foucault studies

REVIEW ESSAY

Defending Society From the Abnormal
The Archaeology of Bio-Power

Brad Elliott Stone, Loyola Marymount University

I: Introduction

The publication of the Collège de France lecture courses marks a new phase of Foucault scholarship. So far there have been four lecture courses published by Gallimard: *"Il faut défendre la société"* (1997), *Les anormaux* (1999), *L'herméneutique du sujet* (2001), and *Le pouvoir psychiatrique* (2003). Of these, two lecture courses, *"Society Must Be Defended"*[1] and *Abnormal*,[2] have already been translated into English, with *The Hermeneutics of the Subject* ready for publication by the end of this year. These lecture courses are valuable for Foucault scholarship not only because they supplement the arguments given by Foucault in his published monographs during the same period (*Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*), but also because there are topics that, although perhaps mentioned briefly or implicitly in the monographs, come to the foreground in the lectures in a way that goes beyond the published texts.

There are probably some Foucauldians who object to the publication of the lectures. Those who take Foucault's final wishes seriously consider the lectures "unpublished" by Foucault, and they should therefore be "unpublished" today, lest one turn Foucault into an author of an *oeuvre*. The editors write in the preface of all of the lecture course books that the lectures should not be considered "unpublished" because Foucault delivered them in the form of public lectures and, furthermore, the books are not publications of

---

[1]   Michel Foucault, *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*, trans. David Macey, English series ed. Arnold I. Davidson (New York: Picador, 2003). Future references to this text will be made as **SMD** followed by the English translation page number.

[2]   Michel Foucault, *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*, trans. Graham Burchell, English series ed. Arnold I. Davidson (New York: Picador, 2003). Future references to this text will be made as **AB** followed by the English translation page number.

Foucault's lecture notes (although the notes were sometimes consulted); rather, they are transcriptions from audio tapes recorded by students of Foucault.[3] However, contrary to the editors' intentions, serious Foucauldians would remind them that Foucault does mention the transcription of public addresses as part of the *oeuvre* process:

> [D]oes the name of an author designate in the same way a text that he has published under his name, a text that he has presented under a pseudonym, another found after his death in the form of an unfinished draft, and another that is merely a collection of jottings, a notebook? … [I]s it enough to add to the texts published by the author those that he intended for publication but which remained unfinished by the fact of his death? … And what status should be given to letters, notes, reported conversations, *transcriptions of what he said* made by those present at the time, in short, to that vast mass of verbal traces left by an individual at his death, and which speak in an endless confusion so many different languages (*langages*)?[4]

There are many ways to turn works into an *oeuvre* of a given author. If "Foucault" is the name of an author-function, we are warned against making an *oeuvre* that corresponds to that function. The Foucauldian *oeuvre* at the time of Foucault's death would look like this: the published manuscripts of Foucault; the interviews he gave that were published in magazines and journals; and essays written by Foucault as prefaces, articles, and interventions. With Foucault's death, some would argue that if scholars were to turn Foucault into an *oeuvre*, these would be the materials that would be the canon (and nothing more). This is what makes *Dits et Écrits* acceptable; all of its entries were previously published by Foucault within his lifetime or cleared for publication before his death.

However, there are other things that are of interest to professional academics: transcriptions of what Foucault said (viz., the lecture courses), pseudonymous writings (e.g., "Michel Foucault" by Maurice Florence), and texts in draft form that would have been published if Foucault had been able to finish them (e.g., the final three volumes of *The History of Sexuality*). These items serve as wonderful resources for Foucault scholarship, and would greatly enhance the understanding of Foucault's works. Some would argue that these texts should be off limits as primary source material; others demand their use for the furtherance of scholarship.

Given that I am writing about the lecture courses, it is obvious that I am in support of their publication and their use in Foucault scholarship. After all, Foucault scholarship requires that we form an *oeuvre* that serves as the object of our investigation. A "hyper-Foucauldianism" that forbids the

---

[3]   Cf. SMD xii, xiv; also cf. AB xiv-xv.

