

Foucault Lectio

1 Lectio 2 - 13/05/2019

So the opening of D&P is the most famous opening to a book, an academic book, in the 21th century. this extraordinary contrast between the *Torture of Dameon* and the rules which only about 79 years later that they forshame of, that is of prison for youth. and we go from this enormous of detail in the *Torture of Dameon* to the like of which we could never imagine, to a time table in which there seems to be nothing even remotely appropriate[compared to] what happened to Dameon.

Foucault call them two penal styles and what he tries to do in fact is try to figure out, historically, how went from Dameon to the Regulae, what brings about that radical transformation, and he going to draw not just historical consequences but also philosophical consequences.

Now Foucault knows that the first thing that will come to people's mind, when they read the contrast, is to say "*that we've becom more humane*", that "*humainziation*". and by becoming more *humane* or *humanization* he means that **there was change in our moral senseibilities** . we can hardly even read about the *Torture of Dameon* without being horrified, there is something about our *moral senseibilities*, or, *moral sensitivities*.

[However,] Foucault going to reject that as an explanation of what happened. he says that *humanization*, being *more humane*, being *morally sensitive* doesn't explain anything, it may be a **description of something about our senseabilities** but it is not an **explanation**. moreover, he thinks that this change in our sensibilities is a result or an affect of something else. the fact that now we are more more sensitive, is not an irreducible self-standing modification - it just didn't happen independently of many other historical processes. so don't think it explain anything by saying the above, rather it is an affect, and what is it an affect of? this is what so extraordinary about Foucault's historical approach, **it is an affect of a new organization of the political technology of the body** . where a *political technology of the body* is change in the *relations of power*. with new *relations of power* a new set of what he calls "*mechanics of power*". It may be the case that our moral sensibilities has changed but that a result of something more fundamental. and something more fundamental that seems very strange as it is something about the *control of the body* [and] not new ideas in themselves.

So the question is: "**How does the political technology of the body and it's new relations to power make people think that the Torture of Dameon is inhumane?**" that as its were the first problem that Foucault wants to address.

and in looking in the difference between Dameon and this *time table for young prisoners*, he says that -garbled- is the most obvious transformation namely the disappearance of torture. and the disappearance of torture is linked to the fact that the *body as such* exercising torture on the body is no longer one of the major goals of penal oppression. [rather] the body is treated in a different way - there are two aspects to disappearance of torture which are linked together because as historical:

1. **The disappearance of the punishment as a spectacle** - The stopping of the practice of the public execution to which many many people came. And Foucault says "punishment is now thought of as something that should be in fact no longer thought of as something that should be enacted publicly so that the idea was that people would have seen the horrors of the torture of dameon people will be less likely to commit crimes.

of course we know that historically it is not true, it is famous that in England when they were a public hangings and the public hangings were much less horrifying than Dameron but not pleasant to watch were supposed to discourage crimes. and do you know what happened? there are a lot of evidence that given large crowd came to this hangings, pickpockets came to the hangings because there were so many people and the crowd was so agitated that it was much easier to steal from, so the public spectacles were not only a deterrent but that was their theoretical justification. and he says, what happened in the literature is that the horror of the crimes that Dameron does was also transferred to the horror of the execution. seeing the execution or the torture was in itself thought of as repulsive as the torture itself.

don't forget there is a certain historical moment where executioners were wearing mask so you didn't know who they were as if they were needed to hide the fact that although they were paid to do the execution there was something shameful in doing the execution. so some of the horror of the criminal was transferred to the horror of the crime. and gradually he says that punishment became to be the most hidden part of the penal process.

What was important is not to see the horror of the criminal being punished but to know that the criminal is being punished. you didn't need to see the modality of the punishment in order to be deterred you just needed to know that the penal institution would punish you. and so public spectacle of the execution became standstill. and you see this in what he says a bit later in the usage of Regiae. Guillotine used to be in public executions, but they gradually transferred to more private settings. because the guillotine was supposed to not and it wasn't invented as a form of torture, Foucault points out it hardly touches the body, there is an immediate decapitation from the guillotine which doesn't cause prolonged suffering ... and so execution by Guillotine came to be moved from public spaces to private spaces.

