

Security, Territory, Population

Chapters 9-13

Outline by John Protevi

LSU French Studies

www.protevi.com/john/Foucault/security9-13.pdf

protevi@lsu.edu

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

Lecture 9: 8 March 1978

- I) Intro: "A minimum of homage to causality": context for transition from pastorate to government
 - A) Counter-conduct revolts
 - 1) The major one leading to the Reformation of course
 - 2) But also counter-conduct revolts in other revolutions (English, French, Russian)
 - 3) Reorganization of religious pastorate: both Reformation and Counter-Reformation incorporated counter-conduct revolts
 - B) Social struggles: "drove, sustained, and prolonged pastoral insurrections"
 - 1) E.g., Peasants' War
 - 2) Inability of feudalism to cope
 - a) With these struggles
 - b) And with new economic / political relations
 - C) Disappearance of Empire and Church as poles of sovereignty / universality
 - D) Pastorate does not disappear in 16th C
 - 1) Intensification and temporal extension
 - 2) Conducting men outside ecclesiastical authority
 - a) Private forms of problem of conduct
 - b) Reappearance of philosophy as guide to life
 - c) Public domain: sovereign and task of conducting life
 - d) Education of children as privileged site
 - E) Transition / forecast: 2 issues with new political governmentality
 - 1) Governmental reason
 - 2) Domain and objects of governmentality
- II) Emergence of new governmental reason
 - A) Contrast with St Thomas Aquinas:
 - 1) No discontinuity btw sovereign power and governing: "theological-cosmological continuum"
 - 2) 3 analogies of government
 - a) God is creator of nature as King is founder of state, God's governing is like King's
 - b) King is like vital force of the organism, that which submits everything to one principle
 - c) King is like father of family or pastor of flock: common good leading to heaven
 - B) All this changes: not the analogy of God to King, but the method of rule
 - 1) The new science holds that God rules by immutable / universal law

- 2) Thus He no longer "governs" the world in a pastoral sense
 - a) Salvation: final causes / anthropocentrism
 - b) Obedience: God shows His will through signs to be interpreted
 - c) Truth: world is a book hiding deep truths to be deciphered
 - 3) So now we see a "de-governmentalization" of the cosmos via change into classical episteme
- C) Specificity of the new governmental reason
- 1) In relation to sovereignty
 - a) Government as different from sovereign rule
 - b) We now have to consider the political aspect of the "art of government"
 - 2) In relation to nature
 - a) Old: nature is governed by God
 - b) New:
 - i) Nature is ruled by divine / natural laws or principles
 - ii) So government of men is different from natural rule: here we see *raison d'État*
- D) Methodological comment
- 1) Instead of search for unitary origin
 - 2) Can we not start from multiplicity of sources and look to emergence of unities?
 - a) Biological / mathematical language of "coagulation ... integration"
 - b) So intelligibility in history
 - i) Should not look for a "metaphor of the source"
 - ii) But look to processes for "constitution or composition of effects"
- III) *Raison d'État* as the new governmental reason
- A) Preliminary remarks
- 1) Seen as novelty by contemporaries
 - a) Some will claim it is a false novelty, as can be shown by looking to the ancients
 - b) Others reply it is truly a novelty, for it looks to how contemporary states now function
 - 2) And as a scandal
 - a) A different type of scandal from that provoked by Galileo
 - b) A scandal specific to the new type of governmental reason
- B) Three references as to the scandal of *raison d'État*
- 1) "Machiavelli"
 - a) Machiavelli sought to safeguard Prince's rule, not the state
 - b) "Marx is our Machiavelli":
 - i) Machiavelli does not address governmental reason
 - ii) But he is the means by which the debate occurs
 - c) Basic concepts of the debate
 - i) Critics of *raison d'État*
 - (a) Outside God, there is no specific governmental reason; it's all about the Prince
 - (b) And besides, Machiavelli isn't even good for safeguarding the Prince
 - (c) And if you have only the Prince, i.e., w/o God, then everything is permitted
 - ii) Supporters of *raison d'État*
 - (a) Some: we have nothing to do with M., who is only concerned w/ the Prince
 - (b) Others bite the bullet: look at M's *Commentaries*: there you find government
 - 2) The term *politique*

