

Foucault Blurb

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ci61KBsZVbI>

Dr. Kligman “Acres of Skin” Holmesburg Prison

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q\\_3YYFkWnTU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q_3YYFkWnTU)

Inside CCA

<https://www.youtube.com/user/InsideCCA>

Black on White Crime whitelivesmatter

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZZxi62yo7U>

Wackenhut in Pakistan

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h-PWvBQbBuE>

Boot Camp

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p2HDBUc\\_UgM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p2HDBUc_UgM)

Big Army Guy Exercises

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xfBwzFREGWU>

How to model

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mWRzgc2t4vY>

Model poses

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yuPTz6N2MbI>

Modeling again

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1I91DuAu4-4>

## **ANGELA DAVIS**

- Prisons are perfect for those seeking zero-maintenance labor; no unions, no health care etc
- Prison populations are exploited and abused. They're used as resources for things like medical research.
- There's a web of relations between “industrial complexes”: prison-industrial, military-industrial, medical-industrial
- Beginning in the 1980s massive capital poured into the prison sector, privatizing all dimensions of prisons.

## FOUCAULT ON POWER

### I. WHAT THE "POWER" FOUCAULT WANTS TO DISCUSS IS NOT

- (Sovereignty): group of institutions and mechanisms ensuring the subservience of citizens to a given state.
- (Law): A mode of subjection having the form of "rule" (vs of "violence")
- (Overall unity of domination): A general system of domination exerted by one group over another.
- *These are all only "terminal forms" of power, not power itself.*
- (Today's) power(-strategies) are not centered. Power thus does not have a central point, or a source of sovereignty. Where there is a center or a sovereign, these must be understood, again, as "terminal forms"

### II. WHAT POWER IS

*THE KEY METAPHOR HERE IS WARFARE. POWER IN SOCIETY IS A BATTLE, NOT A STATE.*

- All power has the task of ordering human multiplicities.
- Foucault thinks that power goes through distinct phases in history, passing from "sovereignty" (as pattern) and "spectacle" (as central mechanism), before say 1700, then to "discipline" 1700s-1900s, then say to "Bio-Power" and "Control" in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century.
- Power always distributes bodies, surfaces, lights, gazes
- Power = a multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization
- Power = A process which through ceaseless struggles and confrontations transforms, strengthens, reverses... (As Nietzsche's "monster of energy")
- Power = \*The support that relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or system
- Power = *a moving substrate of force relations which by virtue of their inequality constantly engender states of power, always local and unstable*
- Power is produced from one moment to the next, over and over in perpetually-altered forms (exactly as Nietzsche), in every relation of one point to another
- POWER IS EVERYWHERE BECAUSE IT COMES FROM EVERYWHERE
- Power thus rests on/in ... is composed of... power-relations. But these relations come into a choreography at a larger scale, which may be termed a "strategy."
- What we usually call "power" is thus an *effect* of power: state apparatus, law, social hegemonies. These are the static face of strategies (which really are in perpetual transformation)
- Strategies are both effects and causes. As effect, they are concatenations resting on a bed of mobilities. As causes, they seek to arrest these mobilities.
- Power (at the larger scale) = a complex strategical situation

### III. PROPOSITIONS ON POWER:

- Power is not acquired, seized, shared, held, or lost. It's exercised from innumerable points.
- Relations of power are immanent to other types of relation
- Power comes from below. Force-relations (in domains of production, families, groups, institutions) are the basis for
- EFFECTS OF CLEAVAGE that run through the social body as a whole
- Forming a GENERAL LINE OF FORCE
- Which TRANSVERSES LOCAL OPPOSITIONS and links them together... redistributing, realigning, homogenizing, serializing, converging
- Major dominations are hegemonic effects *sustained by all these (smaller) confrontations*
- Power relations are both intentional and non-subjective. There is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives, but there is no class which directs the network of power. The "aims and objectives" are simply aspects of calculated tactics, which can be read by an analysis. They are *not* the aims and objectives of some individual or class who are directing the power. Power is not external or local to them—it always passes through the whole society. Across society, tactics become connected to one another, attract and propagate one another
- Where there is power, there is resistance. Resistance is immanent to power.