[4]   Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon, 1972), 23-24; emphasis mine.

formation of an *oeuvre* would result in the end of Foucault scholarship. If Foucault scholarship is to continue, we either have to keep talking in circles about the same texts over and over again (a repetitive commentary), or we must find new connections, new ideas, and new texts. That is a cold brute fact of academe. To ward off any allegations of hypocrisy, we Foucauldians can still hold that the *oeuvre* is an unstable attempt to form a discursive unity, although *oeuvres* are inevitably formed nonetheless. One way to remember our distrust of *oeuvres* is to always remind ourselves that there are multiple "Foucaults" to be studied without feeling the need to form a united Foucauldian system.

The goal of this essay is to present the main themes of both *"Society Must Be Defended"* and *Abnormal*, which are not only the two translations we have so far in English, but also the two lecture courses that mark a turning point in Foucault's understanding of subjectivity—from a strictly disciplinary model to a model made up of normalization, governmentality, and the care of the self. The hope is that the reader will be introduced to the merits of these texts, and begin to incorporate the ideas therein into future Foucault scholarship.

The main apparatus in the lectures is the archaeology of sovereignty and the subsequent epistemic shift to bio-power. Many readers of Foucault believe that archaeology is brought to an end with the 1969 publication of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* or the 1972 essay "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." This is simply not true. Foucault never gives up the archaeological project. All of his "genealogical" texts (lecture courses included) describe discontinuities in enunciative modalities, concepts, domains, statements, and objects.[5] Along with his discussion of the different *dispositifs* of power, one still finds an archaeology, albeit implicit in the published monographs, of the knowledge that emerges along with that power arrangement. Furthermore, those power arrangements are discontinuous, so that the shift from one *dispositif* to another is often complimented by a shift from one *epistémè* to another. Where the lecture courses are helpful, I believe, is in the fact that the lecture courses offer the archaeological analysis that is implicit (or sometimes completely missing) from the published works.

Foucault mentions archaeology in both lecture courses. In *Abnormal*, at the end of the first lecture, although Foucault says aloud that the goal is "to *study* … the emergence of the power of normalization," the manuscript says, "to *do an archaeology of* … the emergence of the power of normalization."[6] In *"Society Must Be Defended,"* Foucault says that archaeology is "the method specific to the analysis of local discursivities," whereas genealogy is "the tact

---

5   Cf. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Pt. II-III.

6   AB 26, including the footnote; emphasis mine.

which, once it [archaeology] has described these local discursivities, brings into play the desubjugated knowledges that have been released from them."[7] Here, it seems that genealogy is always a secondary process to be done *after* archaeology. In other words, there is no genealogy without prior archaeology. No power arrangement is analyzable until there is also an analysis of the knowledges and discourses produced and perpetuated by that power.

Therefore, in this essay, I seek to examine these two lecture courses archaeologically. *Abnormal* is an archaeological account of how the concept of monstrosity is discontinuous from the Classical to the Modern age, and how a new discourse, medico-juridical discourse, comes into existence in order to explain the new concept of monstrosity. This discourse is itself discontinuous with the juridical and medical discourse of the Classical period, which leads Foucault to criticize its power over life and death. Since this discourse has the power over life and death, it becomes bio-political, aligning itself with theories of race and sexuality; in short, it becomes one more discourse of normalization. My discussion of *Abnormal* makes up the second section of this essay.

