

Michel Foucault - SMBD

Foreword (Ewald and Fontana)

Intro (Davidson)

1: 7 Jan 76 - 1 [Inversion of Clausewitz]

--genealogy

--power

--war

2: 14 Jan 76 - 23 [Power]

--'rights'

--power

--discipline

3: 21 Jan 76 - 43 [War, SMBD]

--sovereignty

--war "as analyzer of power relations"

--dialectic --> race struggle

4: 28 Jan 76 - 65 [Bi-Valent Counterhistory of Race Struggle]

--counterhistory of race struggle

--class struggle / state racism

5: 4 Feb 76 - 87 [Hobbes + Right to Revolt]

--Hobbes

--England

6: 11 Feb 76 - 115 [Fr Noble History (as a weapon)]

--Origins

--Boulainvilliers

7: 18 Feb 76 - 141 [Nations, Warrior Sovereignty, War as Grid of Int]

--Nation/Nations

--Nation and War

8: 25 Feb 76 - 167 [history as anti-state knowledge, it's
disciplinarization]

--Management of history

--Disciplinary Knowledge

9: 3 Mar 76 - 189 [Revolutionary History - kinda boring]

--tactical history

--Barbarian

10: 10 Mar 76 - 215 [Liberal univ of st8 to eliminate war-as-analyzer]

--Nation an Rev/Sieyes
--New historical grid of intelligibility: domination/totalization
--(birth of dialectic)

11: 17 Mar 76 - 239 [BioP and Racism]

--Sov/Bio-politics
--Population
--Racism

//////////

Foreword (Ewald and Fontana)
Intro (Davidson)

--REF TO "MESHES OF POWER" *** -- in the Elden book

1: 7 Jan 76 - 1

--genealogy
6 *have to look local
6-8 *buried/DQ'd knowledges
8-9 *def. (general definition of genealogy)
11-3 *danger: recolonization of the concept

--power
13-4 *against economism
-----liberal [possession-contract]
-----Marxist [economic functionalism]
15 *against pwr-as-repression (Reich)
-->

--war
15-6 *inversion of Clausewitz (and Nietzschean!)
-(1) pwr anchored to force created through war, historically spec
-(2) silent war (politics "sanctions and reproduces the disEQ of forces")
-(3) invert clausewitz
16-8 *Nietzsche against Reich
--"contract-oppression" = Reich
--"domination-repression" = Nietzsche
----F notes he has to modify, maybe even abandon(*****)

2: 14 Jan 76 - 23

25 **Power, Right, Truth
-"right" as instrument of domination (25-6)

Power:

27+: polyvalent, diffuse, de-centered

- (1) capillary (real extremities, not formal center)
- (2) material practices
- (3) circulation (and subjection) (29-30)
- (4) ascending analysis (and K of descending analysis)
- (5) knowledge/power (and not ideology) (33+)

"Methodological Precautions" (34+)

--roots of Sov Pwr

--**disciplinary power (35+)

---[a-sovereign]

-----i) bodies/capacities, not land/products

-----ii) calc not expenditure

---Overlap w/ sov in 19C

-----i) used in ongoing fight w/ monarchists

-----*****ii) concealed mechanisms, erases domination, "democ of sov" (37)

--> human science, "sovereign based rights" (call for non-sov rights) (37+)

3: 21 Jan 76 - 43

F clarifies -- not a history of sov, but manufac of subjects

--sovereignty

presupposes 3 elements (self-fulfilling prophecy) (43-4)

- (1) subject to be subjectified
- (2) a unity of diff pwr
- (3) legitimacy to be respected

*****Anti-sovereign 'theory of domination' (45-6)

- (1) SUBJ: not start w/ subj, but rx of dom that manufac subjects
- (2) PWR: show diff sites of pwr, and rx of dom that force to converge
- (3) LEGIT: not origin, but technical instrument than guarantee extension

--war "as analyzer of power relations" (47-52)

(1) invert clausewitz

(2) Disco emerges w/ st8 monop, historical claim

--(a) war as birth of st8s

--(b) war presides over law ("peace itself is a coded war")

