ANTHROPOLOGY
of the CONTEMPORARY
RESEARCH
COLLABORATORY

PAUL RABINOW
GAYMON BENNETT

A DIAGNOSTIC OF EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS

2007
working paper

no.9

Anthropology of the Contemporary Research Collaboratory (ARC) aims to develop new techniques of collaboration, modes of communication and tools of inquiry for the human sciences. At ARC's core are collaborations on shared problems and concepts, initially focusing on security, biopolitics, and the life sciences, and the new forms of inquiry.

www.anthropos-lab.net

Suggested Citation: Rabinow, Paul and Bennett, Gaymon. "A Diagnostic of Equipmental Platforms," *ARC Working Paper,* No. 9, 2007.

A Diagnostic of Equipmental Platforms

PAUL RABINOW AND GAYMON BENNETT

A Diagnostic of Equipmental Platforms

Paul Rabinow and Gaymon Bennett

CONTEMPORARY FIGURES: WHAT IS BEING PROBLEMATIZED?

Figure	Mode of Veridiction	Metric (Relational Field)	Mode of Ontology	Object (Relation)
Biopower	*Logos* (verification)	Normalization	Probabilistic (series)	Population-Bodies
Human Dignity	*Nomos* (declamation)	Dignity	Archonic (being)	Humanity-Human
Synthetic Anthropos	*Ethos* (reconstruction)	Flourishing	Emergent (assemblages)	Forms-Pathways

EQUIPMENTAL MODULES: WHAT DOES EQUIPMENT CONSIST OF?

Figure	Mode of *Ethik*	Serious Speech Act	Affect
Biopolitical	Prudential	Verified Reduction	Disinterest
Human Rights	Vigilance	Authorized Testimony	Commitment
Human Practices	Vigorous Insistence	Warranted Assertion	Assurance

EQUIPMENTAL COMPOSITION: HOW IS EQUIPMENT COMPOSED?

Figure	Mode of Composition	Specialist	Venue
Biopolitical	Planning	Social Technocrats	Governmental
Human Rights	Redressing	Humanitarian Technocrats	Rights Based NGOs
Human Practices	Leveraging (T,T,R)	Second Order Participant	Agile Assemblages

EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS: WHAT IS EQUIPMENT USED FOR?

Figure	Mode of Jurisdiction	Method	Purpose
Biopolitical	Regulation	Modulation	Security
Human Rights	Protection	Emergency Intervention	Restoration
Human Practices	Remediation	Collaboration	Resourceful solutions

Introduction:
Toward A Diagnostic of Contemporary Equipment

Paul Rabinow and Gaymon Bennett

> *"It is not the 'actual' interconnections of 'things' but the **conceptual** interconnections of **problems** which define the scope of the various sciences. A new 'science' emerges where new problems are pursued by new methods and truths are thereby discovered which open up significant new points of view."* [1] *Max Weber.*

Our goal is to design new practices that bring the biosciences and the human sciences into a mutually collaborative and enriching relationship, a relationship designed to facilitate a remediation of the currently existing relations between knowledge and care in terms of mutual flourishing. The means to inquire and explore to what extent these new relationships will be fruitful consist in the invention, design, and practice of what we refer to as ***equipment***. Equipment is a technical term referring to a practice situated between the traditional terms of method and technology. The rest of this piece as well as the ***diagnostic*** tables we have developed to orient our practice and our inquiry will spell out the meaning of the term equipment as far as we currently understand it. The diagnostic we are developing serves as an aide in achieving our goal of designing and synthesizing equipment. If successful, such equipment should facilitate our current work in synthetic biology (understood as a Human Practices undertaking) through improved pedagogy, the vigilant assessment of events, and focused work on shared problem-spaces:

+ ***Pedagogy***: Pedagogy involves reflective processes by which one become capable of flourishing. Pedagogy is not equivalent to training, which involves reproduction of expert knowledge. Rather, it involves the development of a disposition to learn how one's practices and experiences form or deform one's existence and how the sciences, understood in the broadest terms, enrich or impoverish those dispositions.

Our inquiry is directed at the practices and experiences of the synthetic biology community. We are addressing the question: How is it that one does or does not flourish as a researcher, as a citizen, and as a human

being? Flourishing here involves more then success in achieving projects; it extends to the kind of human being one is personally, vocationally, and communally. As a place-holder, we note here that flourishing is a translation of a classical term (*eudaemonia*) and as such a range of other possible words could be used: thriving, the good life, happiness, fulfillment, felicity, abundance and the like. [2] Above all, *eudaemonia* should not be confused with technical optimization as we hold that our capacities are not already known and that we do not understand flourishing to be uncontrolled growth, progressivism, or the undirected maximization of existing capacities. Adequate pedagogy of a bioscientist in the 21st century entails active engagement with those adjacent to biological work: ethicists, anthropologists, political scientists, administrators, foundation and government funders, students, and so on. Contemporary scientists, whether their initial dispositions incline them in this direction or not, actually have no other option but to be engaged with multiple other practitioners. The only question is: how best to engage, not whether one will engage. Pedagogy teaches that flourishing is a life-long formative process, one that is collaborative, making space for the active contribution of all participants.

+ ***Events***: A second set of concerns involves events that produce significant change in objects, relations, purposes, and modes of evaluation and action. By definition, these events cannot be adequately characterized until they happen. Past events that have catalyzed new relationships between science and ethics include: scandals in experimentation with human subjects and the invention of equipment to limit them, the promise of recombinant DNA and its regulation, crises around global epidemics and significant biotechnological interventions, the Human Genome Initiative and the growth of bioethics as a profession, and 9/11 and the rise of a security state within whose strictures science must now function. Just as scientists are trained to be alert to what is significant in scientific results, our work is to develop techniques of discernment and analysis that alert the community to emergent problems and opportunities as they take shape.

+ ***Problem-space***: Events proper to research, as well as adjacent events, combine to produce significant changes in the parameters of scientific work. These combinations of heterogeneous elements are historically specific and contingent. At the same time, they produce genuine and often pressing demands that must be dealt with, including ethical and anthropological demands. In sum, our understanding of the contemporary challenge is to meet what Max Weber calls “the demands of the day” through the design and development of equipment. Such equipment must be adequate to remediating these heterogeneous combinations, the problems raised, and a near future in which it would be possible to flourish.

Synthetic biology arose once genome mapping became standard, once new abilities to synthesize DNA expanded, and once it became plausible to direct the functioning of cells. Its initial projects addressed a part of the global crisis in public health – malaria. At the same time, a first ethical concern that it has had to deal with arises from the risk of bio-terrorism. Its current challenges cluster around the production of biofuels. In sum, synthetic biology can be understood as arising from, and as a response to specific problems: capacities, demands, and difficulties. Not all of these problems are radically new and not all of the solutions will be either. What they do call for is resourceful solutions and inventive ways of thinking, experimentation, and organization.

Given the emergent character of innovations in synthetic biology, the precise form of collaboration called for cannot be settled in advance. However, such collaboration will involve intensive and ongoing reflection with selected SynBERC PI's on the emergent ethical, ontological, and governance problem-spaces within which their work is situated and develops. This framing allows us to adjust our designs to the substantive and specific challenges and opportunities presented by innovations in synthetic biology and genomics. Such adjustment will require the coordination of appropriate expertise and the development of new collaborative equipment.

Our task is to provide conceptual analysis of this problem-space so as to reflect on its ethical significance and ontological status; as well as to provide equipment that contributes to solutions that are more responsive and responsible. A step in that direction is the construction of a diagnostic of contemporary equipment. In the remainder of this introduction we provide succinct and reduced definitional characterizations for the key terms that frame and provide entry into our diagnostic:

- **The Pathway to equipment**
- **What is a Problematization?**
- **What is the Contemporary?**
- **What is a Figure?**
- **What is Equipment?**

□ The Pathway to equipment

We began this work intending to produce a diagnosis of a new "figure" or "diagram" or "rationality" taking shape in the world. Although the contours of what seemed to be emerging were vague, we had a strong sense arising from a great deal of discussion, analysis, seminar work, and reading, that whatever the terms "biopower" and "biopolitics" might mean – and they were being used in a growing number of ways, most of which seemed to us misleading and misguided – that the term or concept or brand were clearly not adequate for understanding contemporary reality. Furthermore, as an additional support for our unease with how these terms were being used, we knew that Michel Foucault, who coined the terms, never had intended them to serve the undisciplined and heterogeneous uses to which they are currently being put. Foucault's focus had been historical and conceptual and, at least in his later work, non-totalizing. Above all, concepts like "biopower" or "governmentality" had been conceived and put forth in a mode that was expressively capable of recursive rectification. Neither naming a unique meaning of Western or world history nor uncovering the nefarious workings of "governmentality" everywhere can meet the criteria of recursive rectification.

Once we actually began working directly on the current piece, after multiple delays and blockages, we concluded that it was currently premature to diagnose a new "figure" or "diagram" or "rationality". First, it became clear that what each of these terms means is far from clear. Second, we came to believe that while major changes in diverse empirical domains were unquestionably underway, it was not at all obvious that they had taken anything like a general and definitive form. Furthermore, we concluded that it was conceptually hazardous to assume that they ever would. Having reached an impasse, we decided to change strategies by shifting registers.

At first, we decided to move from characterizing a general diagram or rationality to attempting to distinguish the contours of the problematization to which that general diagram was presumably responding. Even there, however, after two semesters' travail with multiple empirical projects laid out and discussed, it gradually became to seem likely that even the task of attempting to distinguish and characterize the parameters of an emergent problematization in a comprehensive manner was premature. Unlike the question of what figure comes "after" biopower, however, the challenge of specifying the vectors and contours of an emergent problem-space remains, in our view, a valid one. Consequently, we decided to return to the concrete: our site of inquiry. We shifted our efforts

back to the challenge of figuring out how best to comprehend, invent, and practice the work we have taken up in SynBERC.

This correction of our course proved to be serendipitous providing the means of rectification that we lacked. It led us to conclude that what we needed currently was a diagnostic of equipment. Said another way, we shifted our attention from the attempt to characterize the "actual interconnections of things," to an attempt to distinguish "the conceptual interconnections of problems" with the hope that we would be "opening up significant new points of view." Such points of view, we came to think, would be significant to the degree that we could transform these perspectives into actual practices. The production of actual practices, after all, is what equipment, as we understand it, is all about.

To sum up: we are concentrating our initial efforts on conceptualizing, designing, and experimenting with equipment rather that a general figure per se. Given that choice, we decided that the next critical step was to construct a diagnostic. This diagnostic work should assist us in experimenting with and adjusting practices in our particular project, but will leave open the broader issue of whether or not a distinctive figure is emerging within and along side of existing figures as responses to and factors in shifts in a larger problematization. Said another way, within a diagnostic analysis precedes synthesis.

What is Problematization?

A ***problematization***, Michel Foucault writes, "does not mean the representation of a pre-existent object nor the creation through discourse of an object that did not exist. It is the ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc)." [3] The reason that problematizations are problematic, not surprisingly, is that, something prior "must have happened to introduce uncertainty, a loss of familiarity; that loss, that uncertainty is the result of difficulties in our previous way of understanding, acting, relating." [4] " Foucault experimented throughout his life with developing methods of analysis adequate to diagnosing and conceptualizing problematizations in history. Although he never settled on a fixed or definitive method, his consistent, if not unique goal, was to contribute to a "History of the Present." In that project, a certain understanding of the past would provide a means of showing the contingency of the present and thereby contribute to making a more open future.

The primary task of the analyst is not to proceed directly toward intervention and repair of the situation's discordancy, as one could imagine those in the pragmatist traditions advocating, but rather to pause, reflect, and put forth a diagnosis of "what makes these responses simultaneously possible." [5] For Foucault, the specific diacritic of thought is not uniquely in this act of diagnosis but additionally in the attempt to achieve a modal change from seeing a situation not only as "a given" but equally as "a question." Such a modal shift seeks to accomplish a number of things. First it asserts that not only are there always multiple constraints at work in any historically troubled situation, but that multiple responses exist as well. Foucault underscores this condition of heterogeneous, if constrained, contingency -- "this transformation of an ensemble of difficulties into problems to which diverse solutions are proposed." – in order to propose a particular style of inquiry. The act of thinking is an act of modal transformation from the constative to the subjunctive: from the singular to the multiple, from the necessary to the contingent.