Section three turns to *"Society Must Be Defended,"* which Foucault states is the last lecture course on discipline and normalization. In these lectures Foucault lays out the archaeological elements that account for the Modern *dispositif* of power, bio-power. To do this, Foucault shows the discontinuity in the concept of history. A new historical discourse, historico-political discourse, will emerge as a partial, war-based account of "nations" (a new discursive object in its own right). This new discourse directly challenges the previous "philosophico-juridical" form of historical discourse, which is best represented by Hobbes's *Leviathan* and Machiavelli's *The Prince*. For both Hobbes and Machiavelli, war is the antithesis of politics; however, as Foucault will show in *"Society Must Be Defended,"* politics is nothing more than war continued in a different way, or said differently, arranged under a different *dispositif*. Also, the old historical discourse offers us histories of the sovereign; the new history will work against the notion of sovereignty. As a result, the *dispositif* changes from the power of the sovereign to a war model. This war model allows for the emergence of bio-power, as the war that becomes politics is not the war between one group and another (the Classical notion of races), but between the dominant subgroup within a country against the "inferior" subgroup (the Modern notion of races). Therefore, "society must be defended" from its own inferiorities, the exaggerated result of which is the State racism of the twentieth century.

In the final section of the essay, I ask the reverse question. Foucault shows us how knowledge and power work together so as to make the

---

[7]   SMD 10-11.

statement: *Il faut défendre la société contre les anormaux*. We must, along with Foucault (for what is the point of archaeology without critique?), ask the reverse: *Faut-il défendre la société contre les anormaux?* Answering this question negatively opens up a new possibility of subjectivity, truth, and power.

II: *Abnormal*

According to Foucault, the goal of *Abnormal* is to analyze "the emergence of the power of normalization, the way in which it has been formed, the way in which it has established itself without ever resting on a single institution but by establishing interactions between different institutions, and the way in which it has extended sovereignty in our society."[8] What emerges in *Abnormal* is a particular discourse, medico-juridical discourse, also called "expert psychiatric opinion." It is a strange mixture of medical and juridical discourse,[9] although it follows neither judicial nor medical discursive practices. This new discourse gives birth to a new discursive object: the abnormal. The abnormal represents a monstrosity behind all criminality, a monstrosity of the lack and/or rejection of bio-political and/or disciplinary normative practices.

This new object is discontinuous with the monsters of the previous *epistémès*. In the Medieval period, monstrosity was thought of mostly in terms of "the bestial man," the person who is half human and half animal, the by-product of the crossing of two kingdoms. The Renaissance age puzzled over Siamese twins, and the Classical *epistémè*, steeped in its organized *tableaux*, was unable to place the hermaphrodite.[10] All of these variations or types of monsters shared the property of being strange "mixtures." Foucault explains this idea of the monster in the following way:

> the monster is essentially a mixture … of two realms, the animal and the human: the man with the head of an ox, the man with a bird's feet—monsters. It is the blending, the mixture of two species: the pig with a sheep's head is a monster. It is the mixture of two individuals: the person who has two heads and one body or two bodies and one head is a monster. It is the mixture of two sexes: the person who is both male and female is a monster. It is a mixture of life and death: the fetus born with a morphology that means it will not be able to live but that nonetheless survives for some minutes or days is a monster. Finally, it is a mixture of forms: the person who has neither arms nor legs, like a snake, is a monster.[11]

---

[8]   AB 26.

[9]   As we know from *The Order of Things*, Foucault is very suspicious about the mixed nature of things in the Modern *epistémè*. Cf. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage, 1970), Ch. 9.

[10]   Cf. AB 66.

[11]   AB 63.

Why were monsters a problem? The problem with monsters was that they defied the categories of understanding, be they civil, scientific, or religious. This is why Foucault calls the monster in his course summary of the 1974-1975 year an *antiphysis,* one that is against nature.[12] Monstrosity, Foucault tells us, "is the kind of natural irregularity that calls law into question and disables it."[13] To use a well-established Foucauldian term, monsters are living transgressions: "the monster is the transgression of natural limits, the transgression of classifications, of the table, and of the law as table … there is monstrosity only when the confusion comes up against, overturns, or disturbs civil, canon, or religious law."[14] The Classical monster was a criminal because the monstrosity was illegal—it broke the law, and therefore was often executed under the old punitive methods of sovereign power.