#### IV. POWER-RELATIONS

- All power, but most clearly disciplinary power, actually rests upon an organization of very small elements, called "power-relations." Wherever there is an unequal relation (for example) between individuals, that is a power relation. Power relations are thus "immanent" to other forms of relation: domestic relations, work relations, relations of production. Power-relations are not added on to these, but these *are* power relations and can be and are leveraged, organized, consolidated, into large patterns which sometimes produce large, prominent forms (state, ruling class, army, etc.), and which also have local-level effects.
- Power-relations become power-relations insofar as they rest on, integrate in, and form the support for larger strategies/systems extending beyond them.
- Power-relations are STRICTLY relational. They play the role of adversary, target, support, handle. A given strategy utilizes them in different ways. Every strategy depends on them, and thus rests upon a *plurality of resistances*.
- Power-relations are mobile, not passive.
- In their constant motion they sometimes fracture unities, effect regroupings...
- When revolution is possible that is because of a certain strategic codification of points of resistance.
- Power-relations thus constitute "matrices of transformation".

- Power-relations are “doubly conditioned,” by local situation, and by over-all strategy. Strategies are limited by the specificity of local tactics; tactics are limited by the “strategic envelope” that makes them work.

## V. POWER-KNOWLEDGE

- “Power-relations” names the bodily-spatial dimension of gestures, behaviors, and body-machine integration. In addition to this dimension there is another, of knowledges.
- Practices feed into schemas of knowledge bear upon practices, in loops. These loops may be small and local, or large and general.
- Knowledges, like power-relations, are “tactically polyvalent.” What they mean is not given, but determined by the strategies which make use of them. They may have one meaning/use now, and another, even opposite one later.
- The technical term Foucault gives for a linked, (feedback-)union of power and knowledge is “discourse.” Discourses are “series of discontinuous segments” whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable. Discourses and silences are both instruments and effects of power.

## VI. DISCIPLINE AS A MODE OF POWER (operating at the level of the particular)

### A. DISCIPLINE IN GENERAL

- =A (n historical) *modality of power*
- 1700s-1800s becoming-general as a “form of domination” distinct eg fr slavery, service, vassalage, asceticism
- Discipline consists in “a multiplicity of often minor processes” which overlap, repeat, imitate, support, converge, and migrate across domains, early on, in response to some local “need” ... later, as a general method of quickening productivities of various sorts
- Its primary functioning is “capillary”
- Discipline always involves *normalization*: a constant dividing between normal/abnormal
- Discipline, especially as panopticism, prefers to establish “axial” conjunctions and to eliminate horizontal conjunctions. (Compare to DeBord’s spectacle as a system of “unification in separation,” and Althusser’s ideology as “always-centered”)
- \*A mode of opposition here presents itself: horizontal conjunctions are a threat to disciplinary organization.

### B. DISCIPLINE’S LEVELS

- Like Althusser’s notion of (material) “ideology,” discipline operates on two perpetually-intertwining levels:
- Technico-Political      bodies and spaces
- Anatomico-Metaphysical      discourses
- Discipline always involves: hierarchy, surveillance, observation, writing

### C. DISCIPLINE’S OBJECTIVE

- It always seeks to produce “docile bodies,” which can be understood as
- Increasingly useful
- Decreasingly resistant

#### D. DISCIPLINE’S TECHNIQUES

- At the level of the body and space
- Discipline seeks “holds” on movements, gestures, attitudes
- And it partitions time, space, movement
- It explores, breaks down, and rearranges both gestural-behavior segments and spaces

##### 1. DISCIPLINARY SPACE

- Is a “mixed space,” part real, part ideal, because on the one hand we are talking built architecture, but at the other we are talking processual functions and regimes of naming and surveillance
- Involves: enclosure, partitioning, ranking