A problematization then refers to both a kind of general historical formation as well as a nexus of responses to that formation. The diverse but not entirely disparate responses, it follows, eventually form (an increasingly significant) aspect of the problematization. Foucault is characterizing a historical space of conditioned contingency

that emerges in relation to (and then forms a feed back situation with) a more general state of affairs, one that is real enough, but neither fixed nor static. Thus, the domain of problematization is constituted by and through economic conditions, scientific knowledge, political actors, and other related vectors. What is distinctive is Foucault's identification of the problematic state of affairs (the dynamic of the process of a specific type of problem description, characterization and reworking), as simultaneously the object, the site, and ultimately the substance, of thinking.

Foucault's concept of problematization is broad but not unlimited in scope. It is not as general as John Dewey's 'discordance.' Rather, Foucault's term requires that the situation in question contain institutionally legitimated claims to truth or one or another type of sanctioned seriousness, "serious speech acts". Without the presence of serious speech acts there is no problematization in the strict sense of the term (although obviously there could be any number and type of problems).

Foucault designed his concept for archaeological and genealogical work in a History of the Present that aims to demonstrate or present contingency. For an Anthropology of the Contemporary concerned with emergent assemblages, developing a method or critical concepts, to demonstrate their contingency makes no sense. By definition, emergent assemblages are contingent. Consequently, the current challenge is to design and invent modes of experimentation and verification with modified forms of critical analysis. We are orienting ourselves differently than Foucault. In the present one can look back or look forward. Foucault provided the lineaments of a problematization understood as historical phenomena involving blockages, problems, and diverse solutions. In the History of the Present the question of what it is that is being problematized is approached by specifying the ways in which a range of solutions can be traced back to a set of prior problematizations as responses to those problematizations. For example, taken up in a History of the Present two of the figures addressed in our diagnostic—biopower and human dignity—can be analyzed as responses to prior problematizations and not as sites of problematization themselves.

By contrast, we are attempting to provide a **diagnostic** that is oriented to the near future. In this position the challenge is not to make the present seem contingent, but situating ourselves among contemporary blockages and opportunities the challenge is to reformulate these blockages and opportunities as problems so as to make available a range of possible solutions. In an Anthropology of the Contemporary the question of what is being problematized

is approached by identifying the ways in which formerly stable figures and their elements are becoming recombined and reconfigured such that a present challenge is to diagnose nascent figures, equipment, and assemblages. In our approach these nascent figures are not epochal, that is to say they are not simply replacing prior figures. Rather, they share elements of existing figures in the process of recombination and reconfiguration, such that a primary task is to identify the relations among and between figures and their elements, and to identify pathways of transformation as distinctive forms are taking shape. In sum, problematization taken up as a task of an Anthropology of the Contemporary rather than a History of the Present, is not to trace current figures back to prior problematizations, but to remediate current blockages and opportunities by conceptualizing the near future as a series of problems in relationship to which possible solutions become available to thought.

□ What is the Contemporary?

What is the contemporary? The ordinary English language meaning of the term "the contemporary" is: "existing or occurring at, or dating from, the same period of time as something or somebody else." But there is the second meaning of "distinctively modern in style" as in "a variety of favorite contemporary styles." [6] The first use has no historical connotations, only temporal ones; Cicero was the contemporary of Caesar just as Thelonious Monk was the contemporary of John Coltrane or Gerhard Richter is the contemporary of Gerhard Schroeder. The second meaning, however, does carry an historical connotation and a curious one that can be used to both equate and differentiate the contemporary from the modern. It is that marking that is pertinent to the project at hand. Just as one can take up the "modern" as an ethos and not a period, one can take it up as a moving ratio. In that perspective, tradition and modernity are not opposed but paired: "tradition is a moving image of the past, opposed not to modernity but to alienation." [7] *The contemporary is a moving ratio of modernity, moving through the recent past and near future in a (non-linear) space that gauges modernity as an ethos already becoming historical.*

The anthropology of the contemporary seeks to develop methods, practices, and forms of inquiry and narration coherent and co-operable with understandings of the mode (or modes) taken by *anthropos* as figure and an assemblage. [8]

What is a Figure?

The concept of ***figuration*** designates a way of establishing connections among events, actors, discourses, practices, and objects such that a more or less stable and integrated ensemble is produced whose form is such that the significance and functions of the ensemble cannot be reduced to the its constitutive elements. Figuration thus also designates a way of connecting elements into an ensemble such that the significance and functions of each element depends on, though may not be reducible to, the form produced by the connections. Figuration involves a kind of synthesis—the production of a composite whole whose logic of composition cannot be reduced to its constitutive elements. If figuration designates a way of connecting and synthesizing elements, the resulting ensemble can be designated a ***figure***.

The terms figuration and figure have a long history extending back to the Greeks. [9] In our present work we find pertinent and helpful Erich Auerbach's concept of figural interpretation. We have been made aware of the hermeneutic controversies attached to Auerbach's work, to which we do not intend to enter. Stripped of this controversy, we find a central point that Auerbach makes extremely helpful to our work. Figural interpretation, as Auerbach describes it, is a method of taking up reality in which connections are established between "two events or persons in such a way that the first signifies not only itself, but also the second, while the second involves or fulfills the first." For Auerbach, the poles of the figure are integrated in and by a shared temporality. Making use of this insight, we want to draw attention to the shared ontology of figural integration. The crucial integrating aspect of this shared ontology is its mode. Mode is a term that can indicate a way of doing something, the form in which something exists, and the form's temporality. In figural interpretation the temporal aspect of the way in which the poles of a figure exist and are connected is crucial. The poles of a figure, although historical, may in fact be separated in time or place. Their ontologically constitutive connection—the connection that integrates them as a single figure—is thus likely not established through the "horizontal dimension" of direct historical causality.[10] Rather, the integrative connections are established "vertically." That is to say, the poles are linked by way of factors whose ontology is characterized by a mode other than historical causality, per se. In classical figural

interpretation, such modal connections usually pass through a primordial, eternal, or otherwise transcendent factor whose temporality is beyond, comprehensive, or definitive of history. The ontological mode of such a factor establishes the integration of elements as a single figure. [11]

Unlike Auerbach's figural interpretations, the ontological mode of the figures taken up in this diagnostic is characterized neither by the eternal, nor transcendental, nor historically comprehensive. Rather, the temporality which characterizes the ontological mode is *contemporary* (although each of the figures consists of elements which themselves are characterized by other temporalities) This means that, unlike Auerbach's figural interpretation, the distinction of "horizontal" and "vertical" connections is less pronounced. However, this also means that like figural interpretation direct historical causality recedes as a prominent type of connection. The pathways through which the elements of the figures in the diagnostic are connected up are neither historically horizontal nor transcendentally vertical, per se. Rather, the pathways by way of which the elements are connected and given form are contemporary.

What is Equipment?

We proceeded with an informed awareness that there is a still rather inchoate, if insistent, demand for new ***equipment*** to reconfigure and reconstruct the relations between and among the life sciences, the human sciences, and diverse citizenries both national and global. This conviction stems from the pragmatic situation in which we are working: the National Science Foundation funds our work. But the commonplace also resonates with a year's work with members of the Anthropology of the Contemporary Research Collaboratory (ARC) indicating that parallel questioning, and the need for new equipment, exists in other domains such as bio-security, bio-complexity, etc.

Equipment, though conceptual in design and formulation, is pragmatic in use. Defined abstractly equipment is a set of *truth claims*, *affects*, and *ethical orientations* designed and combined into a practice. [12] Equipment, which has historically taken different forms, enables practical responses to changing conditions brought about by specific problems, events, and general reconfigurations. [13]

Equipment is a term (word+ concept + referent) that, by definition, does not retain a constant meaning. Such variation is a source of its richness and flexibility. Mapping and analyzing its distributions would be the kind of work a much more extended genealogy would have to undertake; how to undertake such an enterprise within the anthropology of the contemporary as opposed to the history of the present is, currently, largely unexplored, lacking the requisite navigational concepts and methods.

Equipment takes different forms in the contemporary. This variability stems from the fact that: the contemporary is neither a unified epoch nor a culture and consequently there is no reason to expect there would be a single form within it; as well as to the fact that scholarly work in the history of the present have shown that there are multiple facets to even a settled problematization and thus, it follows, multiple solutions requiring, it would be logical to assume, diverse equipment.

The challenge of constructing a diagnostic of contemporary equipment is three-fold: (a) to provide a tool-kit of concepts that enable one to conduct inquiries into the contemporary world in its actuality; (b) to conduct those inquiries in a manner such that those concepts and those inquiries function so as to make the relations (connections

and disjunctions) between *logos* and *ethos* apparent, and available, to oneself and to others. That is to say, to make those relations part of the inquiry itself as well as part of a way of life. (c) To take into account the *pathos* encountered and engendered by such an undertaking, and to find a place for it within the form under construction. In our technical vocabulary, these challenges consist in designing and synthesizing a form which can maintain a constantly available level of generality. Such forms must be able to function effectively to reconstruct specific problems while being plausibly applicable to a range of analogous problems. That is, the challenge is to compose a form of equipment that will be able to function as an ***equipmental platform***.

The briefest of reminders of what general forms equipment has taken in the ancient and modern configurations – taken up from a contemporary problem-space – will help distinguish contemporary forms. The will do so, in part, by indicating a certain continuity of terms, elements, and problems across equipmental forms, as well as a certain discontinuity of metrics, modes, and objects.

AN ANTIQUE FORM OF EQUIPMENT

The guiding hypothesis of Foucault's lectures during 1981-2 at the *Collège de France*, *L'Herméneutique du sujet* was that in antiquity the challenge to "know thyself" had been inextricably coupled with another Delphic command to take "care of the self." [14] The twinned imperatives had made sense for as long as the goal of thinking had been linked to "a good life," or a "flourishing existence." Thus, for millennia, while truth-seeking was an essential part of a life well-led, it was not an autonomous goal or practice, nor was it disconnected from ethical work of the subject on himself and others. Rather the purpose of equipment and its precondition was to contribute to a thriving existence both individual and communal. It was within that context that the problem of how to transform *logos* into *ethos* made sense. Remarkably, today the problem of the relations of science, ethics, and a thriving existence seem once again to be under-going a process of a re-problematization.

There existed in antiquity a corpus of arts and techniques essential to the care of the self. Much of Foucault's inquiry in the 1981-2 lectures focused on this corpus, these practices, these exercises, constituent of, and essential to, self-formation and care.

> *"The test of one self as a thinking subject, who acts and thinks accordingly, who has as his goal, a certain transformation of the subject such that there is a self-constitution as an ethical subject of truth."* [15]

The challenge was to develop forms of exercises of thought whose goal was to connect thought to *êthos*. [16]

In the late antique world there existed a range of equipment developed in order to aid those engaged in these exercises. The key equipment that was required to take care of the self, to aid it in its confrontations with the external world, or most generally to accomplish the complex task of facing the future, was "*un équipement de discours vraies*." [17] An arsenal, if you will, of *logoi*. The Greek word for these '*discours vraies*,' is *paraskeuê*, which the French translate as *équipement.* As the name suggests, this equipment was designed to achieve a practical end. These 'true discourses,' these '*logoi*' were neither abstractions nor, as we say today, 'merely discursive.' They had their own materiality, their own concreteness, and consistency.

What was at stake in the use of this equipment was not primarily a quest for truth about the world or the self. Rather, the practice consisted in means of assimilating these true discourses as aids in confronting and coping with external events and internal passions. The challenge was not just to learn these maxims, often banal in themselves, but to make them an embodied dimension of one's existence. The purpose of equipment was to have them ready at hand when they were needed. True discourses were equipment to the extent they had been assimilated thoroughly, made to function as rational principles of action: «*fait du logos enseigné, appris, répété, assimilé, la forme spontanée du sujet agissant.*» [18] Learning these maxims was not hard, accomplishing the goal of making these *logoi* a principle of action, of self-mastery, of a flourishing existence, was a life-long process.