In the Modern period, which begins at the end of the eighteenth century, the understanding of monsters enters a new stage. In the new arrangement of knowledge, "[m]onstrosity … is no longer the undue mixture of what should be separated by nature. It is simply an irregularity, a slight deviation, but one that makes possible something that really will be a monstrosity, that is to say, the monstrosity of character."[15] Monsters are no longer criminals because they violate natural law; criminals are monsters because they violate the norms of society. In the later part of the eighteenth century, Foucault tells us, "we see something emerge … the theme of the monstrous nature of criminality, of a monstrosity that takes effect in the domain of conduct, of criminality, and not in the domain of nature itself … the moral monster."[16]

The case study that Foucault chooses in order to examine the moral monster and its role in the emergence of medico-juridical discourse is the Henriette Cornier case. In this case, Cornier murders the infant daughter of a neighbor for what appears to be no reason at all. Since Cornier is not mad in the Classical sense, she cannot be acquitted. Since she has no direct motive for the crime, the interest which led her to perform the crime cannot be punished by Classical punition theory.[17] This, Foucault argues, leads to the medico-juridical (psychiatric) evaluation of actions, which differs from the merely medical (is Cornier insane?) or merely juridical (what was Cornier's motive so we can punish that motive?) evaluation:

---

[12]   Cf. AB 328.

[13]   AB 64.

[14]   AB 63.

[15]   AB 73.

[16]   AB 74-75.

[17]   Cf. AB 111-112. The idea that the interest must be punished (and not the crime directly) is further explained in *Discipline and Punish*. Cf. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1977), 94.

> What do we see when we consider how Henriette Cornier's life has unfolded? We see a certain way of being, a certain habitual way of behaving and a mode of life that exhibits little that is good. She separated from her husband. She gave herself up to debauchery. She has had two illegitimate children. She abandoned her children to the public assistance, and so on … Her debauchery, her illegitimate children, and the abandonment of her family are all already the preliminaries, the analogy of what will happen when she well and truly kills a child who lived alongside her … Since the subject so resembles her act, then the act really is hers and we have the right to punish the subject when we come to judge the act.[18]

Her "motiveless crime" actually turns out to be in tandem with the person she is, a moral monster. Her other abnormalities (debauchery, child abandonment, illegitimate children, etc.) are the explanation for why Cornier killed the little girl. Cornier has not merely committed a crime; she is a criminal monster, and this is just one more event in the chain of her abnormal agency. Since she is now guilty of something, being an abnormal individual, she can be punished by law.

With this maneuver, psychiatry becomes differentiated from psychologico-medical discourse, which focused on questions of madness. It is also differentiated from the Classical juridical model, which assigned punishment based on the material motive of a crime. Medico-juridical discourse, Foucault writes, deals with "an irregularity in relation to a norm and that must be at the same time a pathological dysfunction in relation to the normal … Between the description of social norms and rules and the medical analysis of abnormalities, psychiatry becomes essentially the science and technique of abnormal individuals and abnormal conduct."[19] Therefore "[a]ny kind of disorder, indiscipline, agitation, disobedience, recalcitrance, lack of affection, and so forth can now by psychiatrized."[20] As a result, psychiatry takes center stage in the judicial process.

There are three functions of medico-juridical discourse within the legal system. First, psychiatric opinion given by the psychiatrist creates a doubling effect. The offense is connected to other abnormalities of the accused so that the defendant herself (what Foucault calls "a psychologico-ethical double") is on trial, not the offense.[21] Second, psychiatric opinion creates the "delinquent," the person who already resembles the crime committed. This is useful for crimes that would have previously been labeled as "motiveless."[22] Finally, the psychiatrist takes over the position of the judge, creating the

---

[18]   AB 124.
[19]   AB 163.
[20]   AB 161.
[21]   Cf. AB 15-18.
[22]   Cf. AB 18-21.

