

Security, Territory, Population

Chapters 5-8

Outline by John Protevi

LSU French Studies

www.protevi.com/john/Foucault/security5-8.pdf

protevi@lsu.edu

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

Chapter 5: 8 February 1978

- I) Why study "state" and "population" via notion of governmentality?
- A) Recall the triple displacement of F's previous work on disciplines: going to the outside
- 1) Going outside *institutions* enables genealogy of a "technology of power"
 - a) Understanding psych hospital on basis of "psychiatric order," which is itself part of global project of public hygiene.
 - b) Understanding psych order in relation to reduction to status of minors
 - c) Understanding coordination of different techniques (children's education, aid to poor, workers' tutelage) as part of a "technology of power"
 - 2) Going outside *functions* shows "general economy of power" of "strategies and tactics"
 - a) That is, we don't look to successes and failures of functions of prison
 - b) But insertion of functions in "strategies and tactics" supported even by failures of prisons
 - 3) Going outside the *object* to show constitution of "field of truth" in which those objects appear
 - a) IOW, do not presuppose the object of analysis (e.g., "the mad")
 - b) But show the field w/in which that object is constituted
- B) So F proposes doing a similar displacement for the state: can we go outside the state?
- 1) There is an immediate problem: is not the state the totalizing field for all these "outsides" of institutions, functions, and objects? Can we ever get outside such a horizon for social being?
 - 2) So F has to ask himself: has his move to the outside just been a move from micro to macro?
 - a) Well, it's not really a method F wants to defend from this objection
 - b) It's more like a change in point of view producing positive effects
 - i) Genealogy of relations of power: how they change on basis of non-power processes
 - (a) E.g., the army: it's not really a matter of studying state control
 - (b) But genealogy of military discipline connects it to a series of problems
 1. Floating populations
 2. Commercial networks
 3. Technical innovations
 4. Models of community management
 - (c) Thus we see military discipline as composed of "techniques w/ operative value in multiple processes"
 - ii) Instability of relations of power
 - (a) They are permeable to other processes

- (b) So changes can come to institutions bcs their power relations have become incompatible with "mutations of technologies" of power
 - iii) Accessibility of institutions to struggles that use the institution as their theater
 - (a) E.g., dissident spiritual movements (see Lecture 8) didn't target the Church
 - (b) But they changed the way religious power was exercised
 - C) Challenge: is governmentality the "outside," the "general economy of power" that accounts for changes in the state?
- II) History of government of people
 - A) 13-15th C French dictionaries show physical and moral senses of term "government"
 - 1) One didn't govern a territory
 - 2) Instead, one governs people
 - B) By contrast, Greeks didn't govern people
 - 1) Despite image of pilot of ship of the polis
 - 2) Because here the object of governing is the polis, not the individual people
 - C) The missing link then begins in the pre-Christian and then Christian East
 - 1) Pastoral power
 - 2) Practice of spiritual direction, the direction of souls
- III) Pastoral power
 - A) King as shepherd of the people was common trope in ancient Middle East
 - B) Especially with the Hebrews;
 - 1) Divinity of the shepherd
 - a) With the Hebrews God is the shepherd, not the king
 - b) Greek gods were never shepherds of the people (a huge understatement!)
 - 2) Characteristics of Hebrew pastoral power
 - a) Divine shepherd guides a "multiplicity in movement"
 - b) Fundamentally beneficent
 - i) Vs. beneficence being only one divine attribute, alongside omnipotence, etc.
 - ii) Pastoral power aims at salvation / safety (*salut*)
 - (a) Aims at subsistence
 - (b) Is a duty to care for flock
 - 1. manifesting itself as zeal, devotion, etc.
 - 2. not self-centered but other-directed
 - (c) Individualizes: leading to paradoxes
 - 1. Must care for whole flock and for each one in the flock
 - 2. Paradoxes of sacrifice
 - a. Shepherd sacrifices self for flock
 - b. Shepherd sacrifices rest of flock for a single sheep
 - IV) Forecast: Christian Church and institutionalization of pastoral power
 - A) While Western Europe is extremely violent and expansive
 - B) It is also the only one with pastoral power in the form of governmentalized state

