

# *Security, Territory, Population*

Outline by John Protevi  
LSU French Studies  
[protevi@lsu.edu](mailto:protevi@lsu.edu)

## Lecture 1: 11 January 1978

- I) Five proposals on F's treatment of power
  - A) Not a theory of power, but just an investigation of mechanisms and sites of power
  - B) Power mechanisms are related to production, family, sexuality, etc
  - C) Studying power in this way
    - 1) Is not history, sociology, or economics
    - 2) But involves philosophy as "politics of truth"
      - a) = knowledge effects of struggles in society
      - b) [NB that these are no longer coded as "war" after analyses in "Society"]
  - D) Ethical or practical dimension ("what is to be done")
    - 1) All theory involves an imperative
    - 2) Such imperatives are only aesthetic
    - 3) But praxis happens in a "field of real forces"
    - 4) And so cannot be merely willed by a speaking subject
    - 5) So all F can do is provide "tactical pointers":
      - a) The commitment to struggle is presupposed
      - b) "if you want to struggle, try this"
  - E) F's categorical imperative: "never engage in polemics"
- II) What is "security"?
  - A) Example of theft in legal system, disciplinary mechanism, security apparatus
    - 1) Legal system: binary distribution
    - 2) Disciplinary mechanisms:
      - a) "third figure" arises: "culprit" as both inside / outside law
      - b) Human sciences allow surveillance, diagnosis, treatment of individuals
    - 3) Security:
      - a) Calculating probability within a series of events
      - b) Calculation of cost of action
      - c) Normalization and establishment of "bandwidth" of the acceptable.
  - B) Historical entanglement of security with legal system and disciplinary mechanisms
    - 1) Older modalities of law and discipline include security aspects
    - 2) Security apparatuses do not foreclose continued existence of law and discipline
  - C) What does change is the "system of correlation" of law, discipline, and security
    - 1) Studying this change is not studying history of "techniques" of, e.g., enclosure
    - 2) But studying history of "technologies," i.e., history of "correlations"
  - D) Another example: disease

- 1) Legal treatment of lepers
  - 2) Disciplinary treatment of plague
  - 3) Security treatment of smallpox (NB: here is where "population" appears)
- E) So F's question: is our "general economy of power" becoming a "domain of security"?
- III) Forecast: four "general features" of security apparatuses (space, aleatory event, norm, population)
- IV) Spaces of security
- A) A false start: different spatial extensions
    - 1) Sovereignty exercised on territory
    - 2) Discipline exercised on [pre-existing] individuals
    - 3) Security exercised on an entire population [of individuals]
  - B) But this can't be; all three modes of power presuppose multiplicity
    - 1) Sovereignty exercised over a multiplicity of subjects
    - 2) Discipline manages a multiplicity by individualizing [rather than pre-supposing individuals]
  - C) Different treatments of space [of town] in three modes of power
    - 1) Le Maitre: sovereign problem of "capitalizing" a territory
    - 2) Town of Richelieu: disciplinary problem of controlling an artificial, enclosed space
    - 3) Study of 19<sup>th</sup> C Nantes: security problem of managing spaces of circulation
      - a) Working with material givens
      - b) Maximizing the positive and minimizing the risky and inconvenient
      - c) Organizing "poly-functional" elements
      - d) Opening onto a uncertain future
  - D) Summary of security
    - 1) In terms of the series managed by probability estimates
      - a) Series of mobile elements
      - b) Series of events
      - c) Series of "accumulating units"
    - 2) In terms of the "milieu" as that in which circulation occurs
      - a) Security works with milieu as technical schema / pragmatic structure prior to concept
      - b) Milieu = site of "conjunction of series of events" among
        - i) Individuals
        - ii) Populations
        - iii) Quasi-natural urban events (i.e., what happens to humans when living in towns)
    - 3) So problem of sovereignty (to become problem of government) = exercise power at point of connection of physical elements and human nature as it appears in the milieu

## Lecture 2: 18 January 1978

- I) Security and the event: the example of "scarcity"
  - A) Scarcity as the object of sovereign power: make laws regulating market
  - B) The physiocratic edicts of 1754-64 show the move to security
- II) Methodological remarks on the analysis of Abeille's text
  - A) Not an archeological analysis for its knowledge production rules
  - B) But a genealogy of technologies of power: its objectives, strategies, and program of action