"doctor-judge" double, which brings an end to pure juridical discourse. Since abnormality is now a medical issue, the goal will no longer be punishing but treating and curing.[23] Under the auspices of medicine, psychiatry gains a prominent position in the bio-political *dispositif* of the Modern *epistémè* as a branch of public hygiene, protecting society against the psychological ills of the abnormal individuals.[24] As we will see in the next section of this essay, eventually it will be said that "society must be defended" from this illness, and psychiatry will serve as the defender of normalcy.

The last five lectures of *Abnormal* focus on the issue of sexuality. The reason why sexuality plays such an important role in the archaeology of psychiatry is that childhood becomes the breeding ground for abnormality.[25] In the nineteenth century, the largest concern about children was masturbation. As a result, the onanist becomes the paradigm of moral monstrosity by the end of the nineteenth century. The pathology associated with masturbation was a medical one, for it was believed that all illnesses found their roots in masturbation.[26] Therefore, the masturbating child begins the path of abnormality, which might lead not only to medical problems in her adult life, but also to criminal activities. However, in a unique twist, it is the *parents* who have the responsibility to insure that their children refrain from masturbating. This sets up the Freudian incestuous family structure (especially in bourgeois families) which serves as the laboratory of psychiatry well into the twentieth century.[27]

With the "puerilization" of abnormality, psychiatry becomes able to evaluate adults as abnormals if they seem to have "arrested development;" that is, if adults act like children instead of adults. Foucault discusses the Charles Jouy case as an example of such an evaluation. Charles Jouy is a migrant worker who has a series of sexual encounters with a little girl. The girl is sent to a house of correction for her participation in Jouy's sexual games. However, there is a question as to how to deal with Jouy . Should he be psychiatrized? The answer is yes, but for a reason different from the psychiatrization of Henriette Cornier. Jouy is psychiatrized "by establishing that he remains extremely close to and almost fused with his own childhood and the child with whom he had relationships."[28] In short, Jouy is playing

---

[23]   Cf. AB 21-23. All three of these functions correspond to the discussion Foucault has at the beginning of *Discipline and Punish*. Cf. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 19-23.

[24]   Cf. AB 118-119.

[25]   Cf. AB 242, 299-305. I am using the term "archaeology of psychiatry" from *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, when Foucault states that an archaeology of psychiatry would amount to a discussion of sexuality. Cf. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1978), 130.

[26]   Cf. AB 236-242.

[27]   Cf. AB 263-274.

[28]   AB 303.

"doctor" with the little girl; he has the psychological development of a little boy; he is a case of arrested development. The difference between Cornier and Jouy is described by Foucault in terms of the childish traces in one's actions: "The alienists essentially said to Henriette Cornier: You were not then what you later became, and for this reason we cannot convict you. The psychiatrists say to Charles Jouy: If we cannot convict you, it is because when you were a child you were already what you are now."[29] Prior to medico-juridical discourse, alienists would not try to trace Cornier's actions back to infantile instincts. In the Jouy case, it is merely a coincidence that Jouy's offense was with a child and could be traced to a childish game; the real difference is that Jouy is an adult whose criminal actions are explained by an abnormality, a lack of development.

I will return to *Abnormal*, especially the first lecture, in the final section of the essay. It suffices for the moment to have traced the history of psychiatric discourse and the discursive objects that are created in its wake. Insofar as this history and these objects are discontinuous, Foucault has offered an archaeology of the abnormal individual and the discourse that will make possible a *dispositif* of power that plays with life and death.

III: *"Society Must Be Defended"*

"Society Must Be Defended" is probably best thought of as a genealogical text dealing with the emergence of modern bio-power through the notion of race. In this essay, race is viewed as a discursive concept, and therefore placed within what I believe is the larger archaeological goal of the lectures: the archaeology of historico-political discourse. This discourse is discontinuous with the philosophico-juridical discourse of Machiavelli and Hobbes and the Classical notion of history, whose purpose was to legitimize sovereignty through an "impartial" retelling of past events. Historico-political discourse, however, holds that impartiality is impossible, that truths (especially historical truths) are based on which side of the battle one is on.