--(c) binary structure of society

(3) U/Q (52)

--(a) 1st historical-political disco of postmedieval Western society

--(b) perspectival -- singular, not universal

(4) epistemology

- (a) truth-weapon: truth not neutral, position influences force of truth
- (b) value of ascending analysis
- (c) historical ('blood dried in codes')****
- (d) mythology (56)
- (e) winner-takes-all challenge to royal power, colonized by dialectic

--how to study? (59+)

- (1) eliminate "false paternities" of Machiavelli/Hobbes
- (2) Dual Birth in 1600s: English, French (binary race wars)
- (3) recast: i) bio or ii) class

--->St8 no longer obj of K, but the thing to be conserved (61)

---> "Society Must Be Defended"

4: 28 Jan 76 - 65 [Bi-Valent Counterhistory of Race Struggle]

Role of hist:

- (1) juridical continuity
- (2) the glory of sov power

Nietzsche:

- (1) genealogy: ancient uninterrupted origin
- (2) memorial: reinforce importance of every act
- (3) exemplary: example-based

Dumezil: Juridical, magical (67-8)

****Counter-History of Race Struggle (69+)

- (1) unbind ppl from st8 (history of conquest/pillage)
- (2) nondazzled people (light not just glorify all, dark side)
- (3) Anti-Roman / Jews
- (4) Shows that history hides/misrepresents
- (5) 'declare war by declaring rights' (power unjust b/c it belongs to noone)

--racism / state racism

***not all race history = speech of the oppressed (76+)

-revolution: 78-9

--Thiers transforms race to class struggle (recog by Marx)

--> consolid of St8!! SMBD (80+) *****

5: 4 Feb 76 - 87

-***St8 as permanent internal war

--Hobbes

-war of all against all?

(1) presupposes equality, diff would lead to war

(2) theater of rep (92) [we are not at 'war', we are at 'st8 of war']

-->Found of st8

*3-type sov:

i) sov-as-individual (grant, not transfer rights)

ii) victors legit acquisition of conquered

iii) familial - child consents to mercy of st8 to let live

--in essence, not glory, but the "counterhistory" from below -- of defeated willing to consent to authority due to fear of 'state of nature'

*'neverending diplomacy' (96)

"it's what the frightened losers wanted when the battle was over" (98)

--erases real basis of war

--sovereignty deduced by reason

--wanted to eliminate the fact of the Conquest

-warding off permanent Civil War (it's what you wanted!) -99

Db8 over the Norman Conquest (99-109)

Levellers/Diggers

Levellers--unjustness of Conquest invalidated all current law

Diggers--rebellion = response

Social war = Hobbes advesary (109-11)

***not based on Reason, but history!

"A schematic dichotomy between rich and poor no doubt already existed, and it divided perceptions of society in the Middle Ages, just as it did in the Greek Polis. But [seventeenth century England (w/ the Levellers and the Diggers)] is the first time a binary schema became something more than a way of articulating a grievance or a demand, or of signaling a danger.

This was the first time that the binary schema that divided society into two was articulated with national phenomena such as language, country of origin, ancestral customs, the density of a common past, the existence of an archaic rights, and the rediscovery of old laws. a binary schema which justifies rebellion not simply on the ground that the situation of the most wretched has become intolerable and that they have to rebel because they cannot make their voices heard ... [but] a call for rebellion begin formulated as a sort of absolute right: we have a right to rebel not because we have not been able to make our voices heard, or because the prevailing order has to be destroyed if we wish to establish a fairer system of justice. The justification for rebellion now becomes a sort of historical necessity. It is a response to a certain social order. The social order is a war, and rebellion is the last episode that will put an

end to it.

The logic and historical need for rebellion is therefore inscribed within a whole historical analysis that reveals war to be a permanent feature of social relations. War is both the web and the secret of institutions and system of power. ... we are not talking about right, and we are not talking about sovereignty; we are talking about domination, about an infinitely dense and multiple domination that never comes to an end. There is no escape from domination, and there is therefore no escape from history. Hobbes's philosophico-juridical discourse was a way of blocking this political historicism, which was the discourse and the knowledge that was actually active in the political struggles of the seventeenth century."
--Foucault, Society Must Be Defended p 109-110.