Chapter 6: 15 February 1978

- I) Theme of the shepherd in Greek literature and thought

- A) Homeric vocabulary
 - B) Pythagorean tradition
 - C) Classical political thought
 - 1) Two theses about its origin and extent
 - a) Eastern import via Pythagoreans
 - b) Commonplace in classical age
 - 2) Foucault disagrees with the latter thesis, finding the shepherd image to be rare
- II) Plato is the great exception
- A) Texts other than The Statesman
 - 1) Blessed power of gods in early existence of humans
 - 2) Principal magistrates in current hard times
 - 3) Thrasymachus vs Socrates in Bk 1 of the Republic: who is the good shepherd?
 - B) The Statesman: true political power cannot be modeled on the shepherd
 - 1) The thesis is set forth: the politician / statesman is a shepherd of men in the polis
 - 2) Four stages to the counter-argument
 - a) Shepherd as invariant
 - i) On whom is his power exercised?
 - ii) This only leads to pointless division and an endless typology of animals
 - b) Man as object is the invariant
 - i) What then is the role of a shepherd [of men]?
 - ii) But here we find a whole range of functions:
 - (a) feeding, care, therapy
 - (b) people providing these functions can claim to be shepherds of men
 - iii) Yet there can only be one ruler
 - iv) So here we have the problem of the "rivals of the king"
 - c) If the method of division fails, we can turn to myth to find essence of politics
 - i) When God was shepherd, in the good time, there was no need of politics
 - ii) Only when the world turned wrong and gods withdraw do we find politics
 - (a) But politicians are not above the flock
 - (b) The way God is above his flock
 - d) Thus the politician cannot be a shepherd, but must be a weaver
 - i) The shepherding functions are auxiliary to politics
 - ii) But politics is the art of weaving all these together with an eye to concord
 - C) Conclusion for all of classical Greek thought: pastoral power is not how politics is thought
- III) So we have to look to Christianity as the source of pastoral power in the West
- A) The Church's institutionalization of pastoral power is "unique in history"
 - 1) Daily government of men in real life
 - 2) Aimed at salvation
 - 3) With universal scope of all humanity as potential target
 - B) Pastoral power is not invariant; there is a whole history of struggles
 - 1) Gnosticism (identity and power of pastors)
 - 2) Asceticism (anchorites vs cenobitics)
 - 3) Struggles leading to Wars of Religion: about pastoral power as governing men in daily life
 - 4) Reformation leads to two styles of the pastorate

- a) Meticulous but hierarchically supple Protestant pastorate
 - b) Centralized, hierarchical Church via the Counter-Reformation
- 5) But, while there was a revolt against feudalism, there was never a revolt *against* pastorate
- C) We've never done a history of the technologies of pastoral power
- IV) Characteristics of pastoral power
 - A) Recap of last week's discussion of Hebrew pastoral power
 - 1) God was shepherd, but also much else besides (legislator, jilted lover, etc)
 - 2) No pastoral institution among the Hebrews
 - B) With Christian Church, pastoral power
 - 1) Becomes autonomous, fundamental, essential
 - 2) Becomes institutionalized (though here the question of the parish priest appears)
 - 3) Remains distinct from political power
 - a) Scope of its power:
 - i) It directs everyday life and management of goods
 - ii) But with otherworldly salvation as its goal
 - b) Two further remarks
 - i) Pastoral power and political power have all sorts of connections
 - ii) How did they remain separate in the West?
 - (a) In the East they are much more closely linked / intertwined
 - (b) But in West, they are separate

Chapter 7: 22 February 1978

- I) Introduction
 - A) Recap of last week
 - B) Specificity of the Christian pastorate
 - 1) Difference from Hebrew pastorate
 - a) Enrichment, development, transformation
 - b) Institutional network
 - c) Art of conducting daily life of men
 - 2) Difference from sovereign power, pedagogical power, and rhetoric
 - 3) We need to look for entry of art of governing men into politics as "threshold of modern state"
 - C) Forecast: just some features of pastorate relative to salvation, law, and truth
- II) Salvation
 - A) Greek polis / Hebrew flock: common destiny and moral reciprocity of pastor and flock
 - B) Christian pastorate is more complex form of responsibility (though this is expressed in Hebrew)
 - 1) Fully distributive: Pastor assures salvation of all
 - a) Salvation of everyone: community as a unity
 - b) But each individual sheep is absolutely important
 - 2) Paradoxically distributive
 - a) A disruptive sheep may have to be sacrificed for good of the whole
 - b) But a single sheep can demand total focus of the pastor
 - C) Four novelties of the Christian pastorate:
 - 1) Analytical responsibility: pastor responsible for each act of each sheep

- 2) Exhaustive and instantaneous transfer: pastor consider each act of sheep as his own act
- 3) Sacrificial reversal: pastor must be prepared to die / risk his soul to save his sheep
- 4) Alternate correspondence:
 - a) Shepherd has to have had difficult sheep to work with
 - b) Shepherd's weaknesses help his flock by giving example of struggle
- D) These practices amount to "a subtle economy of merit and fault"
 - 1) But these acts of shepherd and flock are not dispositive
 - 2) So actual salvation depends on God