- a) Think governmental rationality in and for itself
 - i) Relation of government and sovereignty as "technical" issue [not F's term, but it fits]
 - ii) Not the legal-theological problem of foundation of sovereignty
- b) Politics becomes its own domain: Louis XIV integrates *raison d'État* and sovereignty
- 3) State
 - a) State institutions all predate this period (armies, tax collectors, etc.)
 - b) But it's at this point that a reflection on practice of the state emerges
 - i) State practice becomes an object of knowledge (*connaissance*) and strategy
 - ii) And thus the state becomes an object of affect: "desired ... feared ... etc"
 - c) F seeks emergence of state as political issue in general history of governmentality
 - i) Not a "circular ontology of power"
 - (a) State as monster growing of its accord
 - (b) And encroaching on civil society / private life
 - ii) But a "move to the outside":
 - (a) State relations of power as emergent effects of multiple processes of government
 - (b) State as "episode in governmentality"

Lecture 10: 15 March 1978

- I) Intro: Palazzo's text from @ 1600
 - A) Objective and subjective senses of *raison d'État*
 - 1) Objective: that which is necessary and sufficient for republic to preserve its integrity
 - 2) Subjective: "rule or art" making known means for obtaining integrity / peace of republic
 - B) Characteristics of this discourse of *raison d'État*
 - 1) No reference to cosmos, nature, or the divine
 - 2) Concerned with essence / knowledge relation
 - a) *raison d'État* is the essence of the state
 - b) And it is the knowledge that assures that essence
 - 3) Protective / restorative of integrity of state: it is conservative rather than transformative
 - 4) No purpose external to the state:
 - a) It is "auto-telic" [not F's term, but it fits]
 - b) Thus there is no final day, no end time
 - C) Palazzo responds to objections
 - 1) Why should men obey such a government which doesn't offer them personal salvation?
 - 2) Wouldn't such a government be discontinuous, needed only in crises?
 - a) No, it is always needed due to men's weakness
 - b) It's the "continuous act of creation of the republic"
 - i) It's always already been necessary
 - ii) And will always continue to be necessary
 - D) With this last point, we see a new "historical and political temporality": an "open historicity"
 - 1) No problems of origin and hence dynasty
 - 2) No problem of the end time and hence no problem of restoration of Empire
 - a) Perpetual / universal peace no a matter of "balanced plurality"
 - b) We can have a notion of progress in happiness, but this requires notion of population

- E) Forecast of remainder of lecture: *Raison d'État* according to salvation, law, truth
- II) Salvation and the question of *coup d'État*
 - A) *coup d'État* is not seizure of the state by those outside state power
 - B) Rather, it is an act of *raison d'État*, IOW, an act by those in power
 - 1) *Raison d'État* usually works with laws, directing them as a tool
 - 2) To preserve state in crisis, for "salvation" of state, you must override laws in a *coup d'État*
 - a) Thus the *coup d'État* is the state acting immediately on itself
 - b) It is the "self-manifestation of the state itself"
 - C) Some key elements in the notion of *coup d'État*
 - 1) Necessity
 - a) State's salvation is not necessarily a "law," or at least it overrides all laws
 - b) Politics thus isn't at heart concerned with legality, but with necessity
 - 2) Violence
 - a) Need for violence in *coup d'État* puts *raison d'État* at odds with beneficent pastorate
 - b) Need to sacrifice some individuals for salvation of state
 - 3) Theatricality
 - a) The *coup d'État* must be immediately recognized
 - b) [JP: compare with economy of visibility of sovereign torture, which is legal]
 - c) Marginal note by F about theater and politics
 - i) Theatricality of *coup d'État* vs religious ceremonies of power (coronations, etc)
 - ii) Theater as privileged site of political representation (e.g., of the *coup d'État* itself)
 - iii) Nature / cosmos is being "de-dramatized" (no longer God's theater)
 - iv) So we know have a "new tragic sense of history" (vs a "divine comedy")
- III) Law and obedience: revolts and sedition: Bacon
 - A) Summary of Bacon's text
 - B) Comparison with Machiavelli
 - 1) Possession of state
 - a) For M, the dispossession of the Prince is the key
 - b) For B, it's the "virtuality" of sedition / riot, the ever-present possibility of disorder
 - 2) Source of the danger
 - a) For M, it's the nobles
 - b) For B, it's the common people
 - 3) Target of the analysis
 - a) For M, it's the Prince's characteristics
 - b) For B, it's the economy and opinion
- IV) Truth and wisdom of Prince vs knowledge of state
 - A) Prudence and wisdom of Prince oriented to handling of laws
 - B) The sovereign in age of *raison d'État* must know the elements of the state: "statistics"
 - 1) Technical challenge of obtaining the right information
 - 2) Problem of the secret
 - 3) Problem of the public: modifying opinion / consciousness / way of acting
- V) Conclusion
 - A) Methodological remark:
 - 1) F focusing on state as a "practice" of governing, not a full genealogy / history of state