--England

6: 11 Feb 76 - 115

--Origins

---goes through french origin stories

Boulanvillers [aristocratic knowledge -- history as weapon!

--Juridical knowledge (history of betrayals

--Administrative knowledge (history of robbery

New form of History(133-8)

-New Subject of history: "society" / "nation" (134)*****

--new speaking subject: nobility (sep. nation from others in the st8)

--new subj of history: nobility (group w/ conflicts/betrayals)

--new pathso: F

Competing histories:

**challenge admin power/know (nobility)

**organize history (king)

7: 18 Feb 76 - 141

*Historical discourse

Anti-Roman History (against glory of royal power)

(1) Historical Continuity of Roman History broken (german invasion of Rome)

--thru new object of hist

(2) new speaking subject (St8 doesn't speak itself, now Nations speak st8)

--'nation' in broad sense --> nationality, race, class

Nobles --> "the nation as subject-object of the new history"

[against statist conception of state: a people found a state. nobles -- many nations in a state]

--Nation and War

**warrior sovereignty

-historical rehash of Clastres

--war as grid of historical intelligibility (155-63)

Boullanvier's "three generalizations" on war:

(1) foundations of right

(2) battle form

(3) invasion-rebellion

(1) foundation of rights -- "right becomes no more than a useless abstraction"

-1: history - no nat rights, a) always war or b) unequal, fx of war

-2: theory - 'free subjects' a) freedom to dom b) not eq c) only enjoyed in domination

-3: hist + theory - a) even if free existed, b) didn't resist law of hist

--"the egalitarian law of nature is weaker than the nonegalitarian law of history"

(2) the battle form "war as an internal inst, & not the raw event of a battle"

--"the problem of who has the weapons ... can provide the starting point for a general analysis of society" (159)

--"it is a war that begins before the battle and continues after it is over."

---"war insofar as it is a way of waging war, a way of preparing for and organizing war" --> techniques: distr, nature, techni, recruit, paym (159)

--"war is a general economy of weapons, an economy of armed people as disarmed people within a given State, and with all the institutional and economic series that derive from that." (160)

(3) invasion-rebellion system

a)--"the problem B is analyzing is therefore not who won and who lost, but who became strong and who became weak"

b) until 17C: war was between 2 masses

--17C: "there are no more multiple and stable great masses, but there is a multiple war"

--a real version of war of all against all (against Hobbes's fake one)

quote: "Until the seventeenth century, a war was essentially a war between

one mass and another mass. For his part, Boulainvilliers makes the relationship of war part of every social relationship, subdivides it into thousands of different channels, and reveals war to be a sort of permanent state that exists between groups, fronts, and tactical units as they in some sense civilize one another, come into conflict with one another, or on the contrary, form alliances. There are no more multiple and stable great masses, but there is a multiple war. In one sense, it is a war of every man against every man, but it obviously not a war of every man against every man in the abstract an -- I think -- unreal sense in which Hobbes spoke of the war of every man against every man when he tried to demonstrate that it is not the war of every man against every man that is at work in the social body. With Boulainvilliers, in contrast, we have a generalized war that permeates the entire social body and the entire history of the social body; it is obviously not the sort of war in which individuals fight individuals, but one in which groups fight groups.

....

war turns the very disruption of right into a grid of intelligibility, and makes it possible to determine the force relationship that always underpins a certain relationship of right. Boulainvilliers can thus integrate events such as wars, invasions, and change -- which were once seen simply as naked acts of violence -- into a whole layer of contents and prophecies that covered society in its entirety (because, as we have seen, they affect right, the economy, taxation, religion, beliefs, education, the study of languages, and juridical institutions). A history that takes as its starting point the fact of war itself and makes its analysis in terms of war can relate all these things -- war, religion, politics, manners, and characters -- and can therefore act as a principle that allows us to understand history. According to Boulainvilliers, it is war that makes society intelligible, and I think that the same can be said of all historical discourse.