Historico-political discourse is discontinuous with philosophico-juridical discourse in three main ways. First, there is a shift in enunciative modality; that is, the speaker of the discourse changes. Foucault writes that "the subject who speaks in this discourse [historico-political discourse] … cannot, and is in fact not trying to, occupy the position … of a universal, totalizing, or neutral subject. In the general struggle he is talking about, the person who is speaking … is inevitably on one side or the other."[30] This differs from the philosopher, who claims to speak from perfect reflective

---

[29]   AB 302-303.

[30]   SMD 52.

equilibrium, from a disinterested view from nowhere. The new discourse changes that; it approaches truth in an interested way.

Second, historico-political discourse "inverts the values, the equilibrium, and the traditional polarities of intelligibility, and which posits, demands, an explanation from below … in terms of what is most confused, most obscure, most disorderly and most subject to chance."[31] Since it is an interested discourse, the new discourse does not seek the pretty or simplest picture of history. Instead, it puts aside the abstractly universal rational schemata and offers an ugly, dirty, complicated story. Foucault explains this new history this way: "So what is the principle that explains history? … a series of brute facts … a series of accidents … a bundle of psychological and moral elements … a fundamental and permanent irrationality … which proclaims the truth."[32] This differs from the philosopher, who stands on the side of reason and is therefore unwilling (or perhaps unable) to deal with the hard facts of an unending war.

Third, this new discourse "develops completely within the historical dimension … It is interested in rediscovering the blood that has dried in the codes … the battle cries that can be heard beneath the formulas of right … the dissymmetry of forces that lies beneath the equilibrium of justice."[33] Unlike the philosopher, who in her own way seeks a kind of "peace" in the exploration of history, the speaker of historico-political discourse shows that war has always been beneath the surface of order and peace. Historico-political discourse is a war discourse, which makes it perfect for the analysis of power in terms of war. The author referenced repeatedly by Foucault is Boulainvilliers, who formulated a war-based theory of power and history in the early eighteenth century.

Prior to the formation of this new discourse, history was a tool of sovereign power. It performed two functions—one genealogical, the other memorial. The genealogical function of history was to show that sovereignty was legitimate. It did so by praising antiquity and its heroes, showing that the present sovereign is the legitimate heir to that glorious antiquity, and therefore allows the fame of the past to be incorporated into the present sovereign. The memorialization function was connected to the genealogical function insofar as the detailed annals and records of every action and decision made by the sovereign demonstrated the sovereign's importance. This way, the sovereign would survive into posterity.[34] In short, "[h]istory

---

[31]   SMD 54.

[32]   SMD 54-55.

[33]   SMD 55-56. It is interesting to note that this new history is quite similar to Foucault's description of "effective history" in "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." Cf. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), §§6-7.

[34]   Cf. SMD 66-67.

was a ritual that reinforced sovereignty."[35] It was the history of power as told by power; it was the way that the sovereign justified its claim to power. As Foucault writes

> we can understand the discourse of the historian to be a sort of ceremony, oral or written, that must in reality produce both a justification of power and a reinforcement of that power … The point of recounting history, the history of kings, the mighty sovereigns and their victories … was to use the continuity of the law to establish a juridical link between those men and power … Like rituals, coronations, funerals, ceremonies, and legendary stories, history is an operator of power, an intensifier of power.[36]

Sovereignty is the subject and the object of the old historical discourse: it is a history of sovereignty written by the power of the sovereign in order to justify the sovereignty.