Think on what happens with modern countries with execution, in the United States you can go to see the executioner, there is certain people who do but you have to have special privileges and rights, it happens in the time of the execution there is an partition where the executioner is being injected a non-lethal injection only at the moment of the execution itself the doors come apart and you don't see anything, you see some doctor pushing tubes which have the lethal injection as if there is something still shameful about the execution itself.

and he says that with the emergence of something like the forshadowed wounds in retrieving the prisoners there is move from the idea that judging is the most important of penal punishment to the idea that it is not even punishment it's also a way of correcting and training and curing and what we thought on rehabilitation and what is important that all the techniques of rehabilitating and not just having prisoners and this is connected with the idea that rehabilitating proceed by not directly punishing the body but what Foucault called "the grip of the body is loosened" the relationship between the body and punishment changes, and the case of Dameron and in many other cases, the body was the direct target for the suffering.

in the new regime although the body involved, it is rather something else which is rather body training. he puts it as the movement from punishment of unbearable sensations to a coming into suspended rights. when you are in prison it is your right to freedom that is suspended and it's suspended so that it will be rehabilitating and reemerge as a full legal subject. now what happens that in addition to judges there is what we call an entire army of technician: doctors, psychiatrist, educators, psychologist and this people who are called technician of rehabilitation. they become the focus of the punishment.

he also points out how paradoxical it is mainly that the doctor have to watch those people till the very last moment while taking care of them to the very last time. the point is not make pain an accidental feature, he called it incorporeal punishment. however you can't fully disassociate the corporeal element from the punishment so there still remains some suffering basis to the punishment, a basis which has not been completely satisfied but which is involved in the incorporeal punishment in accidental manner and not as a direct object of the punishment.

moreover there is other changes in the process, what is the object of the crime being punished, the crimes that are punished are similar, you also judge the psychological state of the criminal and not just his crime. it is not just an explanation on what the legal code try to correct but also to correct the person. this involve into the legal code an non-legal entity in themselves such as psychiatrist which are capable in correcting the

criminal but in themselves are not a legal subject as they are containing an object of scientific knowledge, a separate discourse, which came to be due to the will to show on scientific basis who will become a criminal. what in stake here is the person and not just the law.

Foucault says that this show a change that the curative function of the prison was to cure the defect in the person and not just the crime, the soul thus become a scientific object and much more than judging it is. he show it in the french legal code by the legislative move that you can't be both mentally limited and a criminal. which shows the shift not only in theoretical manner but also in concrete manner in particular time and space. [39:53]

2 Lectio 3 - 16/05/2019

The mode of analysis is that of the present, that is to say he distinguish what important to the particular present problem and by it filter the relevant fact. that is because the issue is what important to us. So we are looking for what are the problems now and based on that look on the history of it. it doesn't mean you impose present categories on the past, but that you look for what important to us now. it is a question of perspective.

About power, Foucault never use power as "the power" but as *relation of power* as power. instead of looking on power as unified and simple thing Foucault try to see power in terms of function from bottom up, in the case of the prison it is not a one thing but because there was a web of practices power manifestation that when operated together gave rise to the Prison as a system. the problem is that we still look on things in structuralist terms that is to say that we look on macro power as a given but when in fact there is web of micro powers.

Power	Relation of Power	
Basic State	Macro	Micro
Movement	Descending unity and homogeneity	Ascending specificity and heterogeneity
Manner of manifestation	Derivation	Assembly
Results in	Micro	Macro
Resulted structure	Damien	Faucher

The question Foucault asks is what is the assembly of micro power that gave rise to the macro structure.

