle of political economy critique of governmental reason
 - A) Background
 - 1) Condorcet: take an individual interest embedded in society
 - a) This interest is dependent on an infinite number of things
 - b) Nevertheless, each individual effort serves good of all
 - 2) *Homo economicus* is thus embedded in "indefinite field of immanence"
 - a) Doubly involuntary: accidents befalling him and benefits he provides to others
 - b) Doubly indefinite:
 - i) Accidents come from non-totalizable field
 - ii) And benefits are also non-totalizable
 - 3) Thus positive nature of economic calculation depends on what eludes calculation
 - B) This structure of dependent / blind calculation is the meaning of the "invisible hand"
 - 1) Usual reading

- a) This is just smuggled in providential God
- b) Who occupies point of economic totalization / transparency / knowledge
- 2) F's reading of Smith: for invisible hand to bring about social good
 - a) Each actor MUST be blind to totality and so must ONLY pursue individual interest
 - b) And ALL political actors must be blind; sovereign cannot pretend to know
 - i) Government cannot obstruct individual interest
 - ii) Government cannot totalize knowledge of economy
- 3) Thus economic rationality is founded on unknowability of totality of economy
 - a) There must be a "multiplicity of points of view"
 - i) They are irreducible to each other
 - ii) Which assures their convergence
 - b) The multiplicity cannot be totalized: "economics is an atheistic discipline"
- C) Thus economic rationality of liberalism "steals" essentials of that which sovereign rules over
 - 1) In other words, liberalism is founded on an "essential incompatibility"
 - a) Non-totalizable multiplicity of economic subjects of interest
 - b) Totalizing unity of juridical sovereign [who rules equally over all subjects of right]
 - 2) And therefore an "economic-juridical science" is impossible
 - 3) So here we have the possibility of political economy as critique of governmental reason
 - a) Critique here in the Kantian sense: "limits and condition of possibility" of X
 - b) Political economics says: no economic sovereign bcs of its ignorance of totality
 - c) We can thus analyze the debates over government planning / socialism in this light
- IV) Conclusion: on a more restricted scale, we see political economy critique of police state
 - A) Obviously, contra the mercantilist / administrative state which posits an economic sovereign
 - B) But more interestingly contra the physiocrats, who agree that sovereign must not intervene
 - 1) But country is sovereign's property, so he has right to taxation
 - 2) The Economic Table allows sovereign to have exact knowledge of economy
 - a) So the freedom of economic agents is justified
 - b) By the total economic knowledge of the sovereign
 - 3) Sovereign explains to economic agents / shares his knowledge
 - C) So it's physiocracy that Adam Smith opposes
 - 1) There can be no total economic knowledge possessed by sovereign
 - 2) Thus [classical liberal] political economy can establish economy as limit of government
 - 3) And so civil society and not economy will be object of liberal governmentality

Lecture 12: 4 April 1979

- I) Intro: discussion of homo economicus (H E)
 - A) Characteristics
 - 1) Non-substitutable and irreducible atom of interest
 - 2) Cannot be equated with or reduced to subject of right
 - 3) Does not have same dialectic as subject of right
 - a) Subject of right enters contract w/ other subjects by renouncing / transferring some rights
 - b) H E is part of economic domain by "dialectic of spontaneous multiplication"
 - B) Results for relation of H E to political (sovereign) power

- 1) Subject of right limits sovereign power
 - 2) H E strips sovereign of power by revealing inability to master economic field
 - a) In Middle Ages through 17th C, God's intentions were inscrutable
 - b) Now it's the economic realm that is "impenetrable" to sovereign knowledge
 - C) Two solutions to this stripping of sovereign power over economy
 - 1) The solutions:
 - a) The "geographic" solution:
 - i) Market is free space where sovereign cannot enter
 - ii) Same raison d'Etat, just with one zone subtracted
 - b) Physiocratic solution: sovereign will exercise a different kind of power over market
 - i) He will recognize its reality, the way a geometer recognizes geometrical reality
 - ii) From political activity to theoretical passivity
 - 2) These two solutions: only a "theoretical and programmatic virtuality" never applied in history
 - a) Art of government must be exercised in space of sovereignty
 - b) But this space is occupied by economic subjects, not juridical subjects
 - c) So how can sovereign avoid be reduced to leaving them alone or being only a geometer?
 - i) Juridical theory cannot help here
 - ii) New object / new plane of reference needed to constitute new correlate of art of govt
 - (a) New ensemble enveloping both subject of right and economic actor
 - (b) As aspects that can be integrated by virtue of belonging to a complex whole
 - D) Civil society as new object of governing in order to maintain unity / activity of governing
 - 1) Need for new object for government faced with economic reality
 - a) To avoid split into juridical action and economic passivity
 - b) Or to avoid being reduced to observing "geometer"
 - 2) The art of government requires a new object: civil society
- II) Civil society as correlate of technology of government:
- A) Preliminary discussion
 - 1) Definition
 - a) It's the juridical structure of government pegged to economic structure
 - b) H E = abstract / ideal / purely economic point inhabiting complex reality of civil society
 - 2) Ontological status
 - a) NOT a historical-natural given that is foundation of and source of opposition to state
 - b) IOW, civil society is a "transactional reality" like madness or sexuality
 - i) Have not always existed
 - ii) Are born from interplay of relations of power and everything which eludes them
 - B) To illustrate this historical genesis, F discusses change in nature of civil society in 18th C
 - 1) Preliminary discussion
 - a) In Locke, civil society = society w/ a juridical-political structure
 - b) With entry on scene of political economy, civil society changes
 - 2) Ferguson's text: *Essay on the History of Civil Society*: civil society has 4 aspects
 - a) As an historical-natural constant
 - i) Human nature is historical, because human nature is social
 - ii) Social bonds are spontaneous and inevitable
 - iii) So we can find state of nature in civilization as well as in "primitives"