III) Law

- A) Greek citizens do not obey other men
 - 1) But they do follow the law ("zone of respect")
 - 2) And allow themselves to be persuaded by others ("zone of ruse"):
 - a) orators, doctors, philosophers
 - b) in general, the teacher / student relation
- B) Christians insist on "pure obedience"
 - 1) Christianity is not a religion of law
 - a) But of God's will
 - b) Thus pastor's actions will be individualized (as in treatment of those who lapse)
 - 2) Complete subordination is the goal
 - a) Submission of one individual to another (institutionalized in monastic life)
 - i) Test of absurdity
 - ii) Test of the cantankerous master
 - iii) Test of breaking the law
 - b) Submission is not finalized (has no other goal than submission)
 - i) Greek citizens only subordinate themselves to another in order to achieve some goal
 - ii) Christians strive to achieve "state of obedience"
 - (a) Feeling of humility = knowing your own will is a bad will
 - (b) Thus you strive to mortify the will, to will only to not have a will
 - iii) This self-negating will is related to
 - (a) The notion of the "flesh"
 - (b) The inherited Greek notion of *apatheia*
 - 1. For the Greeks, this meant
 - a. Renouncing pleasures in order to achieve absence of passions
 - i. absence of passivity
 - ii. no longer being the passive object of emotions
 - b. Thus the goal of *apatheia* is self-mastery
 - 2. But for the Christians this means
 - a. Renouncing pleasures in order to avoid egoism / personal involvement
 - b. Thus the goal of apetheia is renunciation of the personal will
 - c) Submission of everyone implies a "generalized field of obedience"
 - i) The pastor / abbot / bishop does not want to command
 - ii) But has to be commanded to command others
- 3) So we have a mode of individualization via the destruction of the self

IV) Truth:

- A) Here we are close to mode of Greek teaching
 - 1) Teaching by example
 - 2) Teaching in an individualized manner
- B) But there are two novelties in Christian teaching
 - 1) Direction of daily conduct: a "modulation" of details
 - 2) Spiritual direction
 - a) For the Greeks, this was
 - i) Voluntary
 - ii) Circumstantial / consolatory (triggered by reaction to a bad event)
 - iii) Its examination of conscience was aimed at self-mastery
 - b) For Christians, it's different in each respect
 - i) Not always voluntary (obligatory for monks)
 - ii) Not circumstantial but permanent
 - iii) Examination of conscience not aimed at self-mastery but at subordination to other
- V) Recap: Christian pastorate does not aim at salvation, law, or truth
 - A) But is a new form of power
 - 1) That inserts economy of merits into general theme of salvation
 - 2) That establishes relation of individual obedience
 - 3) That establishes way in which inner truth of soul becomes element for exercise of power
 - B) And an "absolutely specific mode of individualization" by means of
 - 1) Three modes:
 - a) Analytical identification (of merits and faults at each moment)
 - b) Subjection (*assujettissement*) as generalized obedience / "servitude"
 - c) Subjectivation (*subjectivation*) as production of subjectivity w/ hidden truth
 - 2) Thus we have here a "history of the subject"
- VI) Forecast: Pastorate as prelude to governmentality
 - A) As establishing different relations of power using themes of salvation, law, truth
 - B) As constituting a certain type of subject:
 - 1) Identified via merits and faults
 - 2) Subjected to networks of obedience
 - 3) Subjectified (*subjectifié*) via "compulsory extraction of the truth"

Chapter 8: 1 March 1978

- I) Introduction
 - A) Reasons for previous lectures on the pastorate
 - 1) There is no unified Judeo-Christian morality (bcs Hebrew and Christian pastorate differ)
 - 2) Western relation of religion and politics
 - a) Is not Church and state
 - b) But government and pastorate (ambiguity of term "minister")
 - B) The key term "conduct"
 - 1) "Economy of souls" is a pastoral term
 - a) Greek economy was management of the household
 - b) Christian economy of souls is universal and singularizing