An example would be: When does the alarm clock invented, that is a micro power, but then invented the snooze button which have different function. or another example: standing in a line is a micro power relation, which work in correspondence by the public opinion that will cast upon you if you not follow the line.

Though it is not that you take only one micro power relation alone but as assembly.

It is interesting to note that by this that since power relation is trivially everywhere, the question is what power relations should be concerned.

2.1 The docile body

It is the body which is viable to be trained and be an object of something else. there are relation of powers can give arise to a body to become docile. those power relations become an habit.

Panopticon is to be in complete visibility. it is not that object necessarily known by those who subjected to it but they are always in relation with them For Foucault it is less of an issue that the Panopticon itself was built but that it's techniques of power have been implemented. Moreover the forms of power is intersubjective.

3 Lectio 4

Foucault is not interested in intentional state of the people but the result of the decision.

That because the intention that drive an action is disconnected from the result. so the question become how does power work in history and not what the intention of people throughout history.

it is not the queality of the individual that matter here but the place of the individual in the hierachy of power. it is the structure itself that in the focus. thus power is a relational system, not who has power, but how is the relations structured so that power will form itself.

Foucault want us to ask not what they wnat but how they operate within the system, moreover power is not homegenous, that is to say power work in different manners in different contexts or even within the same context. we tend to think on power as homogenous, but in how things operate different systems work in differnt manner, the family works differently from the psychotherapist; and each have their own specificity. thus, one want to reveal the specificity of those institution in order to understand them. so it is not the case that power make things the same.

strategy is the assamble of power relations, when a distinct power systems operate together they create a disciplinary society, this will give rise to the question whatever war is a good optic to analyze power by.

Banthen wisdom is in taking disperse power system into one idealized manifestation.

On top of it all it is not that it is enough to understand each distinct power mechanism but to see them as a unified whole, only then they make sense fully.

Part of the forming of power relation is dependent on the knowledge, by knowing about the individual it give abilty to mechnize the other.

There is distinction between deliquints and criminals, criminals is those who did crime and paid to it, deliquints is those who have a future to create a crime. thus encompassing the future.

Delinquents are the dangerous individual, this is a concept that arise from the social sciences, this is turning the discourse into a scientific discourse, which arise from legalistic psychotherapy, Foucault criticize that it is incoherent legal concept.

What does the policing of the future do? it create a realm of power relation based on fear that wasn't before.

This is a process where the trivial actions of the everyday to be seen through the whole, and by that reveal that there place is not as obvious as is.

In the last section If discipline informs punishment, what the mechanisims of punishment done, is to make them as mechanism of order, this is sience theya re so diffused. and the therapy for chaos, this is since they implement in secceful manner due to their auonomoy. this is the *carasoul of society* all of this is based on scientific fields, things like personality types, that why he inisti to connect relation of power to knowledge.

In conversatoin called the " of Judging" where Foucualt had a debate about capital punishment, he says, there exist in these matter a decree which exist after the war in which the psychatirst need to ask three questions:

1. is the individual demnted
2. is he susceptible to penal punishment
3. Is he dangerous to society

those question are not within the legal domain, namely danger is not a political power, but within psychology it is is hidden as pasychological state

and he add:"that all of these political categories is not only to punish, but also to constrain and hinder, and import values on the society in which one live"

danger inr elation to what? in relation to social interst, but within psychatric framing this is not political but masked as truth.

if one were to conduct on debate without scientific background

Foucault could argue that we need to see categories that define how humans should behave have a political function

Statistics originally called political arithmetic.A

4 Lectio 5

Foucault argue that by understanding the institution by the prison is mistaken as it is defined by something broader:

1. Discipline is one of the manner force
2. The normalization give a certain broad structure that in itself is not forced, this can be seen in the macro level of psychiatry but also for letter parts

so it hold on techniques that normalize behaviours .

remember that norms are not legal binaries, but as an all encompassing continuity and as result you always within it's scale while the legal category can exclude members from it.