- 2) F focuses on how state practice becomes an object of reflection
- B) The "population" as present and absent; not really an object of reflected practice
 - 1) Present
 - a) Salvation: state as auto-telic implies population as subject of happiness
 - b) Law / obedience: population as that which might riot
 - c) Truth: population as subjects with opinions
 - 2) Absent
 - a) Salvation:
 - i) *raison d'État* is state's auto-relation;
 - (a) State's salvation is at stake
 - (b) Not men's happiness
 - ii) Hence population is not object of reflection
 - b) Obedience:
 - i) Bacon worries about sedition, but doesn't see free actors
 - ii) Bacon's economy = circulation of wealth, not population of economic actors
 - c) Truth:
 - i) Imposing representations on a passive public
 - ii) Not manipulating their free ideational activity
- 3) Population doesn't really appear until constituted as correlate of police

Lecture 11: 22 March 1978

- I) Intro: role of state in complex event of transformation from pastorate to *raison d'État*
 - A) State has dual role in this transformation
 - 1) Principle of intelligibility for understanding relation of already given elements
 - 2) Objective, as what must exist at end of process of rationalizing art of governing men
 - B) But how does *raison d'État* crystallize into a "political technology"?
 - 1) Preserving the state in good order, that is, of avoiding revolution (cycle of growth / decay)
 - 2) Expansion of the state due to its position in a competition with other states
- II) Competition in a plurality of states
 - A) Theoretical perspective:
 - 1) State as auto-referential / auto-telic
 - 2) Working in a "world of indefinite historicity" with a plurality of states
 - B) Practical / historical perspective:
 - 1) End of models of universality
 - a) Disappearance of Roman Empire (treaty of Westphalia)
 - b) Fragmentation of Church with Reformation
 - 2) Development of economic / political competition (colonialism / conquest of seas)
 - 3) Concrete problem of Spain as object of analyses
 - a) Seeking de facto domination in an open field of competition
 - b) Though constantly threatened and subject to real "revolution"
 - i) That is, no longer an abstract / Platonic cycle
 - ii) But set of real processes that turn strength into weakness

- C) Transformation from dynastic rivalry to (reflection on practice of) state competition
 - 1) Three-fold schema of transformation
 - a) From King's wealth to wealth of the state itself
 - b) From King's possessions to forces that characterize the state
 - c) From King's familial alliances to temporary alliances of state interests
 - 2) Caveat: of course history is much more complex than simple schema of "transformations"
 - D) The key new term is "force":
 - 1) We now have reflection on practice of dealing with dynamics: a political physics
 - 2) Hence Leibniz is such a key figure
 - E) Summary / transition
 - 1) Target of *raison d'État* = preservation / development of a dynamic of forces
 - 2) Two great assemblages for this
 - a) Military-diplomatic apparatus (rest of this lecture)
 - b) Police (next lecture)
- III) New military-diplomatic apparatus / system of inter-state security
- A) Objective is balance of Europe
 - 1) Elements: "Europe" and "balance"
 - a) What is "Europe"?
 - i) Different from Christendom: it is limited geographically
 - ii) Not hierarchical, or at least not under a single form of Empire
 - iii) Instead, division bt group of 15 powerful states and group of less powerful states
 - iv) Opening out onto rest of world in relation of colonialism / commercial exploitation
 - b) What is "balance"?
 - i) Limitation of gap between strongest and the others
 - ii) Egalitarian aristocracy of most powerful states
 - iii) Possibility of coalition of smaller / less powerful states able to limit strong states
 - 2) Goal: peace as "relative eschatology"
 - a) Not from unity of Empire
 - b) But from maintaining plurality as such, from preventing unification
 - B) Instruments: war, diplomacy, permanent military apparatus (*dispositif*)
 - 1) War
 - a) Now it is necessary to preserve balance
 - b) No longer to rectify an injustice or violation of right
 - i) One no longer needs a judicial pretext (though they can easily be arranged)
 - ii) War is no continuous with politics (setting stage for Clausewitz's dictum)
 - 2) Diplomacy
 - a) Ruptured relation to law:
 - i) No longer oriented to restoring judicial rights / laws / traditions
 - ii) But no conducted in terms of "physical principles" / dynamics of states
 - b) Establishment of "practically permanent negotiations"
 - i) Not yet permanent diplomatic missions
 - ii) Early idea of "society of nations"
 - c) Development of "law of nations"
 - d) Crystallization of all this in Treaty of Westphalia