...[snip below]...

The other thing I would like to stress is that by making the force relationship intervene as a sort of war that is constantly going on within society, Boulainvilliers was able to recuperate -- this time in historical terms -- the whole kind of analysis that we find in Machiavelli. But for Machiavelli, the relationship of force was essentially described as a political technique that had to be put in the hands of the sovereign. The relationship of force now becomes a historical object that someone other than the sovereign - something like a nation (like the aristocracy or, at a later stage, the bourgeoisie) -- can locate and determine within its own history. The relationship of force, which was once an essentially a political object, becomes a historical object, or rather a historico-political object, because it is by analyzing this relationship of force that the nobility, for example, can acquire a new self-awareness, recover its knowledge, and once more become a political force within the field of political forces.

...

war is basically historical discourse's truth-matrix. "Historical discourse's truth-matrix" means this: What philosophy or right would have us believe notwithstanding, truth does not begin, or truth and the Logos do not begin, when violence ceases. On the contrary, it began when the nobility started to wage its political war against both the Third Estate and the monarchy, and it was in this war and by thinking of history in terms of war that something resembling what we now know as historical discourse could establish itself.

...

One last remark, finally. The reason Clausewitz could say one day...that war was the continuation of politics by other means is that, in the seventeenth century...someone was able to analyze politics, talk about politics, and demonstrate that politics is the continuation of war by other means.

snip: When I speak of grid of intelligibility, I am obviously not saying that what Boulainvilliers said is true. One could probably even demonstrated that everything he said was false. I am simply saying that it could be demonstrated. What was said in the seventeens century about the Trojan origins of the Franks, or about how they emigrated and left France under the leadership of a certain Sigovège at some point and then returned, cannot be said to have anything to do with our regime of truth and error. In our terms, it is neither true nor false. The grid of intelligibility established by Boulainvilliers, in contrast, does, I think, establish a certain regime, a certain division between truth and error, that can be applied to Boulainvilliers's own discourse and that can say that his discourse is wrong - wrong as a whole and wrong about the details. Even that it is all wrong, if you like. The fact remains that it is this grid of intelligibility that has been established from our historical discourse.

8: 25 Feb 76 - 167

*U/Q about Boulainvilliers?

-did NOT invent history

-but invented a speaking subject that used history as a weapon

--goes through Machiavelli & admin knowl ...

--hist not just glory/right, but of

"We cannot understand the emergence of this specifically modern dimension of politics unless we understand how, from the eighteenth century onward, historical knowledge becomes an element of the struggle: it is both a description of struggles and a weapon in the struggle. History gave us the idea that we are at war; and we wage war through history." [172]

*notes on historicism

--"historicism is nothing other than what I have just been talking about: the link, the unavoidable connection, between war and history, and conversely, between history and war. No matter how far back it goes, historical knowledge never finds nature, right, order, or peace. However far back it goes, historical knowledge discovers only an unending war ... history can never really look down on this war from on high; history cannot get away from war, or discover its basic laws or impose limits on it, quite simply because war itself supports this knowledge, run through knowledge, and determines this knowledge. Knowledge is never anything more than a weapon in a war, or a tactical deployment within that war. War is wages throughout history, and through the history that tells the history of war. And history, for its part, can never do anything more than interpret the war it is waging or that is being waged through it." 172-3

"the idea that knowledge and truth cannot belong to war, and can only belong to order and peace, is that the modern State has now reimplanted it in what we might call the eighteenth century's "disciplinarization" of knowledge. And it is this idea that makes historicism unacceptable to us, that means that we cannot accept something like an indissociable circularity between historical knowledge and the wars that it talks about and which at the same time go on in it. So this is the problem, and this, if you like, is our first task: We must try to be historicists, or in other words, try to analyze this perpetual and unavoidable relationship between the war this is recounted by history and the history that is traversed by the war it is recounting." (173-4)

--aside on how "a historian's history ... was not power's ode to itself"
-shakespeare, etc