Foucault thinks that our society moved toward normative processes from a legalistic society. In history of sexuality he found out that by the forming of disciplinary mechanism it form as such hierarchy of normalization in the implementation for example in order to discipline medical mortality, like in the case of vaccination where you not enough to punish isolated communities but to normalize it within their rank.

from it arise the question if the contextualization of war is enough.

F make a couple of contrast in the beginning:

1. Foucault thinks that society arise because of the negotiations prior to the rights given within the legal systems. that is to say that the individual is the result of the relation not the given
2. The subject thus become the basis of the analysis which it comes about by the microphysics of power. once it form we will think about it as a natural category.
3. There is no singular central focal point of power but it is dispersed within multiple points.
4. Foucault want us to think about relation of power in the semantic domain of war.

so should we decipher the relation of power through war? through terms like struggle, battles, fight

should the battle modality be what lies behind the stability of the institutions. he take that there is in this modality hypothetical directionality.

[would the subjectum connect to his attempt to ground the scientific validity]

the question of interest for Foucault is when one goes to the ethical principle.

that why he reach the problematic point to other that there is no universal subject. and from that what are the perspective that ground the argument.

When Foucault speak about science is science in so far it relates to human .

As there is no universal perspective from which we can see, it is not something that can be asked directly but by construction of the point of view externally and what it affects.

he don't explicitly criticize the disciplinary society but rather implicitly criticize it in order to escape the outcome of the normative society.

he don't want to give the decision itself as it is decided by our agreement, that is to say the aim is to remove the self evident factor of it.

in terms of sexuality we can't describe it without normativity so for example he would shift the context from desires to pleasure as its normativity is more ambiguous yet it gives positive grounding.

there needs to come about something positive to arise from the arising discourse but it is limited in the political intervention aspect of it from the start, as it is dangerous as it blocks the movement. although that what people look for, in reality it is a combination of little programs.

So let's look on a radical form, when a certain scientific truth arises in the human sciences one needs to question why has it arisen to begin with within the political climate.

for example there is a point in time in which homosexuality wasn't considered especially a disease, this gave rise to possibility of evoking other diseases, so to localize it they split the term to one egodystonic homosexuality and egotonic homosexuality. it happens only on homosexuality and not bdsm as there wasn't a political coalition to support it.

Foucault says that most books about Homosexuality is by liberation, like for example Marcuse, Wilhelm Reich, which take psychoanalysis to show that it is not needed. but Foucault doesn't think it is a good road as it is a negative framing which hides the social techniques of power that made it arise. this is to say it is a manifestation of power relations, they had this category before, with categories like legal and justice, but we think about it on terms of normality.

for example one would be hesitant to answer if bestiality is worse than necrophilia. that is because there is ambiguity in the term worse here, which one is judged bad by the act or the longing. ethically.

what are the three doubts about the repression hypothesis:

1. Historical doubt - is it indeed an historical reality
2. historical theoretical - is the mechanism of power in the order of oppression as by using the category of oppression you have a theory of power and the question is if the theory is relevant.
3. Political-Historical question - is the political discourse which addresses itself of oppression really from itself to separate from oppression (the negation of oppression is liberation) Liberation only matters if you have the category of oppression.

and Foucault proceeds with it the chapter follows by showing that there is multiplicity of discourses that arise. afterwards theory of power is internal to subject in positive manner as the subject thinks itself as the abnormal.

and then the liberation of sexuality is the science of sexuality that intertwined within multiple political relations.

there is importance to distinct the human sciences with the natural sciences. [he knew Thomas Kuhn apparently]

5 Lectio 6

The general characteristics of power in the western tradition is negative while in Foucault Power is a productive and enforcing category.