A MODERN FORM OF EQUIPMENT

Many other forms of equipment were no doubt developed in the ensuing centuries, especially in the Christian monasteries, and later more broadly in the wake of the Reformation. It was at the dawn of what is referred to as modern times, however, that a vastly powerful and comprehensive set of power relations, truth claims, modes of life, and their interfaces began to be given shape. That formation has been referred to most famously by Michel Foucault as the regime of bio-power. We argue that the regime of bio-power became the bio-political and expanded into ever-increasing spheres of life once its rulers and its specialists started experimenting with equipment.

In French Modern, Norms and Forms of the Social Environment, Rabinow traced some of the dimensions of how modern urban planning had gradually developed over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Urban planning had started with the rational reform of physical space but had gradually included more and more

elements into its purview. By the time such planning had become a socialist project during the 1930s it was proud of having expanded its scope from city planning – *un plan de ville* – to planning that included all those elements (spatial, social, psychological, architectural, hygienic, etc.,) that contributed to shaping an individual life – *un plan de vie*. The goal of planning was social and individual health as well as a well-policed order, as the expression goes. By 1942, the French "*Plan d'Équipement National*," defined *équipement* as everything that was not a "*don gratuit"* ("a gratuitous gift") of the soil, subsoil or climate. It is the work of each day and the country as a whole." [19]

A tool chest of *logoi* had been assembled gradually, and eventually (partially) put into practice by the State. Further, social technologies had been invented to oblige individuals to have these rational aids ready at hand on all occasions; or, failing that, at least to have social specialists nearby who could bring the corrective benefits of these technologies (and their '*discours vraies*') to bear with the shortest possible delay. [20]

While the core of welfare technologies continued to be developed after the Second World War in Europe and in certain Communist countries, around the ever-expanding domain of the social, in the United States a different problem-space and object domain was gradually emerging.

Through the 1960s concerns arose regarding the capacity of the developing medical and biological sciences to provide adequate means of analysis for understanding and coping with the ethical and ontological consequences of their own advances. A small number of leading scientists took the initiative to invite philosophers and theologians to think about ways in which research might be moving in the direction of transforming or even destroying human life. [21] Out of these and other political encounters, by the middle of the 1970s a new kind of specialist, the 'bio-ethicist,' had appeared alongside the life scientist as someone authorized to offer serious truth claims about the relation of science and society. The bio-ethicists were assigned the task of elaborating principles according to which "good" science could be discerned from "bad" science. Such discernment was intended to provide an ordering and regulating function, assuring that science would contribute to a healthy society and would guard against pathological practices.

From the first, efforts to bring together experts from the biological, human, and philosophical disciplines to address innovations in the biological sciences faced a central practical problem: the development of methodological practices and forms adequate to the task of precisely defining and effectively responding to

challenges and opportunities. In our terms, they faced the challenge of designing and implementing new *equipment*.

In retrospect, we can see that these efforts remained in a modern equipmental mode. In the first place, bio-ethical equipment was still being guided by the standards and objects of the social. Although bio-ethics appealed to such ethical figures as "the autonomous subject," "the person," and "marginalized communities," these ethical figures were taken up within the narrative of science and society. In the second place, bio-ethical equipment attempted to make visible critical limits within the sciences themselves. Thus, bio-ethical equipment was modern given its object (the social) and given its mode of operation (reform).

An important example of the early development of such equipment is the work of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The National Commission was tasked with developing practices appropriate to the protection of human subjects of research. It needed to respond to public outrage over the Tuskegee and Willowbrook experiments. And it needed to be adequate to the task of preventing the abuse of research subjects in the future. In sum, the National Commission was faced with the task of developing equipment appropriate to particular kinds of problems under particular circumstances and addressing those problems in particular kinds of ways.

The form these practices took was guided by the following considerations: a *serious speech act* (human beings are subjects whose autonomy must be respected), an *affect* (outrage at the abuse of such infamous research projects as the Tuskegee experiments), and an *ethical mode* (human subjects must be protected from such abuse in future through the guarantee of their free and informed consent). [22]

CONTEMPORARY EQUIPMENT

These bio-ethical objects appeared to function well as regulatory guardians of the objects of bio-power: the population (taken up as the community) and the body (taken up as the person). However, in the 1990s this set of arrangements became increasingly problematic. Advances in molecular and developmental genetics (viz. the Human Genome Project, somatic cell nuclear transfer, and human embryonic stem cell research) excited the fear that the life sciences not only put bodies and populations at risk, but human nature and even humanity itself. The human had been introduced as a solution, instead it had become a problem. In a discursive and regulatory flood, bio-ethicists advanced the concept of human dignity as a bulwark against the danger of dehumanization. The

attempt to reform the bio-ethical by bringing a humanitarian equipmental apparatus into this problem-space began to produce a new figure.

With advances in molecular and developmental genetics, the figure of the dignified human began to displace and reconfigure the social. Thus, a number of specific events originally anchored in the apparatus of bio-ethics functioned as vectors to bring elements of the figure of human dignity into shared spaces with the figure of biopower. This meant, among other things, that assemblages of power relations, truth claims, ethical issues, and affective zones were partially recomposed. This process of recomposition resulted in modulation, disarticulation, and reconfiguration of previously stabilized interfaces and connections, ethical issues, and zones of affect.

In short, the figure of human dignity gradually became a trading zone within which discourses and practices associated with the development of medical and biological sciences began to be reassembled such that the objects, discourses, and practices of bio-power were connected to and put in tension with the objects, discourses, and practices of human dignity. Heterogeneous truth claims were being made about what figure of anthropos was at stake, which specialists were authorized to distinguish true and false, and what might be the art of governance appropriate to the situation. Unwittingly, within this zone of turbulence other problem-spaces that would prove to be beyond the metrics of bio-power or human dignity both veridictionally and jurisdictionally began to be given form.

User's Guide:
Employing a Diagnostic of Equipmental Platforms

What is a ***user's guide***? A user's guide is a schematic presentation of the central categories of the diagnostic. It provides specific clarifications concerning definitions, relations, and the order of the tables, categories, and their connections. In short, the user's guide provides an orientation to, and an overview of, the principal features of the diagnostic as well as suggestions as to how they are to be approached.

The diagnostic is composed of three figures and their equipmental correlates. The purpose of the diagnostic is to distinguish, designate, characterize, and fashion the third figure and its equipmental correlates. The three figures in our diagnostic are well recognized if often misinterpreted figures Biopower and Human Dignity, and an emerging constellation of elements that are being brought into relation to one another and may well be coalescing into a third figure. Provisionally, we name this emergent configuration ***Synthetic Anthropos***. The term Synthetic Anthropos is a placeholder that draws attention to the ways in which significant real-world problems are being taken up through the redesign and reconfiguration of pathways. Examples of this work include synthetic biology, bio-complexity, and bio-security. It is crucial to note from the outset that the diagnostic itself has been composed using the modes, metrics, and relations characteristic of this third figure as we understand it today. This means, among other things, that the diagnostic is oriented to, and by, concepts such as *reconstructive veridiction*, *warranted assertion*, *forms-pathways* and other technical elements that will be presented and defined in the tables.

In short, we have composed the diagnostic as a reconstructive project. John Dewey writes:

> "Reconstruction can be nothing less than the work of developing, of forming, of producing (in the literal sense of that word) the intellectual instrumentalities which will progressively direct inquiry into the deeply and inclusively human—that is to say moral—facts of the present scene and situation." [23]

It bears repeating that the figures, categories, and equipmental platforms presented in the diagnostic are in no way to be taken as epochal indicators. There have been other figures and other equipmental platforms in the past, there are others in the present, and without doubt there will be others in the future. The three figures, their

equipmental correlates, and salient features have been selected from among other possible candidates. Moreover, other diagnostics of contemporary equipmental platforms could be designed and synthesized. It is our hope, dear user, that our current diagnostic will facilitate such contemporary compositional work.

□ What is diagnostics of equipmental platforms?

A ***diagnostic*** has two functions. The first is analytic. It functions to lay out tables of categories. That is to say, a diagnostic serves a critical function; it facilitates the work of decomposition of complex wholes in order to test the logic on the basis of which composition has taken place. In diagnostics, the work of decomposition can not be an end-in-itself. Rather, analysis must be followed by recomposition. This synthetic work is the second function of a diagnostic. A **diagnostic** is thus a device operating to distinguish and designate, as well as characterize and fashion categories and elements so as to give them an appropriate form. Here as elsewhere what we mean by *appropriate* ranges over elective affinity, mutual consistency, coherence, and co-operability.

A diagnostic, as an analytic and synthetic device, is initially used to decompose figures and their equipmental counterparts. Such analysis facilitates testing and experimentation with the critical limits and appropriateness of figures to equipment. This testing and experimentation facilitates and is followed by the recompositional work of developing new equipmental platforms for work on emerging figures, i.e. design and synthesis.

Our diagnostic mode takes orientation from, but functions differently than, an analysis of ***regimes of veridiction*** and ***regimes of jurisdiction*** first articulated by Michel Foucault in 1978. [24]

What are regimes of veridiction and regimes of jurisdiction? Regimes of veridiction and regimes of jurisdiction, on our reading, are diagnostic categories that distinguish the connections between ways of dividing up *true and false* and ways of *governing* oneself and others. Foucault suggested that the effort to grasp these "ensembles of practices," these "fragments of reality that induce such particular effects in the real as the distinction between true and false implicit in the ways men 'direct,' 'govern,' and 'conducted' themselves and others," were defining themes of his work. The challenge, as he articulated it, was to analyze the history of the connection between these regimes in view of the fact that the knowledge one needs to take up such analysis is inevitably produced by the very history of the regimes under consideration. The analytic question thus becomes modal: "How can one analyze the connection between ways of distinguishing true and false and ways of governing oneself and others?" [25]

Foucault indicated that the function and purpose of his analytic question was, in the end, more than critical. It was designed to facilitate the opening up of spaces of inventiveness. That is to say, analysis of regimes of veridiction and jurisdiction and the connections between them, constitute,

> "The search for a new foundation for each of these practices, in itself and relative to the other, the will to discover a different way of governing oneself through a different way of dividing up true and false—this is what I would call 'political spirituality.'"

An analysis of regimes of veridiction and jurisdiction and their forms and connections provides a means to test the critical limits of truth and governance, so as to question these critical limits. The work of the analytic is oriented to politics as the question of truth and governance.

Diagnostics, as we are devising it, has a related but different orientation. In the first place, the difference in orientation entails a shift from the political and governance to the ontology and ethics of figures and equipment. Such a shift facilitates both the testing and experimentation with the critical limits and appropriateness of given figures to given equipmental platforms, as well as the recomposition of these figures and platforms.

In the second place, we shift from ***regimes*** to ***modes***. Rather than regimes of veridiction and regimes of jurisdiction, our diagnostic attends to the mode of veridiction and mode of jurisdiction at work in contemporary figures. Mode of veridiction and mode of jurisdiction are diagnostic categories that distinguish connections between ways of dividing up true and false in contemporary figures, and ways of ordering interventionary practices in a given equipmental figure. Mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, within a given figure, speech acts are taken to count in the register of true and false, as well as the ways in which such speech acts are produced and authorized. Of these authorized speech acts only those that can be made to operate according to a specific metric will be qualify and be ordered as part of the figure. A metric, in brief, is the standard by which, within a figuration, aspects of things are selected and coordinated as elements about which true and false speech acts are made and taken seriously. A mode of veridiction must be made to cohere and co-operate with to a particular mode of ontology.

Mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the ways in which within a given equipmental figure a specified range of activities is discriminated as appropriate and subsequently ordered, i.e. organized in relation to one another. The kinds of activities the mode of jurisdiction discriminates and orders are those that appropriately govern the object

of a given figure. Activities that govern an object will be taken to be appropriate if they can be made to operate according to a specific metric, i.e. if they can adjust the object according to the requirements of the standard at work in a contemporary figure. A mode of jurisdiction thus must be made to cohere and co-operate with a particular set of ordering standards laid out according to a mode of veridiction, and vice versa.