- i) Laws of equilibrium
 - ii) "Europe" is means of preventing Germany from restoring its dream of Empire
- 3) Permanent military apparatus
 - a) Four elements of this new military *dispositif*
 - i) Professionalizing the soldier
 - ii) Permanent army as basis for wartime extra recruitment
 - iii) Network of forts and depots
 - iv) New form of military knowledge
 - b) This is a key factor in maintaining European balance
 - i) Not so much war in peace
 - ii) But rather presence of diplomacy in politics and economy

Lecture 12: 29 March 1978

- I) Introductory comments
 - A) Meaning of the word "police"
 - 1) 15th and 16th centuries
 - a) A society with public authority governing it
 - b) The actions that direct such a society
 - c) The positive results of good government
 - 2) 17th century onward
 - a) Means to increase state forces while still maintaining good order
 - b) This is often expressed with term "splendor"
 - B) Relation of "police" and European equilibrium
 - 1) Morphology
 - a) Military-diplomatic: maintain balance while allowing for growth
 - b) Police: foster growth while maintaining good order, i.e., internal state equilibrium
 - 2) Conditioning
 - a) Military-diplomatic equilibrium depends on good police in each state being
 - b) Thus, paradoxically, each state has right to demand / enforce good police in other states
 - 3) Instrumentation: police and statistics mutually condition each other
 - a) Each state must know own forces and forces of others (police requires statistics)
 - b) And police is the means for generating statistics
 - 4) Commerce (discussion deferred to next week)
 - C) Differences in police setups in different states
 - 1) Italy: problematic of police never takes hold
 - a) Problems: police lacking due to
 - i) Territorial division
 - ii) Economic stagnation
 - iii) Foreign domination
 - iv) Church prominence
 - b) Results
 - i) Problematic of growth of forces never took hold bcs unsolvable problem of equilibrium of forces was blocking it

- ii) Primacy of diplomacy, bcs Italian states are always in state of "quasi-war"
- 2) Germany: Territorial division produces "over-problematization" of police
 - a) Multitude of tiny states as mini-laboratories
 - b) Germany came out of feudalism w/o big French administration
 - c) It found its administrative personnel in universities
 - d) Thus we find *Polizeiwissenschaft* in 18th century
- 3) France
 - a) Untheorized / practical development of police w/in administration
 - b) Thus police develops by means of rulings / edicts / critiques
- II) Police as an "entire art of government": Turquet de Mayerne's utopian project
 - A) Four offices distinct from traditional institutions: justice, army, finance
 - 1) Instruction
 - a) Education of children and young people
 - b) Military training
 - c) Choice of professions
 - 2) Charity:
 - a) Poor people
 - b) Public health
 - c) Accidents (fires, etc)
 - d) Money lending to poor artisans to avoid usury
 - 3) Markets
 - 4) Landed property: "Bureau of the Domain"
 - B) Functions
 - 1) Morality
 - 2) Wealth and household management
 - C) Target
 - 1) All the innumerable small activities of men's daily life insofar as they affect the state
 - 2) Men's activity as a "differential element in development of state's forces"
- III) Concrete tasks of police
 - A) Number of men
 - 1) Not absolute number
 - 2) But relationship of number of men to other forces ("differential relation")
 - a) Natural resources
 - b) Wealth
 - c) Commercial activity
 - B) Necessities of life: (e.g., food)
 - 1) Agricultural policy
 - 2) Control of markets
 - C) Problem of health (in relation to urban space)
 - D) Activity of the population
 - 1) Preventing idleness
 - 2) Attending to different professions
 - E) Circulation of goods
- IV) Summary / overview: police deals with all forms of men's co-existence with each other

- A) Not just living, but that little bit extra, "well-being"
- B) Circle of "police"
 - 1) State as power of rational and calculated intervention on individuals
 - 2) Returns as growing forces of the state