***--Genealogy of Disciplinary Knowledges [178+
-not Enlightenment clarity/progress

POWER-EFFECTS

-"we have to see, not this relationship between day and night, knowledge and ignorance, but something very different: an immense and multiple battle, but not one between knowledge and ignorance, but an immense and multiple battle between knowledges in the plural - knowledges that are in conflict because of their very morphology, because they are in the possession of enemies, and because they have intrinsic power-effects." (179)

Technical knowledge in 18C [179+

-allowed independence, wealth creation // became site of struggle

-St8 intervention (180)

- (1) eliminate/disqualify made "uneconomic" ('selection')
- (2) normalize dispersed knowledges (made interchangeable) ('normalization')
- (3) hierarchize/classify ('hierarchicalization')
- (4) one all others done: centralize to control, pyramidal ('centralization')

--medicine, metallurgy, mining, etc

**creation of "science" in the singular (didn't exist before 18C)

so... history is an anti-state knowledge

--but it's disciplinarization has a double reception:

on the one hand "actually made is stronger thanks to a whole set of struggles, confiscations, and mutual challenges"

but also -- a sort of "historical consciousness that is polymorphous, divided, and combative" [186]

9: 3 Mar 76 - 189 [Revolutionary History - kinda boring]

--tactical history

Three Directions (obj, battle, tactics) via Order of Things

- (1) nation / language / philology
- (2) social class / economic dom / political econ
- (3) race / biological specification-selection / biology

II - Tactical generalization of historical knowledge (190-7)

-following B:

- a) find intial conflict
- b) trace betrayals
- c) demonstrate a certain rx of force as right/fair

REVOLUTIONARY THEORY [192+]

"constituent" point of history:

- 1) show force as unequal
- 2) rev as re-estab of force rx (not reconst of laws)
- 3) cyclical history as form of revolution

savage (pre-historical or self-interest) (194+)

vs barbarian (war machine-ish)

B's question: how to capture the barb? (197)

Ans:

- (a) constitution (like a doctor: 'stable constitution')
- (b) revolution
- (c) barbarism
- (d) domination

--"reversibility of a discourse" ***** (208)
-directly proportionate to the homogeneity of the field in which it is formed
-regularity of epist field - allows it to be used in extradiscursive struggles

bourgeoisie originally antihistoric... (209)

10: 10 Mar 76 - 215 [Liberal univ of st8 to eliminate war-as-analyzer]
--Nation an Rev/Sieyes
Sieyès & 3rd estate: Nation

context: Monarchists vs Sieyès

Monarchist:

-nation as group of individuals don't exist
-body politic = body of king
-individuals only political through king's body

Sieyès: "double definition" of nation

-conditions:

--formal condition: nation as juridical state / common law & legislature
--substantive/historical condition:
---(1) "works" (what we call 'functions'): ag, industry, trade
---(2) "functions" (we call 'apparatuses'): army, justice, church, admin
-hist: 18C, bourgeoisie = provide all conditions, but denied formal status

Arg based not on _right to rule_ but on capacity! (222-3)

--Only w/ 18C is st8 about capacity/control, not domination!

***History no longer anti-state!

-but f(x) was not self-justificatory discourse

-"We now have a discourse on history that is more sympathetic to the State and which is no longer, in its essential functions, anti-State. The objective of this history is not, however, to let the State speak its own self-justificatory discourse. It is to write the history of the relations that are forever being woven between nation and State, between the nation's Statist potential and the actual totality of the State. This make it

possible to write a history which will obviously not become trapped in the circle of revolution and reconstitution, of a revolutionary return to the primitive order of things, as was the case in the seventeenth century. What we do now have, or what we may have, is a history of a rectilinear kind in which the decisive moment is the transition from the virtual to the real, the transition from the national totality to the universality of the State. This, therefore, is a history that is polarized toward the present and toward the State, a history that culminates in the imminence of the State, of the total, complete, and full figures of the State in the present. And this will make it possible -- second point -- to write a history in which the relations of force that are in play are not of a warlike nature, but completely civilian, so to speak.