A mode of veridiction and a mode of jurisdiction in a diagnostic thus functions to test the legitimate limits and appropriateness of the interface between truth and ontology on the one hand and ethical practices on the other. Given the pragmatic challenge of designing and synthesizing new equipmental platforms for work on emerging figures, analysis of these two modes is of central importance.

EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS

Equipmental platforms are characterized by a constantly available generality. That is to say, platforms must be designed and synthesized in such a way as to be able to function effectively to reconstruct specific problems, while being plausibly applicable to a range of analogous problems.

An equipmental platform can be distinguished from equipmental activities and from specific instances of equipment. An equipmental platform discriminates appropriate (i.e. coherent and co-operable) equipmental activities and functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities it distinguishes and organizes are those activities that govern objects within a given contemporary figure. These activities taken as an integrated series are instantiated as specific instances of equipment. Put briefly, equipmental platforms function as the basis for the organization of the activities of specific equipment.

Equipmental platforms function in relation to contemporary figures in two important ways. First, platforms contribute to the determination of a problem within a broad field of problematization. Second, platforms contribute to the specification and design of possible solutions to this problem. Equipmental platforms, in short, function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization into concrete problems such that these problems can be taken up as a set of possible solutions.

□ Distinguishing the Tables, Categories, and Connections

The diagnostic consists of four ***tables***, each of which is composed of ***categories*** that are made into series by ***connections***.

TABLES

The user will find two different types of tables included in the diagnostic. The first type, which consists of only one table, provides a diagnostic of ***contemporary figures***. The second type, which consists of three tables, provides a diagnostic of ***equipmental figures***. What is the relation between these two types of figures in this diagnostic? In this diagnostic a contemporary figure worked over for a pragmatic purpose in a problem-space is an equipmental figure.

Table of Contemporary Figures

The table of contemporary figures is designed to provide the categorical distinctions needed to address the question: what, in the contemporary, is being problematized? We have selected three contemporary figures: the figure of Biopower, the figure of Human Dignity, and the figure of Synthetic Anthropos.

These figures do not have a single defining or summary diacritic. A common error is to identify one element, make it the defining diacritic, and come to believe that these figures are epochal or totalizing. Rather, each figure consists of a series. Diagnostically speaking, the series is composed of integral and integrating categories. That is to say, the synthesis of the categories that make up a series is a figure.

Table of Equipmental Figures

The table of equipmental figures is designed to provide the categorical distinctions needed to address three interrelated questions. The first concerns the question: what does equipment consist of? The second concerns the question: how is equipment composed? The third concerns the question: what is equipment used for? The tables of equipmental figures themselves thus form a series.

The equipmental figures are connected to but can be distinguished from the contemporary figures. A contemporary figure worked over for a pragmatic purpose in a problem-space—i.e. made equipmental—is an equipmental figure. The figure of biopower made equipmental is biopolitical equipment. The figure of human dignity made equipmental is human rights equipment. The figure of synthetic anthropos made equipmental is Human Practices equipment.

As with contemporary figures, equipmental figures are analytically composed of series. Equipmental figures thus do not have a single defining or summary diacritic. Analytically speaking, the series is composed of integral and integrating categories. That is to say the consolidation of the categories that make up a series is a figure.

CATEGORIES

Analytically, each of the figures is composed of a series, which in turn are composed of integral and integrated categories. The categories in the diagnostic have been selected for their discriminatory power. Further, they provide heuristic utility, aiding the work of composing new equipment as well as orienting inquiry.

The categories are designed to be recombinatorial. That is to say, the categories that make up each series can be recombined in any number of different ways, although such recombination would likely result in the production or identification of figures other than those elaborated here. In addition, inquiry into empirical cases, which this diagnostic is designed to facilitate, may well suggest other recombinations.

Categories of Contemporary Figures

The series of which the contemporary figures are composed consist of the following categories: (1) **Mode of Veridiction**, (2) **Metric (relational field)**, (3) **Mode of Ontology**, and (4) **Object (relation)**.

- ***CATAGORIES OF THE FIGURE OF BIOPOWER***

The figure of biopower taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series: *Logos* (verification), Normalization, Probabilistic (series), and Population-Body.

- ***CATAGORIES OF THE FIGURE OF HUMAN DIGNITY***

The figure of human dignity **diagnostically** consists of the series: *Nomos* (declamation), Dignity, Archonic (being), and Humanity-Human.

 CATAGORIES OF THE FIGURE OF SYNTHETIC ANTHROPOS

The figure of Synthetic Anthropos is **diagnostically** composed of the series: *Ethos* (reconstruction), Flourishing, Emergent (assemblages), and Forms-Pathways.

Equipmental Figures

Equipmental figures consist of the modules: Mode of *Ethik*, Serious Speech Act, and Affect. Equipmental composition **diagnostically** consists of the series: Mode of Composition, Specialist, and Venue. Equipmental platforms consist of the series: Mode of Jurisdiction, Method, and Purpose.

 CATAGORIES OF BIOPOLITICAL EQUIPMENT

Biopolitical equipmental figures consist of the modules: Prudential, Verified, Reduction, and Disinterest. Biopolitical equipmental composition consists of the series: Planning, Social Technocrats, and Governmental. Biopolitical equipmental platforms consist of the series: Regulation, Modulation, and Security.

 CATAGORIES OF HUMAN RIGHTS EQUIPMENT

Human rights equipmental figures consist of the modules: Vigilance, Authorized Testimony, and Commitment. Human rights equipmental composition consists of the series: Redressing, Humanitarian Technocrats, and Rights-Based NGOs. Human rights equipmental platforms consists of the series: Protection, Emergency Intervention, and Restoration.

 CATAGORIES OF HUMAN PRACTICES EQUIPMENT

Human practices equipmental figures consist of the modules: Vigorous Insistence, Warranted Assertion, and Assurance. Human practices equipmental composition consists of the series: Leveraging, Second Order Participant, and Agile Assemblages. Human practices equipmental platforms consist of the series: Remediation, Collaboration, and Resourceful Solutions.

CONNECTIONS

The connections among the categories in the table consist of both horizontal and vertical sequences. In the narrative portion of the diagnostic, the sequences by which we explain the relations among categories have been selected and traversed that serve to define and stabilize the categories, their relations, and their significance within series. However, in principle, any number of other sequences and combinations of connections could be selected and followed.

A note is warranted concerning the function of these sequences and connections in defining and stabilizing the categories presented in the Equipmental Modules table of the diagnostic. The categories in this table, unlike those, in the other tables, can not be given as an integrated series in advance. Because of this, the categories in this table cannot be defined uniquely by appeal to the series, per se. The categories in the table of contemporary figures, for example, can be defined and related by following vertical sequences through and across the series which constitutes a figure. That is to say, these figures can be described through the internal interfacing of the elements in a series.

However, in the case of the table laying out equipmental modules, by definition, there is no prior integrated series—i.e. equipment—that it could function as a definitional point of reference in advance. Such a reference point only comes into play once modules qualify for and coalesce into a series available for equipmental composition. It follows that the description of how elements in this table qualify as modules for a given equipmental figure, and thereby coalesce such that through interfacing and composition they can then be made into a series, must be done by way of constructing connections to the table of contemporary figures.

In other words the elements of the Equipmental Modules table must first be described by characterizing the connections between those elements, and specified elements in the table of Contemporary Figures. Such connections thus function as relay points through which the equipmental modules are connected up and made to function as a coalesced series.

A Diagnostic of Equipmental Platforms

CONTEMPORARY FIGURES: WHAT IS BEING PROBLEMATIZED?

Figure	Mode of Veridiction	Metric (Relational Field)	Mode of Ontology	Object (Relation)
Biopower	*Logos* (verification)	Normalization	Probabilistic (series)	Population-Body
Human Dignity	*Nomos* (declamation)	Dignity	Archonic (being)	Humanity-Human
Synthetic Anthropos	*Ethos* (reconstruction)	Flourishing	Emergent (assemblages)	Forms-Pathways

EQUIPMENTAL MODULES: WHAT DOES EQUIPMENT CONSIST OF?

Figure	Mode of *Ethik*	Serious Speech Act	Affect
Biopolitical	Prudential	Verified Reduction	Disinterest
Human Rights	Vigilance	Authorized Testimony	Commitment
Human Practices	Vigorous Insistence	Warranted Assertion	Assurance

EQUIPMENTAL COMPOSITION: HOW IS EQUIPMENT COMPOSED?

Figure	Mode of Composition	Specialist	Venue
Biopolitical	Planning	Social Technocrats	Governmental
Human Rights	Redressing	Humanitarian Technocrats	Rights Based NGOs
Human Practices	Leveraging (T,T,R)	Second Order Participant	Agile Assemblages

EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS: WHAT IS EQUIPMENT USED FOR?

Figure	Mode of Jurisdiction	Method	Purpose
Biopolitical	Regulation	Modulation	Security
Human Rights	Protection	Emergency Intervention	Restoration
Human Practices	Remediation	Collaboration	Resourceful solutions

A **contemporary figure** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series:
Mode of veridiction, Metric (relational field), Mode of Ontology, Object (relation):

Figure	Mode of Veridiction	Metric (Relational Field)	Mode of Ontology	Object (Relation)
Biopower	*Logos* (verification)	Normalization	Probabilistic (series)	Population-Body
Human Dignity	*Nomos* (declamation)	Dignity	Archonic (being)	Humanity-Human
Synthetic Anthropos	*Ethos* (reconstruction)	Flourishing	Emergent (assemblages)	Forms-Pathways

- **What is the Mode of Veridiction in a contemporary figure?**
- The **mode of veridiction** in a contemporary figure distinguishes the ways in which, within a given figure, the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. Of these authorized speech acts only those will qualify as part of the figure which can be made to operate in a given relational field according to a specific **metric**.
- **What is a Metric (Relational Field) in a contemporary figure?**
- A **metric** in a contemporary figure designates the standard by which serious speech acts are ordered. By so doing, the metric specifies and associates aspects of things as elements and allows those elements to be displayed and coordinated as a relational field. A given relational field is characterized by a defined mode of ontology.
- **What is a Mode of Ontology in a contemporary figure?**
- A **mode of ontology** in a contemporary figure characterizes the way in which elements in a relational field exist and are taken up. The mode of ontology interfaces elements so as to be connectable in order to constitute a single object. Given that the mode of ontology characterizes a relational field, it follows that the **objects** in a figure of contemporary ontology must be taken up as **relations**.
- **What is an Object in a contemporary figure?**

- An **object** in a contemporary figure is fashioned, in part, by the reworking of things and elements. Fashioning consists of association, coordination, and connection. The operation of fashioning homogenizes elements otherwise of heterogeneous scale and quality. The object can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series. That is to say, it functions within the series as an anchor point thereby consolidating the series as a figure.

The **figure of biopower** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series:
Logos (verification), Normalization, Probabilistic (series), Population-Body:

Figure	Mode of Veridiction	Metric (Relational Field)	Mode of Ontology	Object (Relation)
Biopower	*Logos* (verification)	Normalization	Probabilistic (series)	Population-Body

- **What is *Logos* (Verification) as a mode of veridiction in the figure of biopower?**
- ***Logos* (verification)** as a mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, within the figure of biopower, the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. This mode of veridiction only permits those speech acts to be taken seriously which can be verified through the reduction of particulars to calculable regularities or patterns. Within the figure of biopower such calculable regularities and patterns constitute *logoi*. Verification means both "to substantiate" that is, to make into cases (this is the hermeneutic side of verification) and to "prove the truth of something," (this is the positivist side). Within the figure of biopower, *logoi* take form as the human sciences. The human sciences expand through an ever-accumulating collection of facts and an ever-receding attempt to ground this collection of facts in a definitive manner. The way in which serious speech acts are produced involves incessant movement between an attempt to verify on the one hand truth claims through facts, and on the other hand generalization or theory. Thus, the human sciences generate systematic verification through the reduction of particulars to calculable regularities or patterns. Of such authorized speech acts only those will qualify as part of the figure of biopower which can be made to operate according to a **metric of normalization.**
- **What is Normalization as a metric in the figure of biopower?**
- **Normalization** as a metric in the figure of biopower designates the standard by which **verifications** are ordered. The term norm is normative: it designates a project to order aspects of things according to regular distributions. Norms constitute the grounds for normalization. The standard by which things are distributed in a regular fashion is a **metric**. As a metric, normalization designates what type of things is to be taken seriously, i.e. social facts. Normalization specifies aspects of social facts as elements. The elements that normalization as a metric specifies are those that can be brought into a field and normed. The term normed

designates the way in which elements are associated, displayed, and coordinated as a relational field. This relational field is characterized by a defined mode of ontology: **probabilistic**.