- III) De-moralization of the analysis: scarcity is not "evil"
  - A) Abeille's unit of analysis is the reality of grain, not just the market for grain
  - B) So security tries to connect with reality and in so doing "cancel out" the phenomenon of scarcity
  - C) Analysis of market also includes a normative element: what happens AND what should happen
  - D) Conditions for such an analysis-program
    - 1) Broaden the analysis on side of production, market, and protagonists
    - 2) Splitting the event of scarcity into two levels: "fundamental caesura"
      - a) Level that is pertinent for government intervention: population
      - b) Level that is only instrument for government action: series / multiplicity of individuals
    - 3) Population now object and subject (it is called upon to conduct itself in a certain way)
    - 4) The "people" are those individuals whose conduct exclude them from the population
      - a) This looks like a breaking of the social contract
      - b) But what's at stake is not obedience / disobedience of subject
- IV) Comparison of security and discipline
  - A) Scope
    - 1) Discipline is centripetal: it concentrates, focuses, encloses
    - 2) Security is centrifugal: it constantly widens its scope to include more circuits
  - B) Control
    - 1) Discipline regulates everything
    - 2) Security "lets things happen" at level of neutral processes in order to attain good effects at level of population
  - C) Mode of intervention
    - 1) Law focuses on prohibition:
      - a) order is what remains
      - b) (don't do what we tell you not to do)
    - 2) Discipline focuses on what must be done:
      - a) what remains is prohibited
      - b) (do only what you're told to do)
    - 3) Security responds at level of effective reality in order to regulate phenomena
  - D) Levels of reality
    - 1) Law: the imaginary
    - 2) Discipline: complementary to reality
    - 3) Security: works within reality; gets components of reality to work together.
- V) Liberalism = acting so that reality follows its own laws
  - A) It's true that ideology of freedom is condition for development of capitalist economy; but is this what was aimed at?
  - B) F nuances his famous statement in DP that discipline was guarantee for freedoms
    - 1) Instead we have to see freedom in context of transformations of technologies of power
    - 2) In other words, liberal freedom is "correlative of deployment of apparatuses of security"
    - 3) That is, the freedom F is after is freedom of circulation of both people and things
    - 4) Thus it's not personal political / economic freedom of people, but freedom of action implicit in notion of a "physics," indeed a "political physics"
    - 5) The problem is that the DP formulation creates opposition of freedom and power: freedom is ideological or political while [disciplinary] power is material and works on bodies. But we

have to see liberal freedom as a mode of power that works as conduct of conduct, as governmentality.

### Lecture 3: 25 January 1978

- I) Norms, normation, and normalization
  - A) Law and norm (Kelsen)
    - 1) Of course legal systems enforce norms in some sense
    - 2) But that's not the sense in which F uses term "normalization," which works in margins of law
  - B) Discipline and norms
    - 1) Again, there is a sense in which discipline deals with norms: this is *normation*
      - a) Disciplinary analysis, classification, optimization, training all result in
      - b) A division of normal from abnormal
    - 2) Thus discipline first posits an "optimal model" [a "norm" in the "normative sense"] and from that derives its division of normal and abnormal [i.e., "norm" in the "statistical sense"]
  - C) Security and normalization: smallpox
    - 1) Factors that make smallpox a good example for studying security
      - a) Widely endemic disease
      - b) With strong, intense epidemic outbreaks
      - c) Treatments of smallpox (variolization and vaccination) had four characteristics
        - i) Absolutely preventative (when they worked)
        - ii) Almost total certainty of success (they almost always worked)
        - iii) Could be extended to whole of population w/ little cost
        - iv) Were inexplicable under any contemporary medical theory
          - (a) [since they were thus "empirical"]
          - (b) [their employment was neutral w/r/t medical power-knowledge]
          - (c) [so they couldn't get bogged down by "special interests" in med. Establishment]
      - d) Because of these four characteristics, these treatments benefitted from
        - i) Statistical instruments being put to use regarding population
        - ii) Integration with other security treatments of events (e.g., scarcity)
    - 2) Four new concepts come on line with security treatments: case, risk, danger, and crisis
      - a) Case
        - i) Smallpox no longer seen as a "prevailing disease" (linked to region, way of life, etc.)
        - ii) Rather, smallpox is a distribution of cases
          - (a) "individualizing the collective phenomenon of the disease"
          - (b) Or, "integrating individual phen. w/in collective field" in quantitative analysis
      - b) Risk
      - c) Danger
      - d) Crisis
    - 3) Security and normalization of epidemics
      - a) Establish normal rates in population (whereas discipline treated every patient)
      - b) Then generate other rates for sub-populations (by age, region, etc.)