- iv) But this also means we never find "pure" / "simple" state of nature
 - b) As assuring spontaneous synthesis of individuals via economic bond that threatens it
 - i) Not a mechanism for exchange of rights
 - ii) But a mechanism of "immediate multiplication"
 - (a) Distinct interplay of non-egoist, disinterested interests wider than egoism
 - (b) Non-local bonds among economic subjects
 - 1. No localization in global market
 - 2. But bonds of sympathy are local
 - iii) So civil society is formed of ensembles / communities (not all of humanity)
 - iv) Ambiguous position of economic bonds
 - (a) Civil society is formal medium of non-local economic bonds
 - (b) But economic bond = "principle of dissociation" vs. local sentimental bonds
 - c) As permanent matrix of political power
 - i) Civil society plays role of a spontaneous social contract
 - ii) Thus no need to surrender rights, since there is a spontaneous formation of power
 - (a) De facto bond linking concrete individuals
 - (b) Whose differences are expressed in division of labor in decision-making process
 - (c) IOW, some spontaneously "assume" power by virtue of their "talents"
 - (d) So power exists before it is legitimated
 - d) As "motor of history"
 - i) Opposing principles
 - (a) Spontaneous synthesis / subordination provides hypothesis of stable equilibrium
 - (b) But also dissociation and hence disequilibrium
 - 1. Via egoism of power
 - 2. Via egoism of economic action of H E
 - ii) It's the latter that produces movement of history
 - (a) Example
 - 1. Savagery =
 - a. Society w/o property
 - b. Only beginnings of subordination
 - 2. Barbarism = new economic-political institutions
 - a. Not yet governed by laws
 - b. But by personal relations (patron – client; master – servant; etc.)
 - (b) Discussion
 - 1. Global synchronic [emergent] results from individual blind action
 - 2. Also diachronic emergence as historical progress via blind egoistic interest
- 3) Conclusion: three elements of civil society as markers of "new system of political thought"
 - a) Domain of non-juridical social relations
 - b) Articulation of history and the social bond
 - i) Non-degenerative history
 - ii) But constantly renewed / innovative history
 - (a) New social fabric / relations
 - (b) New economic structures
 - (c) New types of government

- c) Internal and complex relation of social bond and government
 - i) Government as organic component of social bond
 - ii) Social bond as organic feature of form of authority
- III) Conclusion as opening a series of problems
 - A) Civil society enables us to avoid theoretical / juridical problem of original constitution of society
 - 1) Posing the problem of relation of society and state
 - a) Old problem:
 - i) How to find juridical form at origin of society
 - ii) In order to delimit power in advance
 - b) New problem:
 - i) We have an existing society w/ subordination
 - ii) How to regulate power in such a society?
 - 2) Possible solutions
 - a) State as a dimension of civil society
 - b) State as a historical stage in development of society
 - c) State as characteristic of a type of society
 - d) State as self-consciousness / ethical realization of civil society (Hegel)
 - B) Problem of civil society in concrete cases
 - 1) Germany: how can civil society support the state?
 - 2) England: the problem is in terms of government rather than state
 - a) Does civil society really need a government?
 - b) Thomas Paine [question of anarchism]
 - 3) France: what is status of Third Estate as vector of history?
 - C) Does civil society bring about a "redistribution" of governmental reason?
 - 1) Middle Ages: limit government power by appeal to
 - a) Wisdom of person who governs
 - b) = knowledge of human / divine order
 - c) A matter of truth
 - i) Religious texts
 - ii) Divine revelation
 - iii) Order of world
 - 2) 16th / 17th C: raison d'Etat:
 - a) Calculation of power on basis of force / wealth / relations etc.
 - b) No longer indexed to truth, but to rationality
 - i) Raison d'Etat as rationality of the sovereign himself
 - (a) Juridical problem: who is the sovereign?
 - (b) Factual problem: how to exercise this power on economic processes?
 - 1. Sovereign power is unitary and totalizing ("bird's-eye view")
 - 2. But economic processes are a non-totalizable multiplicity
 - c) Liberalism: how to model government on rationality of subjects of interest?
 - i) Inversion: no longer government based on rationality of the governor / sovereign
 - ii) But now rationality of governed is regulating principle of rationality of government
 - D) F's constant warning: notice the entanglements of history!
 - 1) The three forms of government rationality (truth / sovereignty / liberalism) are not successive

- 2) But entangled / coexisting
 - a) National / statist politics still abides by rationality of governing sovereign
 - b) Marxism still abides by rationality of a truth revealing itself in history
 - c) Liberalism abides by rationality of economic agents / the governed
- 3) And thus these three forms constitute object of political debate / struggle for last 2 centuries