Historico-political discourse challenges this use of history. It is against the sovereign; it is "a discourse that cuts off the king's head, or which at least does without a sovereign and denounces him."[37] The discourse is taken up by the oppressed and the non-sovereign (in France, the aristocracy), and serves as a counterhistory of sovereignty. Instead of using history to show the greatness of the sovereign, it would "break up the unity of the sovereign law that imposes obligations; it also breaks up the continuity of glory … It will be the discourse of those who have no glory … who now find themselves, perhaps for a time … in darkness and silence."[38]

The result of this counterhistorical discourse is the creation of a new subject of history, "race," also called "society," a discursive object that makes up the main topic of *"Society Must Be Defended."* A society is defined by Foucault as a "body of individuals governed by a statute, a society made up of a certain number of individuals, and which has its own manners, customs, and even its own law . . . a 'nation.'"[39] The concept of a nation will later be described in terms of a race, but before moving to race, Foucault describes the importance of the concept of a nation.

In the age of sovereign power and history, words like "nation" and "race" referred back to the sovereign. A nation was the group of people and the lands under the power of the sovereign. Hence the sovereign state's definition of "nation" was "a great multitude of men … inhabiting a defined country … circumscribed by frontiers … who have settled inside those

---

[35]   SMD 69.

[36]   SMD 66.

[37]   SMD 59.

[38]   SMD 70.

[39]   SMD 134.

frontiers [and] must obey the same laws and the same government."[40] In other words, "[t]he nation in its entirety resides in the person of the king,"[41] or, to use the phrase attributed to Louis XIV, *L'Etat, c'est moi*. The French race, then, simply meant "those under the crown of the king of France."

"Nation" takes on a different meaning in the age of historico-political discourse. There arose the possibility of there being multiple "nations" within a sovereign geopolitical nation. For example, in early nineteenth-century France, the nobles considered themselves a nation, and the Third Estate was a different nation. This is the origin of the concept of nation that "does not stop at the frontiers but which, on the contrary, is a sort of mass of individuals who move from one frontier to another, through States, beneath States, and at an infra-State level."[42] There can be, for example, one nation in two countries, or two nations in one country, etc. This changes the understanding of war radically. War was previously understood in terms of one nation's (under its sovereign) being at war with another nation (under a different sovereign). Only sovereigns went to war. Now, however, there can be wars between two different nations within the same geopolitical area or under the same sovereign. History becomes the story of race struggle.

Race war began, Foucault claims, in terms of one nation being against another, as explained above. However, in the Modern period, race war takes on a dimension that is more familiar to us in contemporary society. Race ceases to be a concept tied to sovereignty and geopolitical boundaries; it becomes the concept of groups within a political entity. This leads to a different kind of race war than previously conceived:

> The discourse of race struggle (will be recentered and will become the discourse of power itself. It will become the discourse of a centered, centralized, and centralizing power. It will become the discourse of a battle that has to be waged not between races, but by a race that is portrayed as the one true race, the race that holds power and is entitled to define the norm, and against those who deviate from that norm, against those who pose a threat to the biological heritage.[43]

Contemporary race war is the result of one race (one group, perhaps within the same country as other races) claiming superiority over all other races, allowing that dominant race to define what counts as normal. Of course, this means that the abnormal, which was discussed in the previous section of this essay, becomes that which goes contrary to the dominant race's norms. The purity and perpetuity of the race becomes the goal, and with the advent of modern biology, racism as we currently understand it is born. The dominant

---

[40]   SMD 142.
[41]   SMD 218.
[42]   SMD 142.
[43]   SMD 61.

race seeks to become the only race in a country. As Foucault describes, there is "not an armed clash, but an effort, a rivalry, a striving toward the universality of the State."[44] One result is that the expression "society must be defended" changes meaning between the sovereign period and the Modern *epistémè*: "It is no longer: 'We have to defend ourselves against society,' but 'We have to defend society against all the biological threats posed by the other race, the subrace, the counterrace.'"[45]

And this is how racism ties into bio-political power. Foucault writes in the final lecture that race is one of the ways of determining who is forced to live, and who will be allowed to die.[46] In order to force the dominant race to live, one must get rid of the opposing race that is infecting the dominant race. Racism serves as a biological war, one whose goal is the dying of the other races: "The more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as a whole, and the more I (can live, the stronger I can be, the more vigorous I will be. I will be able to proliferate."[47] With this biologism connected to other technologies of normalization, the war of power continues to rage, in spite of the appearance of peace (i.e., no war against an opposing country) and order.