##### 2. DISCIPLINARY TIME

- Uses things like time tables
- Breaks down acts into their components
- Links bodily movements with aspects of objects (consider a military drill)
- Subjects bodies and time to “exhaustive use”—extracting every last productive possibility

##### 3. WHAT DISCIPLINE PRODUCES

- It divides (spatial-behavioral) durations into successive or parallel segments
- Organizes these threads according to a plan; combines them according to increasing complexity
- Concludes with an exam
- It extracts forces from one body/system and combines them with others
- It trains signal-responses (Pavlovian)
- It PRODUCES AN AUTOMATED DOCILITY

##### 4. *From a Marxist perspective*

- The disciplines perpetually re-habituate large masses of people to ever-changing parameters of production (it synchronizes them with the productive apparatus—again, as Althusser)

#### E. TWO HISTORICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF DISCIPLINE

##### 1. Early:

- The disciplinary blockade: the plague town: strict partitioning, ceaseless inspection, a system of permanent registration...: “The plague is met by order.” A plague town is subdivided in a regular, uninterrupted way.
- The disciplinary “mechanism” (=) the panopticon:

- (The blockade appears primarily early on, and then later in response to certain “needs” or crises; the latter appears somewhat later and spreads, becoming a ubiquitous aspect of all major institutions by the 1800s).

## 2. LATER: PANOPTICISM

- Amplifies production, economy, education
- Analyzes multitudes, reducing them to controllable, programmable, monitored unities.
- It makes individuals: alone, perfectly individualized, constantly visible.
- It produces “axial visibility, lateral invisibility”
- \*The “panopticon” is an architectural machine which produces non-architectural effects. It effectively *produces a power-relation independent of the persons involved*, “splitting the see/be-seen dyad.”
- The effect is primarily psychological: a person who knows they *might* be being surveilled at *any* given moment will act as if they *are* being surveilled at *all* moments. They will control, unconsciously or not, their actions, in accord with the schemas they are given. They thus “make power play upon themselves.” They are effectively their own monitors, because a real, objective monitoring system exists around them.
- *YOU BECOME THE PRINCIPLE OF YOUR OWN SUBJECTION*
- *THUS POWER COMES TO FUNCTION AUTOMATICALLY (rather like Althusser’s subjects who are worked by the system of which they’re a part)*
- PANOPTICISM SPREADS  
Through the whole society, which becomes one big “Field of Perception.”

## VII. BIO-POWER AS A COMPLEMENTARY FORM OF POWER (operating at the level of the species)

- There was an historical shift leading up to this too. Back in the day, “sovereignty” rested ultimately upon the power to kill.
- Today’s power rests upon the management of processes of life.
- Life—the life of the human species—is now an object of power. It’s the key thing that is manipulated in strategies.
- Which doesn’t mean things are more peaceful: wars have never been more bloody; “massacres have become vital”.
- Manager of life and survival... bio-power reduces bodies to “naked survival” (This will be the center point of much of Agamben’s work.)
- Nuclear weapons represent the capacity to expose a whole population to death. They are the “underside” of the power of our society to “guarantee continued existence.”
- The very biological existence of populations is now a perpetual political stake.
- Bio-power is inextricably linked with the developments of capitalism. The job here is still to adjust the accumulation of men to the accumulation of capital.
- LIFE ITSELF enters an order of knowledge and power.

- (Social power) assumes responsibility for life-processes and undertakes to control
- Life and its mechanisms now brought into the realm of explicit calculations; power-knowledge now = an agent of transformation of human life.
- The life of the human species is now wagered on its own political strategies.
- A proliferation of political technologies invest the body: health, modes of subsistence and habitation, living conditions, the whole space of existence
- Bio-power, like discipline (its more microscopic companion), effects distributions around a norm (rather than resting on law), engages in continuous regulatory and corrective mechanisms...