Lecture 13: 5 April 1978

- I) Remarks on Delmare's text on police
 - A) 13 domains (religion, morals, etc.) aiming at condition of life in society conducive to well-being
 - B) Different objects of practice / reflection of police
 - 1) Urban issues: coexistence of men
 - 2) Market: circulation of goods
 - C) Police and urban life
 - 1) Genealogy:
 - a) Extension of late medieval urban ordinances
 - b) Requires previous presence of mounted constabulary (*maréchaussée*)
 - 2) So police is something like the "urbanization of the territory"
 - 3) And it's related to mercantilism (part of European balance system focusing on commerce)
- II) Methodological remark
 - A) Rather than [Marxist] focus on introduction of market abstractions (commodity / exchange value)
 - B) F focuses on novel linking together of elements [bottom-up analysis / nominalism]
 - 1) Art of government thought as *raison d'Etat*
 - 2) Competition of states while maintaining European equilibrium
 - 3) Police
 - 4) Emergence of market town (cohabitation and circulation)
 - C) Two comments on the genealogy of police as emergent
 - 1) "market town becomes model of state intervention in men's lives"
 - a) = "fundamental fact of 17th C"
 - b) Or at least "fundamental fact characterizing birth of police in 17th C"
 - c) So that governmentalized state can now focus on being and well-being of individuals
 - 2) Although police has new domains, it uses traditional methods
 - a) Police is not justice, rather it is the "permanent coup d'Etat" [JP: cf. Agamben]
 - b) But its instrument is the regulation, the edict:
 - i) It's juridical, though not judicial (regulation has the "form of law")
 - ii) Thus we are in world of discipline
 - (a) So the spread of disciplinary institutions (DP)
 - (b) Should be seen against background of police as "general disciplinarization"
 - 1. Making town into quasi-convent
 - 2. And realm into a quasi-town
- III) Back to problem of scarcity and criticisms of police by the physiocrats as leading to liberalism
 - A) Theses of the physiocrats / *économistes*
 - 1) Destroy privilege of town by bringing peasant production of grain into system
 - 2) Attack edict as mode of government power
 - a) *Raison d'Etat* presupposes a passive social matter transparent to

- i) Sovereign knowledge
 - ii) And sovereign control
 - b) Physiocrats insist government work with the natural reality of social mechanisms
 - 3) Deny that population is a good in itself
 - a) It has value only in relation to the other forces
 - b) Cannot be fixed authoritatively, but is self-regulating
 - 4) Insist on allowing free trade
- B) Summary: transformation in role of state (birth of liberalism)
- 1) State is to be "regulator of interest"
 - 2) No longer "transcendent and synthetic principle of transformation of happiness of each into happiness of all"
 - 3) This comes about by focus on economy, not critique of judicial status of police state
- IV) Nascent liberalism via critiques of police state by *économistes* is still *raison d'Etat*, though modified
- A) Naturalness of social processes: civil society as the vis-à-vis of the state
 - B) Birth of political economy as a science
 - 1) Independent of state knowledge of itself
 - 2) Yet needing to be taken into account by state
 - C) Population emerges as new object / problem
 - D) Natural population / economic processes entail limits on state governmental intervention
 - 1) Manage and no longer control through rules and regulation
 - 2) Management aims to let natural processes work
 - E) Problematic of freedom
 - 1) Not just rights of individuals over against sovereign power
 - 2) But freedom of economic activity / circulation of goods / action of markets, etc.
- V) Genealogy of modern state on basis of history of governmental reason
- A) Breakup of police apparatus into different institutions
 - 1) Economic practice
 - 2) Population management
 - 3) Law and respect for freedom
 - 4) Police (in sense of intervening to stop disorder)
 - B) These are added to diplomatic-military apparatus
- VI) Concluding remarks on possibility of studying counter-conducts to modern governmentality
- A) Three forms of counter-conduct
 - 1) Eschatology (salvation): civil society
 - a) Raison d'Etat posits man living in indeterminate time
 - i) With state always there
 - ii) Exclusion of eschatology, of "Empire of last days"
 - b) Revolutionary eschatology as counter-conduct in which civil society prevails over state
 - 2) Obedience (law): population
 - a) Raison d'Etat
 - i) Is no longer feudal allegiance
 - ii) But total and exhaustive obedience to imperatives of state
 - b) So we see "right to revolution" as counter-conduct in terms of population and "basic needs"

- 3) Knowledge (truth): nation
 - a) Raison d'Etat possesses truth about men / population / activities
 - b) Counter-conducts
 - i) Nation entitled to its own knowledge ("nation" in sense of social war discourse)
 - ii) Society possessing its own truth
 - iii) Party formulating the truth
- B) Thus civil society, population, and nation
 - 1) Are both incorporated into state and opposed to state
 - 2) And thus three histories are intertwined and inseparable
 - a) raison d'Etat
 - b) governmental reason
 - c) counter-conducts
- VII) Final remarks on method with regard to entire course
 - A) F has moved from microanalysis of pastoral power to general problem of state, on condition that we not reify the state as a "cold monster" growing of its own accord
 - B) Thus he has studied the state as a practice, a "way of doing things," w/o a break btw levels of analysis of micro and macro power