- **What is Probabilistic as a mode of ontology in a figure of biopower?**
- A P**robabilistic** mode of ontology in a figure of biopower characterizes the way in which elements in a relational field of normalization exist and are distributed. A probabilistic mode is neither geometric nor arithmetic; rather it requires a type of logic that is capable of characterizing a series and the likelihood of that series unfolding in a particular manner. That is to say, the kind of element that counts in a probabilistic mode of ontology is a series. A probabilistic mode of ontology interfaces elements so as to be connectable into a single object. The kind of interfaces required within a probabilistic mode of ontology is the ones that can be fit into a series. Elements can only take on their significance for the figure of biopower (i.e. become an object) when placed within a series (i.e. a probabilistic relation). For example, the meaning of an individual suicide takes on its social meaning only when placed in a series. A probabilistic series as an ontological mode is appropriate to the generation of calculable regularities characteristic of verification as a mode of veridiction. Given that probabilistic series characterize a relational field, it follows that the **objects** in a figure of biopower must be taken up as **relations**. The object (relation) of concern in the figure of biopower is **population-body**.
- **What is Population-Body as an object in the figure of biopower?**
- **Population-body** as an object in a figure of biopower is fashioned, in part, by the reworking of distributed elements. Fashioning, consisting of association, coordination, and connection, homogenizes elements otherwise of heterogeneous scale and quality (i.e. populations and bodies). The object population-body can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series that makes up the figure of biopower. That is to say, the object population-body functions within the series as an anchor point thereby consolidating the series as the figure of biopower.

The **figure of human dignity** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series:
Nomos (declamation), Dignity, Archonic (being), Humanity-Human:

Figure	Mode of Veridiction	Metric (Relational Field)	Mode of Ontology	Object (Relation)
Human Dignity	*Nomos* (declamation)	Dignity	Archonic (being)	Humanity-Human

- **What is *Nomos* (Declamation) as a mode of veridiction in the figure of human dignity?**
- ***Nomos* (declamation)** as a mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, in the figure of human dignity speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declaims the status of *anthropos* as dignified. This serious speech act is not established by any *logos*. Only those serious speech acts will qualify as part of the figure of human dignity which can be made to operate in a **relational field** according to the **metric of dignity**.
- **What is Dignity as a metric in a figure of human dignity?**
- **Dignity** as a metric in the figure of human dignity designates the standard by which **declamations** are ordered. As a metric, dignity specifies those aspects of things that count as elements, and are taken seriously. The elements that dignity as a metric specifies are incommensurability, incomparability, autonomy, and inalterability. The elements specified can then be associated, displayed, and coordinated as a relational field. This relational field is characterized by a defined mode of ontology: the **archonic**.
- **What is the Archonic as an ontological mode in the figure of human dignity?**
- **The archonic** as an ontological mode in the figure of human dignity characterizes the way in which essential, incomparable, and inalterable elements in a field of dignity exist and are taken up. The elements that count in an archonic mode of ontology are beings. Dignity in an archonic mode of ontology brings these elements into a relational field so as to constitute them as a single object. Elements only take on their significance for the figure of human dignity (i.e. become an object) when constituted as an archonic being. Given that the mode of ontology characterizes a relational field, it follows that the **object** in a figure of

human dignity must be taken up as a **relation**. The object in the figure of human dignity is **humanity-human**.

- **What is Humanity-Human as an object in a figure of human dignity?**
- **Humanity-human** as an object is fashioned, in part, by the reworking of things and elements Fashioning consists of association, coordination, and connection. The operation of fashioning homogenizes elements otherwise of heterogeneous scale and quality (i.e. the human and humanity). Humanity-human can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series that constitutes the figure of human dignity. That is to say, it functions within the series as an anchor point, thereby consolidating the series as the figure of human dignity.

The **figure of synthetic anthropos** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series: *Ethos* (reconstruction), Flourishing, Emergent (assemblage), Forms-Pathways:

Figure	Mode of Veridiction	Metric (Relational Field)	Mode of Ontology	Object (Relation)
Synthetic Anthropos	*Ethos* (reconstruction)	Flourishing	Emergent (assemblages)	Forms-Pathways

- **What is *Ethos* (reconstruction) as a mode of veridiction in the figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- ***Ethos* (reconstruction)** as a mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, within the figure of synthetic anthropos, the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are authorized and produced. The speech acts that can be authorized as true and false in reconstruction as a mode of veridiction are those assertions that can be put to the test in experimental and pragmatic situations and subsequently can be reused in reworked form. These experimental and pragmatic situations are more than just laboratory parameters per se. Rather; they contribute to and are conditioned by an *ethos*. As such, although technical virtuosity and prowess are significant capacities within this mode of veridiction, such capacities only enter fully into the play of true and false when they contribute to and are conditioned by an *ethos*. Reconstruction as a mode of veridiction acknowledges that thinking takes place not only within a problem-space in which knowledge of the problem-space depends not only on prior experimental and pragmatic conditions and results, but equally on an orientation to the near future. *Ethos* (reconstruction) as a mode of veridiction functions to provide determinations for an indeterminate and unsatisfactory situation in more than technical or declamatory terms. Rather, only those authorized speech acts will qualify as part of the figure of synthetic anthropos which can be made to operate according to a **metric of flourishing**.
- **What is Flourishing as a metric in the figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- **Flourishing** as a metric in the figure of synthetic anthropos designates the standard by which reconstructive speech acts are ordered. This standard operates within a reconstructed situation. Consequently, the standard can be specified although it is neither universalistic nor relativist. Flourishing as a metric thus designates which things count as real and of concern in the figure of synthetic anthropos. As a metric it specifies those aspects of things as elements that are amenable to and in need of reconstruction. These elements are not

characterized by a pre-given and fixed form but are themselves products of previous reconstructions. Once elements are specified, they can then be associated, displayed, and coordinated as a relational field. In sum, as a metric, flourishing brings elements into relation with one another and indicates how they should be associated. How these connections are made depends on the mode of ontology. Within the figure of synthetic anthropos the **mode of ontology** is **emergence**.

- **What is Emergence as a mode of ontology in the figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- **Emergence** as a mode of ontology in the figure of synthetic anthropos characterizes the way in which elements in a relational field of flourishing exist and are assembled. The elements that qualify in an emergent mode of ontology are those that can be made into assemblages. Emergence as a mode of ontology brings elements into adjacency and interfaces them so that they can be assembled into a single object. Elements take on their significance for the figure of synthetic anthropos (i.e. become an object) when made to be an operative part of an assemblage. The significance of such an assembled object cannot be reduced to its constitutive elements and relations. Emergence characterizes a mode of the real in which previous arrangements are necessary but not determinative. Given that emergence characterizes a relational field of flourishing, it follows that the assembled **objects** in a figure of synthetic anthropos are brought together and reconstructed as the **relation forms-pathways**.
- **What is Forms-Pathways as an object in a figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- **Forms-pathways** as an object is fashioned, in part, through the reworking of things and elements. Fashioning, consisting of association, coordination, and connection, homogenizes elements previously of heterogeneous scale and quality (i.e. forms and pathways). The first reworked element is a connective one—a pathway. Pathways are synthesized and integrated into different forms. Forms are the second reworked element. Forms-pathways as a single object relation can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series that constitutes the figure of synthetic anthropos. That is to say, it functions within the series as an anchor point thereby consolidating the series as a figure of synthetic anthropos.

A **contemporary figure** worked over for a pragmatic purpose in a problem-space is
An **equipmental figure**.

- The figure of **biopower** made equipmental is **biopolitical** equipment.
- The figure of **human dignity** made equipmental is **human rights** equipment.
- The figure of **synthetic anthropos** made equipmental is **human practices** equipment.

Equipment is composed analytically of the modules: Mode of *Ethik*□, Serious Speech Act, Affect.

Figure	Mode of *Ethik*□	Serious Speech Act	Affect
Biopolitical	Prudential	Verified Reduction	Disinterest
Human Rights	Vigilance	Authorized Testimony	Commitment
Human Practices	Vigorous Insistence	Warranted Assertion	Assurance

- **What is a Mode of *Ethik*□ as an equipmental module?**
- A **mode of *ethik*□** as a module distinguishes the way in which, within a given equipmental figure, practices are taken up as ethical. Those practices qualify *as ethical* which can be made to operate on an axis of better and worse. How does a given mode of *ethik*□ qualify *as a* ***module*** in a given equipmental figure? It qualifies as an equipmental module when it can be made to operate on an axis of better and worse relative to a metric, i.e. the standards that order the contemporary figure from which an equipmental figure is made. That is to say, a given mode of *ethik*□ will qualify as an equipmental module once it is calibrated according to a specific metric of a contemporary figure. Recall, that in a contemporary figure the metric orders a mode of veridiction and is characterized by a mode of ontology. Given this alignment between the metric and a mode of *ethik*□, the question of what qualifies as a claim in the register of true and false within an equipmental figure, i.e. a serious speech act, must always be adjusted to a mode of *ethik*□. In the modularization of

equipment, prior to equipmental composition, the mode of veridiction and the mode of ontology function as relay points between a mode of *ethik* and a **serious speech act**.

- **What is a Serious Speech act as an equipmental module?**
- A **serious speech act** as a module designates that subset of speech acts that count as true and false in an equipmental figure. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's mode of veridiction and that meet the requirements of a given figure's mode of ontology, qualify as equipmental modules. Just as the mode of *ethik* must be made to operate with a given figure's **metric** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as qualified serious speech acts must be made to cohere with a mode of veridiction and meet the requirements of a **mode of ontology** to qualify as an equipmental module, equipment also consists of affective modules that must also be made to cohere with a given figure's **mode of veridiction** in order to qualify.
- **What is Affect an equipmental module?**
- **Affect** as a module in an equipmental figure characterizes the way in which a **relational field** is maintained such that a specific type of disposition can be generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in a relational field only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's **mode of veridiction** qualify as equipmental modules. Affect coheres with a mode of veridiction when it functions in a relational field such that other dispositions will be less likely to disrupt production the kind of serious speech acts and modes of *ethik* appropriate to work in and on a given figure. Recall that a given figure's mode of veridiction and mode of ontology serve as the relay points between a mode of *ethik* and serious speech acts. Given the relations between affect, relational field, and mode of veridiction, of those affects that qualify only those will count that can be made to coalesce with an equipmental figure's mode of *ethik* and serious speech acts. Those affects which count, operate to bolster and stabilize a disposition to a modular mode of *ethik* and modular serious speech acts. As such affect is integral to equipmental composition.

The **figure of biopower** made equipmental is **biopolitical equipment.**

Biopolitical equipment is composed analytically of the modules: Prudential, Verified Reduction, Disinterest.