Since I want to limit myself to discursive elements in this summary, I will refrain from saying much about the actual workings of power in these systems. However, it is important to note that there is a major shift in *dispositifs* described in *"Society Must Be Defended"* between the sovereign notion of power as repression and the historico-political understanding of power in terms of war. By examining the role of war in power and knowledge, we can begin to think of power in terms other than repression and take up "Nietzsche's hypothesis," that "the basis of the power-relationship lies in a warlike clash between forces."[48] These forces can also take up discursive elements, allowing war to equally serve as an archaeological model as well.

IV: Conclusions

I conclude with what I take to be Foucault's concerns about medico-juridical and historico-political discourse. Foucault worries in *Abnormal* that psychiatry is itself a kind of monster. If monstrosity is defined in terms of strangeness, unnaturalness, and mixture, then psychiatry is itself a monstrosity. It is not quite science, not quite juridical, yet juridico-scientific. Furthermore, Foucault argues, psychiatry is "the reactivation of an essentially parental-puerile,

---

[44]   SMD 225.

[45]   SMD 61-62.

[46]   Cf. SMD 254.

[47]   SMD 255.

[48]   SMD 16.

parental-childish discourse (It is a childish discourse (a discourse of fear whose function is to detect danger and to counter it."[49] Psychiatry is childish, although one of its areas is the puerility of adults. Yet, here is a discourse that is itself puerile; it is all about dangerous and scary people, "monsters." The study of abnormals is based more on fear than science. To show this childishness, Foucault begins the lecture course with passages from two psychiatric reports, neither of which are really scientific, for their descriptions are funny and clearly biased.[50] These reports, although funny, are frightening because "discourses of truth that provoke laughter and have the institutional power to kill are, after all, discourses that deserve some attention."[51] Given that the power to punish is contained in such infantile discourses based on fear, we have reason to be concerned about psychiatric discourse's role in the judicial process in an age of bio-politics.

Similarly, the racist discourse that emerged as a result of historico-political discourse, as described by Foucault in *"Society Must Be Defended,"* has placed the power to kill into problematic hands. Historico-political discourse was developed as a way to escape the model of sovereignty. The result, however, is the invention of bio-power, which is actually more intense than sovereign power. Genocide, colonization, ethnic cleansing, the Holocaust, and institutional racism are some of the catastrophes that receive justification through the discourse of race struggle. As with psychiatry, race discourse infused with the power to kill leaves room for concern. Of course, Foucault is not suggesting that we return to sovereignty; instead, we must find a new way of understanding power, a new way of talking about it, a new way of using it. As Foucault writes, "if we are to struggle against disciplines, or rather against disciplinary power, in our search for a nondisciplinary power, we should not be turning to the old right of sovereignty; we should be looking for a new right that is both antidisciplinary and emancipated from the principle of sovereignty."[52]

As stated at the beginning of this essay, these two lecture courses mark a turning point in Foucault's analysis of subjectivity, and lead us on the path to a new imperative for the next *épistème*. The new imperative is free from both sovereignty and normalizing society. The imperative will no longer be "society must be defended from the abnormal." Rather, it will be one that is perhaps the oldest of all, although meant in a different way: "take care of yourself."

To those ends, Foucault's analyses of psychiatry and race discourse open an opportunity for thought and, perhaps, hope. Archaeology always

---

[49] AB 35.

[50] Cf. AB 2-6.

[51] AB 6.

[52] SMD 39-40.

suggests a kind of reversal. If the imperative explored in these lectures is *il faut défendre la société contre les anormaux*, the reversal is the following question: *Faut-il défendre la société*? As usual, Foucault does not give us the answer to the questions raised by his archaeologies. All he gives us is an axiom: for any discursive formation, if one can show how it came into history, one can see where it will finally someday unravel.