The first chapter in the will to knowledge is to show the way power leads to the proliferation of knowledge, Foucault doesn't deny there is falsehood and oppression but that he will look at them in their totality. it appears that in the 70s while outside scientific discourse you were disallowed to speak about sexuality, in scientific terms you can speak in great extent. the question shifts if there were silences but what kind of silences. the above is why there was a debate in the publication of sex manuals how to form the discourse, in the book "The Joy of Sex" by Ray Comfort was published with emphasis on his M.D, moreover there was a shift from pictures to drawing due to it being counted more scientific as photos could be considered pornographic.

thus there is a question not only where there is silence but in what way it is producing new forms of discourses. thus silence wasn't the ultimate result.

So Foucault give example of a book of “My Secret Life”, a 12vol book published in the 19th century which give account on sexuality. which is to highlight that there is a whole discourse about the sexual desires. this is not only a discourse about morality but also rationality of the sciences and administration, the latter two is unique to the modern period. and because of this bridging it is enough to see that repression theory is not enough. for example in the 19th century there was interest in infants sexuality, this involved interest in the body of children as a bureaucratic control. it was recommended that one should handcuff itself to his child in night so the parent will notice when he masturbate. or for example there was a Museum of Masturbation which warned children were warned scientifically against the dangers of masturbation (no surviving evidence).

So Foucault give as an example the case of — he was playing a game of — with girls, he was ultimately found not guilty but lived afterwards under the hood of psychiatric examination to cure his illness. Foucault argue that as people couldn't speak publicly about sex it needed to be extracted, it is a sort of hidden secret. which was part of the mechanism of power as a form to extract knowledge about sex. that why the book before called “My **Secret** Life”.

So in the case of the man being persecuted, it wasn't an issue within the power relation in itself but only when it became subject to the Scientific discourse. when it is categorized as an illness. so when it shifted from moral discourse moved to scientific discourse it became relevant. there is an incompatibility between the legal and psychological categories, if rape is psychological categories one can question the intention of the one being raped based on superficialities but if it is ethical case as in the law it is not even a question.

Foucault is not opposed to moral sexual categories, but rather he worried when they become a psychological categories, which he perceived as removing the force they have. he will acknowledge that there is more change and not a positive past but he will also have interest in problems we have today.

One of the important issues here is one of the consideration of Foucault in the 2nd chapter, let's say that the discourse is manifesting discourses in order to limit the discourse, whatever one can say about his claim, the modern period manifested discourses on heterogeneity and abnormality. for example in the past there was a perversion called pedophilia, attraction to older people, while we lost it we still maintained the category “pedophilia”.

Moreover as Foucault points out, we're now separated of — in the pre-17th century there was a difference kind between adultery and bestiality, today we no longer separate the two. in the middle ages manuals separated fornication and adultery. but we think of bestiality as a pathology. before bestiality was conceptualized as a psychological disorder they were legally tried as cruelty against animals. but now it is pathology, a kind of illness. and that why in the 2nd chapter he want us not to consider quantity alone but also the quality of power being exercised which are:

1. the line of indefinite penetration of power. for example female sexuality came to be in a trial where the female defendant claimed that based on expert that it is due to “premenstrual stress” which reformed gradually. and it moved to the people themselves thinking on themselves under the same categories.
2. Incorporation of the perversion in the specification of the individual - this is the ability to classify a person according to it, this is not a negative action but a positive new way to specification of class of people. this is not suppressing it but give it an analytic reality and solidify it. even today we still look for your real sexuality, it is a proliferation of the discourse but bringing it into visibility.
3. Perpetual spirals of power and pleasure - they are not necessarily repress each other but accommodate one another
4. it include more subjects under it, such as new spaces.

Those are not negative interaction but a positive interaction, this is why Foucault say the modern society perverse but because power is forming itself directly in people life in active manner, and the more perversion there is the more need of control. the issues with have with particular formalities such as sharing bathroom between the sexes, is not just the danger but the whole discourse as a totality, it is not just repackaging but the nature of power itself in how it manifest within the context.

Just think how much added just by sexuality become a scientific category and what kind of different discourses it gave ground.