I tried to show you how, in Boulainvilliers's analysis, the clash between different nations that exist within a single social body is of course mediate by institutions (the economy, education, language, knowledge, et cetera). but the use of civil institutions was, in his analysis, purely instrumental, and the war was still basically a war. Institutions were merely the instruments of a domination which was still a domination of the warlike kind, like an invasion. We now have, in contrast, a history in which war -- the war for domination -- will be replaced by a struggle that is, so to speak, of a different substance: not an armed clash, but an effort, a rivalry, a striving toward the universality of the State. The State, and universality of the State, become both what is at stake in the struggle, and the battlefield. This will therefore be an essentially civil struggle to the extent that domination is neither its goal nor its expression, and to the extent that the State is both its object and its space. It will take place essential in and around the economy, institutions, production, and the administration. We will have a civil struggle, and the military struggle or bloody struggle will become no more than exceptional moment, a crisis or an episode within it. far from being the real content of every confrontation and every struggle, the civil war will in fact be no more than an episode, a critical phase in a struggle that now has to be seen not in terms of war or domination, but in nonmilitary or civilian terms. (224-5)

*****KEY QUESTION 225+

(not just for the 19C, but the 20C)

--"How can we understand a struggle in purely civilian terms?"

--"can what we call struggle...actually be analyzed not in terms of war, but in truly economico-political terms?"

--"Or do we have to go beyond all that and discover precisely the never-ending substratum of war and domination that the historians of the eighteenth century were trying to locate?"

*****ANSWER: (starts earlier, 226-7) (synthesis: 228)

--mix/juxtaposition of two grids of intelligibility
first: war/battle/invasion/conquest -- reactionary, aristocratic, rightist
second: present/immanent/real/universality -- liberal, bourgeois

--use both grids of intelligibility!

"A history that is written, then, both in terms of an initial rift and a totalizing completion. And I think that the utility, the political utilizability, of historical discourse is basically defined by the interplay between these two grids, or by the way in which one or the other of them is privileged."

--goes on to say...

if balanced - we're good! (????? WTF???)

--two examples of privileging one over other: one rightist, one bourgeois

liberal universality -->

--Bourgeoisie slowly builds up "alternative society" through the Middle Ages (234)

--was losing, but slowly wins! (234-6)

---subsequently does away w/ old duality of domination, universalizes [dialectic!] -->

(1) "War is now no more than an ephemeral and instrumental aspect of confrontations which are not of a warlike nature."

(2) "the essential element is no longer the relationship of domination that exists between one nation and another or one group and another; the fundamental relationship is the State. And you can also see, in analyses like this, the outline of something that can, in my view, be immediately likened, immediately transposed, to a philosophical discourse of a dialectical type."

..."What took place [in the philosophy of history at the beginning of the nineteenth century] was a self-dialecticalization of historical discourse, and it occurred independently of any explicit transposition -- or any explicit utilization -- of a dialectical philosophy into a historical discourse. But the bourgeoisie's utilization of a historical discourse, the bourgeoisie's modification of the basic elements of the historical intelligibility that it had picked up from the eighteenth century, was at the same time a self-dialecticalization of historical discourse. And so you can understand how, from this point onward, relations could be established between the discourse of history and the discourse of philosophy. Basically, the philosophy of history did not exist in the eighteenth century, except in the form of speculations about the general

law of history. From the nineteenth century onward something new -- and, I think, something fundamental -- began to happen. History and philosophy began to ask the same question: What is it, the present, that is the agent of the universal? What is it, in the present, that is the truth of the universal? That is the question asked by history. It is also the question asked by philosophy. The dialectic is born."

[[[[in essence, the dialectic is a bourgeois invention to complete the universalizing project of liberal st8-building]]]]

11: 17 Mar 76 - 239

"the very notion of war was eventually eliminated from historical analysis by the principle of national universality" (239) *****

--Sov/Bio-politics
--Population
--Racism

goes through socialism...

then ends w/ socialist econ not racist, but their form of struggle is!

**only way to kill adversary = racism!
--most racist: Blanquism, the Commune, Anarchism (262)

damn....