- 2) The French term *conduite* is very useful
 - a) The conducting (leading)
 - b) Of conduct (including how you conduct yourself, your comportment)
- II) Crisis of pastorate and transition to governmentality as political function of modern state
- A) External blockages
 - 1) Passive resistance of populations still undergoing Christianization
 - 2) Active resistances of witchcraft and Cathar / dualist heresy
 - 3) Relations with political power
 - 4) Development of economic structures
 - B) Internal resistances (w/in the pastorate):
 - 1) Three types of "revolts of conduct"
 - a) Wanting to have other conductors / pastors
 - b) Wanting to have other objectives / forms of salvation / other methods
 - c) Wanting to escape direction by others
 - 2) Three remarks about this plan of discussion
 - a) Conduct via pastorate struggled against other forms from beginning (e.g., Gnosticism)
 - b) Each revolt has its specificity; they aren't political or economic revolts per se
 - i) For example, Luther was at first a revolt of conduct
 - ii) Of course these revolts are linked to other conflicts
 - (a) Bourgeoisie and feudalism
 - (b) Urban and rural economies
 - (c) Status of women
 - iii) So while they are specific, they are not autonomous
 - c) During and after 18th century, conduct revolts are at margin of governmentality
 - i) Conduct of soldiers in waging war shifts to a matter of civic duty
 - ii) Secret societies become political revolutionary cells aiming at different conduct
 - (a) Political parties as "ladder to exercise of power"
 - (b) Political party as "counter-society" (critique of pastoral power of PCF)
 - iii) Conduct revolts against medicalization of life (e.g., Christian Scientists)
 - C) A "problem of vocabulary"
 - 1) "revolt" is both too strong and too precise
 - 2) While "disobedience" is too weak
 - 3) The term "dissidence" is problematic
 - a) It seems justified
 - i) Often used for religious movements resisting pastorate
 - ii) 1970s use in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union
 - (a) Here we see pastoral politics
 - (b) And a generalized system of terror
 - b) But its current usage makes it too localized for describing past revolts
 - 4) So F proposes "counter-conduct"
 - a) It includes term "conduct"
 - b) It avoids the reification / heroizing of "dissident" from "dissidence"
- III) Counter-conducts in the Middle Ages
- A) Recall some basic points

- 1) Religious perspective: Christianity institutionalized the pastorate
 - a) Binary between clergy and laity
 - b) Theory and practice of priests' sacramental power
- 2) External / political perspective
 - a) Imbrications of pastorate, civil government, and political power
 - b) Feudalization of Church
 - c) Introduction of the judicial model into pastoral practice
 - i) Obligatory confession (4th Lateran in 1215)
 - ii) Belief in Purgatory
 - (a) Modulated punishment for pastoral justice
 - (b) Via system of indulgences
- B) Different forms of anti-pastoral struggles
 - 1) Doctrine
 - 2) Individual behavior
 - 3) Organized groups
 - 4) Whole new attitude / new way of life
- C) Different modes of counter-conduct
 - 1) Asceticism
 - a) Five principles
 - i) Self-centered struggle
 - ii) Progressive difficulty measured by immediate / immanent suffering
 - iii) Cycles of challenge of self taken up by others in competition
 - iv) Apatheia of the ascetic is a self-mastery of own suffering
 - v) Reference to the body is troublesome
 - (a) Body / matter refusal can lead to dualism / Gnosticism
 - (b) Ascetic suffering body becomes body of Christ
 - b) Conflict with pastorate's emphasis on obedience to another
 - 2) Communal organization
 - a) Theoretical background:
 - i) Refusal of pastor's authority via denunciation of Church corruption
 - ii) More subtle approaches
 - (a) Pastor in a state of sin
 - (b) Priest's sacramental power
 1. Refusal of baptism
 2. Refusal / mistrust of confession
 3. Eucharist as simply communal bread and wine
 - b) Practical principles
 - i) Refusal of clergy / laity dimorphism
 - (a) Replaced by dimorphism of elect and the damned
 - (b) Replaced by absolute equality of all members of community
 - ii) Question of obedience
 - (a) Some groups refused obedience altogether (pantheists)
 - (b) Others reinstated some schema of obedience
 1. Reciprocal obedience

2. Hierarchical reversal

- 3) Mysticism
 - a) A different "game of visibility"
 - i) Soul is not given to others for examination
 - ii) But is seen by itself / sees itself in God and God in itself
 - b) As immediate revelation, no teaching is needed
 - i) Different principle of progress
 - (a) Reversal of alternating elements (light / dark, etc)
 - (b) Equivocations / ambiguities (night is an illumination)
 - ii) Ignorance is knowledge
 - c) Immediate communication / dialogue
 - d) Immediate inspiration allowing recognition of God's presence
 - e) Communication through silence
- 4) Problem of Scripture
 - a) Pastorate tended to put Scripture in background
 - b) Counter-conduct communities brought it to forefront
- 5) Eschatology:
 - a) God is returning, so no need for pastor
 - b) Example of Joachim of Fiore

IV) Recap

- A) Pastoralized Christianity is not ascetic, communal, mystical, Scriptural, or eschatological
- B) But these themes are border elements that can be taken up by Church for its own ends
- C) Trying to find "inner depth and background of governmentality"
 - 1) We're not trying to trace endogenous history of power
 - 2) But finding "intelligible relations between elements external to each other"
- D) Pastorate as "field of intelligibility" for why political / economic problems took a religious form
 - 1) Saves us from old schema of ideology as translation of group aspirations into religious belief
 - 2) And enables us to think in terms of strategies and tactics