- c) Then try to bring most deviant rates in line with overall population norm; this action will of course affect the overall population normal rate
  - 4) So, security works with the "interplay of differential normalities"
  - 5) Conclusion:
    - a) Discipline posits a "normative norm" first and then divides normal from abnormal
    - b) Security establishes an overall statistical norm for population and then produces a "normative norm," so that death rate of subgroup should be made closer to overall norm
- II) The town as provoking new problems for government so that security is the response
  - A) Town was always an exception regarding territorial sovereignty
  - B) Town brings the problem of circulation to the fore
  - C) Town government in security is not about obedience of subjects, but about physical processes which are to be brought into acceptable limits by "self-cancellation"
  - D) Pertinent level of government operation is the population
    - 1) Security government is different from the panopticon (limited space, works with sovereignty)
    - 2) Security government works with real mechanisms and focuses on the population
- III) Population
  - A) Sovereignty
    - 1) Negative of "depopulation"
    - 2) Seen as only the source of strength for the sovereign
  - B) Discipline: transitional forms of cameralism and mercantilism
    - 1) Population involved in dynamic relation with state and sovereign
    - 2) As long as it is object of direct regulations, that is, disciplined
  - C) Security:
    - 1) Physiocrats see population as set of processes to be managed, not as collection of subjects
    - 2) Naturalness of the population
      - a) Dependent on a series of variables: climate, commerce, laws, customs, etc.
        - i) It thus escapes sovereign will: it can't just be ordered about
        - ii) But it can be transformed with good, rational, calculating techniques
      - b) Contains "desire" as an invariant
        - i) Pursuit of self-interest allows production of collective interest
        - ii) Whereas sovereignty was ability to say "no" to any individual desire
        - iii) The security government problem is how to say "yes"
      - c) Produces constant phenomena at population level (e.g., suicide and accident rates)
    - 3) With this naturalness of population we see emergence of two new phenomena:
      - a) "Human species": humans are now seen as integrated w/ biological world
      - b) "Public": population seen under aspect of its opinions
    - 4) "Government" is now a term in the series: "population / security / government"
- IV) Population as "operator" of transformations in domains of knowledge (savoir) (cf. *Order of Things*)
  - A) Three examples of this shift
    - 1) From analysis of wealth to political economy
      - a) Distinction of producers and consumers now possible
    - b) Malthus vs Marx
      - i) Malthus: population as bio-economic problem
      - ii) Marx: tries to get rid of population, but finds it in historical-political form of class

- 2) From natural history to biology
  - a) From identification of classificatory characteristics (enabling placement on table)
  - b) To internal organization of organism
  - c) And to the constitutive or regulatory relation of organism with the milieu (Lamarck)
  - d) Darwin takes last, crucial step and puts population as mediating milieu and organism
- 3) From general grammar to philology
- B) Conclusion: population is the "operator" here
  - 1) Allowing power / knowledge interplay
  - 2) And hence that the "man" of the human sciences is a "figure of population"
  - 3) Thus "man" is to population as subject of right is to the sovereign

## Lecture 4: 1 February 1978

Also published as "Governmentality" / *Power* 201-22 / *DE2* 635-57

- I. The question of art of governing in general comes into its own from 1550-1800
  - A. Multiple objects of governing
    - 1) Self
    - 2) Souls and conducts
    - 3) Children
    - 4) States
  - B. Two intersecting processes set the stage
    - 1) Political centralization: dissolution of feudalism leading to great nation-states
    - 2) Religious dispersion: Reformation and Counter-Reformation
- II. The polemic against Machiavelli
  - A. History of reception
    - 1) Machiavelli was at first honored (1532)
    - 2) And then later (1800)
      - a) French and American revolutions; Napoleon
      - b) Clausewitz and relations of politics and strategy
      - c) Problem of territorial unity of Italy and Germany
    - 3) But in the meantime, there was a long anti-Machiavelli tradition
  - B. Characteristics of the Prince according to the anti-Machiavellians
    - 1) Singular, exterior, transcendent relation to the principality
    - 2) Fragile and menaced relation
    - 3) Object of power: maintain / reinforce relation of Prince to his possessions
- III. The positive characteristics of the art of governing (from La Perrière)
  - A. Multiple governments:
    - 1) Household, children, souls, provinces, convents, religious orders, family
    - 2) Compare La Mothe Le Vayer:
      - a) Types of government and their respective sciences
        - (1) Government of self: science of morals
        - (2) Government of families: science of economy
        - (3) Government of the State: science of politics
      - b) Essential continuity of governing
        - (1) Ascending continuity: to govern State, prince must govern self
        - (2) Descending continuity: from State to families via the police
      - c) Introduce "economy" into governing: like attention of father to family
        - (1) Economy in 16<sup>th</sup> C = a form of governing (careful attention)