Figure	Mode of *Ethik*	Serious Speech Act	Affect
Biopolitical	Prudential	Verified Reduction	Disinterest

- **What is Prudential as a module in biopolitical equipment?**
- **Prudential**, as mode of *ethik* distinguishes the way in which, in biopolitical equipment, practices are taken up as ethical. The metric of normalization in the figure of biopower orients and directs practice toward an ever-receding future such that the present can always be improved by small incremental steps. Concomitantly and definitionally a final and fixed state is never achieved. As such, those practices will be taken to be ethical that are ordered so as to contribute to the normalization of populations-bodies through constant observation and inflection. A prudential mode of *ethik* operates in a way that includes but cannot be reduced to a direct means-ends calculus. Rather, prudence calibrates practice along an axis of better and worse relative to the metric of normalization. Biopolitical equipment thus involves optimization, but optimization should not be confused with prudence because within this mode of *ethik* optimization can function as a means but not as an end. In the contemporary figure of biopower the field of normalization structures a specific mode of veridiction—*logos* (verification)—and is characterized by a specific mode of ontology—probabilistic (series). Therefore, in biopolitical equipment the question of what qualifies as a claim in the register of true and false, i.e. a serious speech act, must always be accounted for in evaluations about how prudential a given judgment or action is. In biopolitical equipment verification as a mode of veridiction functions as a relay point between normalization and probabilistic series. In a homologous manner, the mode of veridiction will also function as a relay between a prudential mode and **verified reduction** as a type of serious speech act.

- **What is Verified Reduction as a module in biopolitical equipment?**
- **Verified reduction** as a module in biopolitical equipment designates that class of speech acts that qualify as true and false in the human sciences. Within this class of authorized serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with *logos* (verification) as a mode of veridiction and meet the requirements of probabilistic series as the mode of ontology qualify as equipmental modules. Just as a prudential *ethik* must be made to operate with **normalization** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as verified reduction must be made to cohere with **verification** and meet the requirements of a **probabilistic series** to qualify as an equipmental module, biopolitical equipment also consists of an affect module—disinterest—generated in a relational field that must also be made to cohere with ***logos*** **(verification)** in order to qualify.
- **What is disinterest as a module in biopolitical equipment?**
- **Disinterest** as a module characterizes the way in which a field of normalization is maintained such that a specific type of disposition is generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in this relational field only those that can be made to cohere with **verification** as a mode of veridiction qualify as an equipmental module. Disinterest coheres with this mode of veridiction when it serves to function in the relational field such that other dispositions will be less likely to disrupt production of the *logoi* and prudential *ethik* needed to work in and on a field of normalization. For this reason, an affect of disinterest contributes to the authorization of speech acts and maintenance of relational fields. Recall that verification and probabilistic series serve as the relay points between a prudential *ethik* and verified reductions. Thus, in biopolitical equipment, those dispositions are privileged that can be made to coalesce with a prudential *ethik* and verified reductions. Disinterest operates to bolster and stabilize a disposition to a prudential *ethik* and verified reductions as modules that count in biopolitical equipment.

The figure of human dignity made equipmental is human rights equipment.

Human rights equipment is composed analytically of the modules: Vigilance, Authorized Testimony, Commitment.

Figure	Mode of *Ethik*	Serious Speech Act	Affect
Human Rights	Vigilance	Authorized Testimony	Commitment

- **What is Vigilance as a module in human rights equipment?**
- **Vigilance** as an equipmental module distinguishes the way in which, within human rights equipment, practices are taken up as ethical. Given that dignity as the metric of the figure of human dignity is archonic, and therefore cannot be produced, modified, or improved (but can be ignored, transgressed, or violated), equipment that coheres and co-operates with it requires a distinctive mode of *ethik*. **Vigilance** as a mode of *ethik* appropriate to dignity is animated by a universal moral essence. However, this mode always operates in a particular and changing present, in which, consequently, human rights equipment is made to function in a mode of continual alertness, scanning for threats and generating an increasing number of cases that count as violations of rights. Vigilance calibrates practice in universal terms always in tension with specific cases relative to the metric of dignity. The metric of dignity, recall, structures a specific mode of veridiction—*nomos* (declamation). Therefore, in human rights equipment that which counts as a claim in the register of true and false, i.e. declamation, stems from a vigilant mode of *ethik* in which threats and violations are identified. In human rights equipment, declamation as a mode of veridiction functions as a relay point between dignity and an archonic being. In a homologous manner declamation functions as a relay point between a vigilant mode and **authorized testimony**.
- **What is Authorized Testimony as a module in human rights equipment?**
- **Authorized testimony** as a module in human rights equipment designates that class of speech acts that qualify as true and false in human rights equipment. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that

can be made to cohere with *nomos* (declamation) as a mode of veridiction and which meet the requirements of archonic being as the mode of ontology qualify as equipmental modules for human rights. Just as a vigilant *ethik* must be made to cohere with **dignity** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as authorized testimony must be made to cohere with **declamation** and meet the requirements of **archonic being** to qualify as an equipmental module, human rights equipment also consists of an affect module—commitment—generated in a relational field that must be made to cohere with **declamation** in order to qualify.

- **What is Commitment as a module in human rights equipment?**
- **Commitment** as a module in human rights equipment characterizes the way in which a field of dignity is maintained such that a specific type of disposition is generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in this relational field only those that can be made to cohere with **declamation** as a mode of veridiction qualify as an equipmental module. Commitment coheres with declamation when it functions in a relational field such that violations of dignity are likely to be identified and such that those whose task it is to identify violations maintain the appropriate vigilance. For this reason, an affect of commitment contributes to the authorization of speech acts and the maintenance of relational fields. Recall, that declamation and archonic being serve as relay points between a vigilant *ethik* and authorized testimony. Thus, in human rights equipment an affect of commitment is required that not only can be made to cohere with a disposition to a vigilant mode of *ethik* and authorized testimony, but that also operates to bolster and sustain a vigilant *ethik* and the production of authorized testimony.

The figure of synthetic anthropos made equipmental is human practices equipment.

Human practices equipment is composed analytically of the modules:
Vigorous insistence, Warranted Assertions, Assurance.

Figure	Mode of *Ethik*	Serious Speech Act	Affect
Human Practices	Vigorous Insistence	Warranted Assertion	Assurance

- **What is Vigorous Insistence as a module in human practices equipment?**
- **Vigorous insistence** as a mode of *ethik* distinguishes how human practices equipment is put into use in a relational field of flourishing through constant attention and interventions into problems that are held to be significant, real-world, and remediable in the near future. A mode of vigorous insistence orients and directs human practices equipment toward the near future such that indeterminate and unstable situations can be remediated. Vigorous insistence thus shares an elective affinity with the relational field characteristic of the figure of **synthetic anthropos**, flourishing. A vigorously insistent mode of *ethik* is appropriate to human practices equipment not because it optimizes means-ends relationships. Rather, vigorous insistence pragmatically favors and encourages practices according to an axis of helpful and unhelpful relative to the metric of flourishing. Human practices equipment involves utility, but should not be confused with optimization or standardization as ends-in-themselves. The metric of flourishing, recall, structures a specific mode of veridiction—*ethos* (reconstruction) and is characterized by a specific mode of ontology—emergent assemblages. In this way, the metric flourishing functions as a relay point between a mode of vigorous insistence and **warranted assertion** as a type of serious speech act. Given the alignment of flourishing and vigorous insistence the question of what counts as a claim in the register of true and false, i.e. **warranted assertion**, is likely to be generated through a vigorous search for helpful solutions to the problems specified by a metric.

- **What is Warranted Assertion as a module in human practices equipment?**
- **Warranted assertion** designates that class of speech acts that are authorized to count as true and false in human practices equipment. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that contribute to and are capable of cohering with *ethos* (reconstruction) as a mode of veridiction and meeting the requirements of emergent assemblages as the mode of ontology, qualify as equipmental modules. Just as **vigorous insistence** as a mode of *ethik* must be capable of contributing to **flourishing** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as **warranted assertion** must contribute to **reconstruction** and **emergent assemblages** to qualify as an equipmental module, human practices equipment also consists of an affect module—**assurance**—generated in a relational field that must be made to contribute to reconstruction in order to qualify.
- **What is Assurance as a module in human practice equipment?**
- **Assurance** as a module in human practices equipment characterizes the way in which a field of **flourishing** is organized such that a specific type of disposition is generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in this relational field only those that contribute to **reconstruction** as a mode of veridiction qualify as an equipmental module. Assurance contributes to this mode of veridiction when it bolsters the insistence that, given existing resources, solutions must be possible even when the path to them remains to be invented. For this reason among others an affect of assurance positions one to make warranted assertions and contributes to the maintenance of a relational field of flourishing. Human practices equipment is strengthened by passing through experimental testing. Recall that reconstruction and emergent assemblages serve as relay points between vigorous insistence as a mode of *ethik* and warranted assertions as a privileged type of serious speech act. Thus, in human practices equipment an affect of assurance is encouraged in that it contributes to vigorous insistence and warranted assertions. Assurance operates to enable and favor an ethical disposition toward **vigorous insistence** and a resolve that **warranted assertions** can be devised. As such assurance is integral to the composition of human practices equipment.

The design of the interfaces of equipmental modules and their synthesis is **equipmental composition**.

Equipmental composition analytically consists of the series:
Mode of Composition, Specialist, Venue.

Figure	Mode of Composition	Specialist	Venue
Biopolitical	Planning	Social Technocrats	Governmental
Human Rights	Redressing	Humanitarian Technocrats	Rights-based NGOs
Human Practices	Leveraging (T,T,R)	Second Order Participants	Agile Assemblages

- **What is an equipmental Mode of Composition?**
- An equipmental **Mode of Composition** distinguishes the way in which equipmental modules are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed in such a way as to synthesize them as equipmental platforms. The mode of composition is constituted by a set of design parameters. These design parameters can be distinguished as both upstream and downstream. The first set of upstream parameters is that the synthesized equipment must function according to the requirements of particular metric (relational field). The second set of upstream parameters concerns the requirement that the mode of composition must take into account the specific challenge of interfacing heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules (i.e. mode of *ethik*□, serious speech acts, affects), such that these heterogeneous modules can be made to function in an integrated way. Downstream parameters consist of the challenge of composing these modules in such a way that they will function in specific cases but simultaneously will be capable of spanning or covering a range of cases, conditions, and problems characteristic of a given figure and the available modules. That is, compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as platforms. Successful synthesis of design parameters requires a specific type of **specialist** with distinctive skill sets, authority, and access to resources.

- **What is a Specialist in equipmental composition?**
- A **specialist** in equipmental composition designates the type of individual who designs module interfaces such that disparate modules can be synthesized into a single set capable of functioning according to the requirements of a given figure and capable of managing specific cases. The challenge for the specialist is to interface the modules in such a way that the resulting composition functions as the basis for the organization of specific equipmental activities within a given relational field. Analytically, it is useful to think of these specialists as technocrats who can be distinguished from technicians, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies. Said another way, these specialists, who are charged with the task of invention, oversight, and management, (but usually not with detailed implementation) can be called "technicians of general ideas." Such invention, oversight, and management draw on, and, given its position within specific figures, has an elective affinity with, affect modules and modes of *ethik*□. Where do these specialists conduct their design resolutions? What is the **venue** within which composition occurs?
- **What is a Venue in equipmental composition?**
- A **venue** in equipmental composition characterizes the scene, site, or setting in which specialists work on design and synthesis. Such venues may have been already stabilized or institutionalized, they may coincide with the articulation of the practice itself, or they may emerge through the practice of equipmental composition. The venue is not a neutral scene in which specialists work, nor is it only the site within which a given mode of composition is advanced. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, when composition is successful, the venue facilitates rather than obstructs the design and synthesis of specific interfaces. Consequently, there are venues in which particular interfaces are more likely to be obstructed than facilitated. Once the equipment is successfully synthesized in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then, of course, it has to be put to use. The consideration of venue thus raises the question of how, where, and when the composed equipment actually will be used as an equipmental platform.

Biopolitical equipment is composed when
The interfaces of biopolitical modules are designed and synthesized as equipment.

Biopolitical equipmental composition analytically consists of the series:
Planning, Social Technocrats, Governmental.

Figure	Mode of Composition	Specialist	Venue
Biopolitical	Planning	Social Technocrats	Governmental

- **What is Planning as a mode of composition in biopolitical equipmental composition?**
- **Planning** distinguishes the way in which equipmental modules are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed and such that they can be synthesized into a biopolitical equipmental platform. In this mode of composition, the first set of upstream design parameter derives from the constraints of a field of normalization. That is to say, planning is a mode of composing equipmental modules such that the resulting equipment operates to distribute a set of elements in a relational field according to a specific **metric**. The second set of upstream parameters concerns the requirement that planning must take into account the specific challenge of adjusting the interfaces of heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules (i.e. prudential mode of *ethik*□, verified reductions, and disinterest), such that these heterogeneous modules can be made to function in an integrated way. Downstream parameters consist of the challenge of composing the modules in such a way that they will function effectively in specific cases of the normalization of populations-bodies but simultaneously will be capable of spanning or covering a range of cases, conditions, and problems characteristic of the figure of biopower and the qualified modules. That is, biopolitical compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as biopolitical platforms. A successful synthesis of these design parameters requires a specific type of specialist, i.e. a **social technocrat**, with a distinctive skill set, authority, and access to resources.
- **What is a Social Technocrat in a biopolitical equipmental composition?**

- A **social technocrat** in biopolitical equipmental composition designates the type of actor who designs module interfaces such that disparate modules can be synthesized into equipment that meets the requirements of the figure of biopower and is capable of managing specific cases. When population-body is taken up in a field of normalization as "society," and when "society" is worked on in a biopolitical equipmental mode, it (i.e. "society") becomes the "social." Analytically, it is useful to think of specialists who compose biopolitical equipment as social *technocrats* who can be distinguished from social *technicians*, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies, while technicians are charged with the production of the **verified reductions** that constitute the elements in a **probabilistic series**. Said another way, social technocrats, who are charged with the task of equipmental invention, oversight, and management within a biopolitical figure (but not the details of its technical implementation per se) can be called "technicians of general ideas." The challenge for the social technocrat is to interface modules in such a way that the resulting composition functions as the basis for the organization of equipmental activities for normalization. Biopolitical invention, oversight, and management draw on, and have an elective affinity with, a prudential mode of *ethik*□ and an affect of disinterest. What is the **venue** in which social technocrats come to their design resolutions? The venue of their work is **governmental**.
- **What is Governmental as a venue in biopolitical equipmental composition?**
- A **governmental** venue characterizes where and how social technocrats work on the design and synthesis of biopolitical equipment. Such a venue is not a neutral scene in which social technocrats work. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, it facilitates rather than obstructs the construction of specific interfaces and their synthesis providing a venue appropriate to the work of planning. Social technocrats work with probabilistic series in fields of normalization. Such work requires a stable venue in which large amounts of material, produced and collected by social technicians, can be gathered, sorted, and distributed in an ongoing fashion. It follows that the composition of biopolitical equipment requires a venue in which long term stability and continuity are institutionalized. Once biopolitical equipment is successfully synthesized in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then, of course, it has to be put to use. Consideration of the specifics of governmental venues thus raises the question of how, where, and when the biopolitical equipmental platform actually will be used.

Human rights equipment is composed when
interfaces of human rights modules are designed and synthesized as equipment.

Human rights equipmental composition analytically consists of the series:
Redressing, Humanitarian Technocrats, and Rights-Based NGOs.

Figure	Mode of Composition	Specialist	Venue
Human Rights	Redressing	Humanitarian Technocrats	Rights-based NGOs

- **What is Redressing as a mode of composition in human rights equipmental composition?**
- **Redressing** distinguishes the way in which modules that qualify for human rights equipment are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed and such that these interfaces can be synthesized into a human rights equipmental platform. Redress as a mode of composition entails the production of equipment capable of rectifying human rights violations in a timely fashion. A first set of upstream design parameter derives from the constraints of a relational field of dignity. That is to say, redressing is a mode of composing equipmental modules such that the resulting synthesis functions to acknowledge or recognize the presence of archonic dignity in the object (relation) humanity-human as a bearer of rights. The second set of upstream parameters concerns the requirement that redressing must take into account the specific challenge of designing and synthesizing the interfaces of heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules (i.e. vigilance as a mode of *ethik*□, authorized testimonies, and righteousness) in the figure of human rights, such that these heterogeneous modules can be made to function in an integrated way. Downstream parameters consist of the challenge of composing the modules in such a way that they will function effectively in specific instances of rights violation but simultaneously will be capable of identifying and addressing a range of instances, conditions, and problems characteristic of the figure of human dignity and qualified modules. That is, human rights compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as human rights platforms. Successful synthesis requires a specific type of specialist, i.e. a **humanitarian technocrat**, with a distinctive skill set, authority, and access to resources.

- **What is a Humanitarian Technocrat as a specialist in human rights equipmental composition?**
- A **humanitarian technocrat** in human rights equipmental composition designates the type of actor who designs interfaces such that disparate human rights modules can be synthesized into equipment consonant with human dignity and capable of rectifying specific instances of rights violations. When human dignity is made into human rights equipment, then objects in the relational field of dignity (i.e. the relation humanity-human) are rendered susceptible of being worked on in an equipmental mode. Those specialists authorized to oversee the composition of human rights equipment are humanitarian technocrats. Analytically, it is useful to think of specialists who compose human rights equipment as humanitarian *technocrats* who can be distinguished from humanitarian *technicians*, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies, while technicians are charged with the production of the authorized testimonies. Said another way, humanitarian technocrats, who are charged with the task of equipmental invention, oversight, and management within the figure of human rights (but not the details of its technical implementation per se) can be called "technicians of general ideas." The challenge for the humanitarian technocrat is to interface modules in such a way that the resulting composition functions as the basis for the organization of activities that cohere with and operate in the name of the protection of human dignity. The invention, oversight, and management of human rights equipment draw on, and have an elective affinity with, a vigilant mode of *ethik* and an affect of commitment. What is the **venue** in which humanitarian technocrats come to their design resolutions? The venue of their work is **rights-based NGOs**.
- **What is a Rights-Based NGO as a venue of human rights equipmental composition?**
- A **rights-based NGO** as a venue of human rights equipmental composition characterizes where and how humanitarian technocrats work on the design and synthesis of human rights equipment. Such a venue is not a neutral scene in which humanitarian technocrats work. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, when composition is successful it facilitates rather than obstructs the construction of specific interfaces by providing a venue favorable to redress. Humanitarian technocrats work in the relational field of dignity, by appeal to the worth of archonic beings. Such work requires a venue capable of fast-paced processing of testimonies from the field and organization of emergency missions. It follows that the composition of human rights equipment requires a venue in which vigilance can be translated quickly into action and testimonies

re-circulated as indications of human rights violations. Once human rights equipment is successfully synthesized in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then, of course, it has to be put to use. Consideration of the specifics of rights-based NGO venues thus raises the question of how, where, and when the human rights equipmental platform actually will be deployed.

Human practices equipment is composed when
the interfaces of human practices modules are designed and synthesized as equipment.

Human practices equipmental composition analytically consists of the series:
Leveraging, Second Order Participant, Agile Assemblage.

Figure	Mode of Composition	Specialist	Venue
Human Practices	Leveraging (T,T,R)	Second Order Participant	Agile Assemblage

- **What is Leveraging as a mode of composition in human practices equipmental composition?**
- **Leveraging** as a mode of composition in human practices equipment distinguishes the way in which modules that qualify for human practices equipment are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed and such that they can be synthesized into an equipmental platform. Leveraging is a mode of composition that takes advantage of existing talent, technology, and resources, adjusts their interfaces such that the resulting connections should yield more potent solutions to real world problems than could have been the case had these elements been taken up serially. Leveraging is distinctive in its attention to interfaces as a strategy for increasing capacities. A first set of upstream design parameters in this mode of composition is how to design module interfaces and synthesize them such that the resulting equipment is suited to harmonizing **forms and pathways** according a **metric of flourishing**. Thus, leveraging as a mode of composing human practices equipment should be distinguished from leveraging as a technique of maximizing forces or resources per se. The second set of upstream parameters consists of the challenge of adjusting the interfaces of heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules in the figure of human practices (i.e. vigorous insistence as a mode of *ethik*□, warranted assertions, and assurance), such that these heterogeneous modules are synthesized so as to function in ways that depends on, but cannot be reduced to, individual modules. In other words, the second set of upstream parameters consists of synthesizing modules such that the resulting assemblage is characterized by emergence. Downstream design parameters consist of designing and synthesizing human practices equipment in such a way as to maintain a

constantly available level of generality. Modules must be composed in such a way that the resulting composition will function effectively to reconstruct significant problems, and is also plausibly applicable to a range of analogous problems. That is, human practices compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as human practices platforms. Successful leveraging requires a specific type of specialist, i.e. a **second order participant**, with a distinctive skill set, authority, and access to resources.

- **What is a Second Order Participant as a specialist in a human practices equipmental composition?**
- A **second order participant** as a specialist in human practices equipmental composition designates the type of actor who leverages pre-existing talent, technology, and resources, designs module interfaces such that these disparate modules can be synthesized into a reconstructed form. Human practices equipment reconstructs emergent forms-pathways through warranted assertions so that conditions of flourishing can be specified and so that forms-pathways can be remediated. Those specialists positioned and trained to accomplish such remediation are **second order participants**. Analytically, it is useful to think of specialists who leverage human practices equipment as second order *technocrats* who can be distinguished from second order *technicians*, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies, while technicians are charged with the production of the warranted assertions. Said another way, second order participants as technocrats, who are charged with the task of equipmental invention, oversight, and management within the figure of human practices (but not the details of its technical implementation per se) can be called "technicians of general ideas." A challenge for the second order participant is to design interfaces in such a way that the resulting synthesis functions to facilitate activities that contribute to and are appropriate to emergence. The invention, oversight, and management of human practices equipment draw on, and have an elective affinity with, vigorous insistence as a mode of *ethik* and an affect of assurance. What is the **venue** in which second order participants come to their design and synthesis resolutions? The venue of their composition is **agile assemblages**.
- **What is an Agile Assemblage as a venue of human practices equipmental composition?**
- An **agile assemblage** as a venue of human practices equipmental composition characterizes where and how second order participants work on the design and synthesis of human practices equipment. Unlike governmental venues that are already stabilized or institutionalized, and unlike rights-based NGOs that

coincide with the articulation of human rights equipment itself, agile assemblages emerge through the practice of human practices equipmental composition. These assemblages privilege agility and eschew fixity. There are two reasons for this. The first reason is that these emergent assemblages are leveraged in relation to significant contemporary problems. The second reason is that these assemblages are explicitly designed not to become apparatuses. [26] That is to say, the *ethos* of leveraging human practices equipment is neither the construction of long-term governmental venues nor urgent rights-based organizations. Rather, these assemblages are designed to be quickly reassembled in relation to different problems once existing problems have been satisfactorily worked on. Second order participants work in the relational field of flourishing. Such work is encouraged by a venue that itself is emergent and open to reconstruction. It follows that the composition of human practices equipment favors a venue that is flexible and pragmatic. Such a venue is structured by vigorous insistence, generating an assurance that warranted assertions will continue to be produced, tested, and effectively deployed. Once human practices equipment is provisionally synthesized and put to use in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then it is ready to be put to use and, when appropriate, remediated. Agile assemblages as venues for the composition of human practices equipment instantiate the challenge of how, where, and why human practices equipmental platform actually will be used.

An equipmental composition ready to use is an **equipmental platform**.

Equipmental platforms are analytically composed of the series:
Mode of Jurisdiction, Method, Purpose.