- (2) Economy in 18<sup>th</sup> C = modern sense, a level of social reality
- B. "Government is right disposition of things leading to a convenient end"
  - 1) Things:
    - a) Traditionally, sovereignty is exercised of territory and people
    - b) Now, governing has to focus on a complex of men and things
      - (1) Metaphor of boat: the men, things and events of a voyage
      - (2) Frederic II: analysis of Russia and Holland
  - 2) Convenient end: finality of governing is well-being of the governed
    - a) Governing with an end of the common = self-reinforcing sovereignty
    - b) Governing with an end of well-being of each = multiple ends
  - 3) Method of governing: disposition of things rather than imposition of law
  - 4) Virtues of governing
    - a) Patience: no need for sword or anger
    - b) Wisdom: knowledge of things rather than divine / human laws
    - c) Diligence: governor must be at the service of the governed
- IV. Correlations with the real re: shift from sovereignty to governing
  - A. Crystallization of a "reason of State" grounded in reality of new states
    - 1) Development of territorial monarchies
    - 2) Development of knowledge about factors of the State
    - 3) Development of mercantilism and cameralism
  - B. Barriers
    - 1) Historical: wars, political turmoil, financial crises
    - 2) Institutional: focus on sovereignty crippled development of reason of State
      - a) Mercantilism: attempt at reason of State, but focused on sovereign power
      - b) Juridical contract theories show same crippling focus on sovereignty
    - 3) Model of the family was too strict, weak, inconsistent
  - C. Breakthrough: emergence of problem of the population
    - 1) Positive feedback loop: demographic, economic, agricultural expansion
    - 2) Isolation of "economy" as level of social reality: population / statistics
  - D. How does population enable breakthrough of art of governing?
    - 1) Population and family
      - a) Theoretical: replacement of family model by economic reality
      - b) Practical: integration of family into governing:
        - (1) Segment of population
        - (2) Instrument of intervention
    - 2) Population appears as goal of governing (improving the lot of the pop.)
    - 3) Managing population leads to development of "political economy"
- V. Governing a population supplements other forms of power (sovereignty / discipline)
  - A. Sovereignty / discipline / government series
    - 1) Focus on population
    - 2) Use security *dispositifs*
  - B. New series, still in place: government / population / political economy
- VI. New title for course: "history of governmentality"
  - A. Ensemble of institutions ... tactics for new form of power
    - 1) Target: population
    - 2) Knowledge: political economy
    - 3) Instrument: *dispositifs* of security
  - B. Tendency to put governing over sovereignty and discipline as form of power
  - C. "Governmentalization" of the State: the state is not historically monolithic
  - D. Rough typology of forms of economy of power in the West
    - 1) Feudal state of justice and society of law

- 2) Administrative state and society of rules and disciplines
  - 3) Governmental state focused on mass of population and society of security
- VII. Forecast: governmentalization of the State:
- A. Born from pastoral power
  - B. Related to diplomatic-military technique (peace through balance of power)
  - C. Reliance on the "police"

## Lecture 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) 13-15<sup>th</sup> 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

## Lecture 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 cenobites)
    - 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 supplanted 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

## Lecture 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 *apatheia* 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"

## Lecture 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 18<sup>th</sup> 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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 acetic, 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

## 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 16<sup>th</sup> 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'Etat* 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) 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> 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) 17<sup>th</sup> 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 18<sup>th</sup> 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 17<sup>th</sup> C"
      - b) Or at least "fundamental fact characterizing birth of police in 17<sup>th</sup> 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