Figure	Mode of Jurisdiction	Method	Purpose
Biopolitical	Regulation	Modulation	Security
Human Rights	Protection	Emergency Intervention	Restoration
Human Practices	Remediation	Collaboration	Resourceful solutions

- **What is a Mode of Jurisdiction in an equipmental platform?**
- A **mode of jurisdiction** distinguishes the way in which an equipmental platform discriminates appropriate (i.e. coherent and co-operable) equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities it discriminates and organizes are those activities that govern the object (relation) within a relational field. Equipmental platforms function as the basis for the organization of these equipmental activities. Of the possible ways in which an object can be governed, only those modes of jurisdiction qualify for an equipmental platform that can be made to operate according to a specific metric, i.e. adjust an object (relation) according to the standards of a given relational field. How the relation between the qualified mode of jurisdiction and an object (relation) adjusted to a relational field is made ready for use is **method**.
- **What is Method in an equipmental platform?**
- A **method** in an equipmental platform designates how the relation between a mode of jurisdiction and an object (relation) adjusted to a relational field is made ready for use. In this way, method functions as a primary structural joint between an equipmental platform and a **contemporary figure**. A method establishes a type of jurisdictional relationship. Of the possible jurisdictional relations that can be established, only those will qualify for a specific equipmental platform that support the equipmental platform so as to organize

activities that work on objects according to the requirements of a given mode of ontology. The rationale for which one undertakes the organization of activities that method supports is an equipmental platform's **purpose**.

- **What is Purpose in an equipmental platform?**
- **Purpose** in an equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which the platform is composed. If mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way in which platforms organize governing activities, and if method designates how these governing relations are established, then purpose characterizes that for which equipmental platforms were originally composed. Equipmental platforms function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization into concrete problems such that these problems can be taken up as a set of possible solutions.

A biopolitical equipmental composition ready to use is a **biopolitical equipmental platform**.

Biopolitical equipmental platforms are analytically composed of the series:
Regulation, Modulation, Security.

Figure	Mode of Jurisdiction	Method	Purpose
Biopolitical	Regulation	Modulation	Security

- **What is Regulation as a mode of jurisdiction in a biopolitical equipmental platform?**
- **Regulation** as a mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way in which a biopolitical equipmental platform discriminates appropriate equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities **regulation** distinguishes and organizes are those activities that govern the relation population-body within the relational field of normalization. Of the possible ways in which population-body can be governed, only those modes of regulation qualify for a biopolitical equipmental platform that can be made to operate according to a metric of normalization, i.e. that can calibrate population-body according to the standards of a relational field of normalization. How the relation between regulation and population-body calibrated to a relational field of normalization is made ready for use is a question of **modulation**.
- **What is Modulation as a method in a biopolitical equipmental platform?**
- As a method in a biopolitical equipmental platform, **modulation** designates how the relation between regulation and population-bodies calibrated to a relational field of normalization is made ready for use. In this way, modulation functions as a primary structural joint between a biopolitical equipmental platform and the **figure of biopower**. Modulation establishes a type of regulatory relationship. Of the possible regulatory relationships that can be established, only those will qualify for a biopolitical equipmental platform that support the platform so as to organize activities that govern population-body according to the requirements

of probabilistic series. The rationale for which one undertakes the regulatory activities that modulation supports is the biopolitical equipmental platform's **purpose**. That purpose is **security**.

- **What is Security as the purpose of a biopolitical equipmental platform?**
- **Security** in a biopolitical equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which the biopolitical platform is composed. This characterization consists of two steps: the determination of a problem within a broad field of problematization and the articulation of possible solutions to this problem. Regulation designates the way in which a biopolitical platform operates in a field of normalization so as to introduce determination into an indeterminate field of security. Modulation designates how relations are established between the biopolitical platform and the field of normalization. In a broad sense, security is the problem for which biopolitical equipmental platforms are composed as components of a solution. Through biopolitical equipmental intervention the general problem-space of security is rendered susceptible to pragmatic intervention. Biopolitical platforms function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization of the figure of biopower into concrete problems of security such that a set of possible solutions become available.

A human rights equipmental composition ready to use is a **human rights equipmental platform**.

Human rights equipmental platforms are analytically composed of the series:
Protection, Emergency Intervention, Restoration.

Figure	Mode of Jurisdiction	Method	Purpose
Human Rights	Protection	Emergency Intervention	Restoration

- **What is Protection as a mode of jurisdiction in a human rights equipmental platform?**
- **Protection** as a mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way in which a human rights equipmental platform discriminates appropriate equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities **protection** distinguishes and organizes are those activities that redress violations or transgressions of humanity-human according to a metric of dignity. Of the possible ways in which the relation humanity-human can be redressed, only those modes of protection qualify for a human rights equipmental platform that are mobilized and directed in the name of dignity. That is to say, dignity constitutes a determination of the way in which human rights equipment operates, i.e. through the protection of humanity-human according to the standard of a relational field of dignity. How the relation between protection and humanity-human as a recognized part of the relational field of dignity is made ready to use is **emergency intervention**.
- **What is Emergency Intervention as a method in a human rights equipmental platform?**
- As a method in a human rights equipmental platform, **emergency intervention** designates how the relation between protection and humanity-human in a relational field of dignity is made ready for use. In this way, emergency intervention functions as a primary structural joint between a human rights equipmental platform and the **figure of human dignity**. Emergency intervention establishes a type of jurisdictional relationship. Of the possible jurisdictional relationships that can be established, only those will qualify for a human rights equipmental platform that declaim the existence of archonic being instantiated in humanity-humans in such a

way that violations can be identified and protective action taken. The purpose for which one protects the relation humanity-human through emergency intervention is **restoration**.

- **What is Restoration as the purpose of a human rights equipmental platform?**
- **Restoration** in a human rights equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which a human rights equipmental platform is composed. This characterization consists of two steps: the determination of a concrete problem within a broad field of problematization and the articulation of possible solutions to this problem. Within the general problematization of the worth of human beings, taken up as a figure of dignity, a series of indeterminations and blockages are framed as a problem of the violation of rights inherent in humanity. That is to say, the object (relation) humanity-human is framed as the bearer of dignity by way of these rights. In this way, human dignity, which, as archonic, could not otherwise be worked on, can subsequently be made susceptible to equipmental intervention. The purpose of this intervention is restoration. Restoration as the purpose of the human rights equipmental platform thus frames the challenge of how to address the permanent problem of human rights violations such that it can be managed through protection and emergency intervention. In sum, human rights equipmental platforms function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization of the figure of human dignity into concrete problems of the violations of rights such that a set of possible solutions become available.

A human practices equipmental composition ready to use is a **human practices equipmental platform**.

Human practices equipmental platforms are analytically composed of the series:
Remediation, Collaboration, Resourceful Solutions.

Figure	Mode of Jurisdiction	Method	Purpose
Human Practices	Remediation	Collaboration	Resourceful solutions

- **What is Remediation as a mode of jurisdiction in a human practices equipmental platform?**
- **Remediation** as a mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way the way in which a human practices equipmental platform discriminates appropriate equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. Remediation entails two integral facets: a change of media, and an amelioration, but not perfection, of an object or situation. These facets are interconnected by a metric of flourishing. The kinds of activities remediation distinguishes and organizes are those activities that engage forms-pathways within a field of flourishing. Of the possible ways in which forms-pathways can be engaged, only those activities organized by a mode of remediation qualify for a human practices equipmental platform. This means that remediation as mode of jurisdiction qualifies for a human practices equipmental platform in so far as it contributes practices which adjust forms-pathways according to the standards of a relational field of flourishing. A metric of flourishing engages human practices equipmental platforms through experimenting with changes of media and ameliorative actions. The metric provides a gauge of and for these remedial practices by assessing the extent to which flourishing is encouraged. A human practices equipmental platform thus functions to organize inventive form-making activities in such a way as to encourage flourishing. The way in which such activities are organized is through the remediation of forms-pathways. How the relation between remediation and forms-pathways adjusted to a relational field of flourishing is made ready for use is **collaboration**.

- **What is Collaboration as a method in a human practices equipmental platform?**
- As a method in a human practices equipmental platform, **collaboration** designates how the relation between remediation and forms-pathways adjusted to a relational field of flourishing is made ready for use. In this way, collaboration functions as a primary structural joint between a human practices equipmental platform and the **figure of synthetic anthropos**. Collaboration establishes relations in a way that can be distinguished from cooperation. A collaborative method proceeds from an interdependent division of labor on shared problems. A cooperative method consists in demarcated work with regular exchange, but does not entail common definition of problems or shared techniques of remediation. Collaboration establishes a type of jurisdictional relationship. Of the possible jurisdictional relations that can be established, only those will qualify for a human practices equipmental platform that promote and contribute to the remediation of forms-pathways in emergent assemblages. The purpose for which one remediates forms-pathways through collaboration is **resourceful solutions** to significant real world problems.
- **What are Resourceful Solutions as the purpose of a human practices equipmental platform?**
- **Resourceful solutions** as the purpose in a human practices equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which the platform is composed. The characterization consists of two steps: the determination of a problem within a broad field of problematization and the articulation of possible solutions to this problem. Resourceful solutions produce determinations in a situation in which what counts as a significant and manageable problem of flourishing is underdetermined. Those problems count as significant that can be framed as a problem of the remediation of forms-pathways through the leveraging and assembling of existing talent, technology, and resources. Through human practices equipmental intervention the general problem-space of flourishing is rendered susceptible to pragmatic intervention. Human practices platforms function as a pragmatic means of taking up aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization of the figure of synthetic anthropos as manageable real world problems. By taking up aspects of the broader problematization in this way, existing resources can be assembled and a range of possible solutions opened up.

NOTES

[1] Max Weber, "Objectivity in the Social Sciences,", p.68.
[2] We will address these issues at more length in another article.
[3] Foucault, p.670.
[4] Foucault, p.598.
[5] Ibid. p. 598.
[6] Definitions from the online Windows dictionary. Some of these sentences appear again in the last chapter where they should take on a different meaning.
[7] Paul Rabinow, Symbolic Domination: Cultural Form and Historical Change in Morocco, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, p. .
[8] On the anthropology of the contemporary see: Paul Rabinow, Anthropos Today: Reflections on Modern Equipment, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005, Marking Time: On the Anthropology of the Contemporary, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
[9] See Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, and Girard Genette's *Narrtive Discourse Revisited*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1988).
[10] Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p.73.
[11] Ibid., 74.
[12] For "practice" see Alisdair MacIntyre.
[13] Paul Rabinow and Gaymon Bennett. (2007) "From Bio-Ethics to Human Practices or Assembling Contemporary Equipment.""
[14] Michel Foucault, L'Herméneutique du sujet, Cours au Collège de France, 1981-82. 'Hautes Études,' Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Etudes, Éditions Gallimard, Éditions du Seuil, 2001. Scholarly édition and After-word by Frédéric Gros. P. 312.
[15] Foucault, « [L]'épreuve de soi-même comme sujet qui pense effectivement ce qu'il pense et qui agit comme il pense, avec comme objectif, une certaine transformation du sujet qui doit le constituer comme, disons : sujet éthique de la vérité.» p. 442.
[16] An example of meditation understood as a practice and a test of the state of a subject seeking an *êthos* is found in Épictète, Livre 1,16. Épictète speaks of a distinctive faculty we have that functions differently than other faculties. We have other faculties such as those that enable us to play a musical instrument or to use language. These faculties, however, can not tell us whether or not we should be playing an instrument or speaking. If one wants to know whether it is good or bad to play an instrument, it is necessary to turn elsewhere. And the place one must turn is to that other faculty, a faculty that is given the name of 'reason.' Reason therefore is assigned a kind of regulatory position, one whose function turns on taking care of the '*souci de soi*.' Foucault, p.438.
[17] Foucault, *Résumé du cours*, p. 479.
[18] Gros, p. 510.
[19] Rabinow, French Modern, p. 2.
[20] It has been plausibly argued, and empirically demonstrated in various instances, that the regime of governmentality to which the state equipment form of political rationality was indebted has undergone a fundamental transformations in recent decades. For example, Nikolas Rose, Powers of Freedom, London.
[21] It shouldn't be overlooked that with the Belmont Report ethicist, for the first time, are made part of the U.S. government, despite the increasing turn to moral discourse as the site of truth distinctions since 1950.
[22] Albert Jonsen. (2003). The Birth of Bioethics New York: Oxford University Press.
[23] John Dewy, Reconstruction in Philosophy, p.
[24] Michel Foucault, "Questions of Method," in Power: Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, eds. James D. Faubion and Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 2000), 230-233.
[25] Ibid., 238.
[26] See Paul Rabinow, Anthropos Today: Reflections on Modern Equipment (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).