

1

Strategies for Waging Peace

Foucault as *Collaborateur*

Stuart Elden

Foucault is unhappy at the outset of "*Society Must Be Defended*".¹ It is clear that the lecture as performance, with the assumed role as expert, was not to his liking, and that the preparation was getting in the way of the research itself. He speculates about the possibilities if

thirty or forty of us could get together in a room. I could tell you roughly what I've been doing, and at the same time have some contact with you, talk to you, answer your questions and so on, and try to rediscover the possibility of the exchange and contact that are part of the normal practice of research or teaching

(Foucault, 1997: p. 4; 2003b: p. 3)

As Ewald and Fontana note, 'he dreamed of holding a seminar in which truly collective work could be done. He made various attempts to hold such a seminar' (Foucault, 1997: p. viii; 2003b: p. x; see Foucault, 1994a: p. 49). The two most famous results are the publication of the dossier on the case of Pierre Rivière, which occupied Foucault's seminar at the Collège de France for a number of years (Foucault, 1973); and *The Foucault Effect*, a collection which appeared after his death, but which collects a number of papers from colleagues in his seminars (Burchell *et al.*, 1991).

What this chapter seeks to do is to discuss several other projects in which Foucault operated as a *collaborateur*, a colleague, a research team-leader, a facilitator. In this we see that his Collège de France courses not only contain numerous developments of material familiar from his books, as well as themes that he never worked up for publication, but also material that finds its most explicit expression in his work with others. Almost none of this material is available in English; much is not

even published in France. This chapter therefore draws extensively on materials archived at the Institut Mémoires de l'Édition Contemporaine (IMEC) in Paris.² These projects provide valuable background and a more general contextualisation of "*Society Must Be Defended*" than can be gained simply from the course itself or the better-known writings in Foucault's career. For while "*Society Must Be Defended*" is explicitly orientated around questions of war, it is implicitly about the tactics that must operate in peacetime.

This goes beyond merely an acknowledgement of Foucault's return to, and reversal of, Clausewitz. According to a paper in the Foucault archive, shortly before his death Foucault planned a collaborative project with students at Berkeley. Keith Gandel's project outline on 'New Arts of Government in the Great War and Post-War Period' seeks to continue that work, studying how mechanisms of wartime governance continued into peacetime. The proposal puts forward the idea of 'waging' peace, suggesting that 'peace became a new object for government', having become recognised as a problem during the Great War.³ Reversing a formulation Foucault makes in *Le pouvoir psychiatrique*, we can claim that the verso of violence, of war, is sovereignty (Foucault, 2003a: p. 45). In the "*Society Must Be Defended*" course itself Foucault notes how war itself can change, from a concentration on the battle to 'a war that begins before the battle and continues after it is over' (Foucault, 1997: p. 141; 2003b: p. 159), which he suggests derives from Boulainvilliers (see also Foucault, 1997: pp. 146–7; 2003b: p. 165). This chapter takes these formulations as its guide, looking at how Foucault's collaborative projects discuss the strategies for waging peace, both as compliment and context to "*Society Must Be Defended*".

Reading "*Society Must Be Defended*"

Obviously, as this volume attests, there are several different things going on in "*Society Must Be Defended*". One of these is a question that Foucault has been concerned with for some time. The preceding courses *Le pouvoir psychiatrique* and *Les Anormaux* had provided much detailed analysis, and *Discipline and Punish* had further polished these theses. This is the question of normalisation.

In our day, it is the fact that power is exercised through both right and techniques, that the techniques of discipline and discourses born of discipline are invading right, and that normalising procedures are increasingly colonising the procedures of the law, that

might explain the overall workings of what I would call a 'society of normalisation'.

(Foucault, 1997: pp. 34–5; 2003b: pp. 38–9).

We can find this particularly in the discussion of state racism in both its Nazi and Stalinist forms: 'a racism that society will direct against itself, against its own elements and its own products. This is an internal racism, a permanent purification, one of the fundamental dimensions of social normalisation' (Foucault, 1997: pp. 53, 71; 2003b: pp. 62, 81). What we find here is the replacing of the historical war with the biological struggle for life: 'differentiation of species, selection of the strongest, survival of the fittest races' (Foucault, 1997: p. 70; 2003b: p. 80).

It is also found in the discussion of 'the existence, foundation, or development of *grandes écoles* such as the École des Mines and the École Ponts et Chaussées'. In sum we see a 'huge effort being made to homogenise, normalise, classify and centralise medical knowledge'. Foucault relates all of this to public hygiene campaigns, and other health campaigns in society as a whole (Foucault, 1997: p. 161; 2003b: p. 181); something which had been discussed at length in *Le pouvoir psychiatrique*. Technical knowledge allows the state to intervene in areas it had not previously had the ability to do so, including notably the medical sciences and in particular their implementation in society as a whole. The key is of course, public health or hygiene, rather than just hospitals and clinical practice. In public health, the same sorts of mechanisms Foucault traces in *Discipline and Punish* can be found: selection, normalisation, hierarchisation and centralisation (Foucault, 1997: p. 161; 2003b: p. 181). Power takes control of life in both general and specific terms, of the human as a living being and as part of a population: what might be called a sort of extension of state power [*étatisation*] over the biological (Foucault, 1997: p. 213; 2003b: p. 240).

This is a twofold relation. Not only does politics infiltrate biology, but biology also infiltrates politics. Politics becomes increasingly mathematical as it becomes medical. Foucault is well known for discussing the way that sexuality and medicine are important for both disciplining the individual body and regulating the collective or social body – *anatomo-politics* and *biopolitics* (Foucault, 1976: p. 183; 1978: p. 139; 1997: p. 216; 2003b: p. 242), see also (Foucault, 1976: pp. 191–2; 1978: p. 145; 1994a: vol. III, p. 152; vol. IV, p. 93). This notion of calculation is both a particular case of and the foundation of the more general science of ordering. What is important is the reformulation of old ideas of *mathesis*

into a general calculative, ordered, mode of thinking. This mode of thinking, a *savoir* which functions as a general domain or field, organises the particular sciences. Problems of classification, hierarchisation, vicinity or proximity are important: a politicising of the argument of *The Order of Things* (Foucault, 1997: pp. 162, 170; 2003b: pp. 182, 190).

"*Society Must Be Defended*" equally discusses issues such as geography, climate and water. One of the key concerns of this period was about water flow – the dangers of swamps and marshes for epidemics, and the need for circulation. The organisation of the town becomes a central problem (Foucault, 1997: p. 218; 2003b: p. 245). We find some discussion in "*Society Must Be Defended*" of these issues, in particular of the layout of rational towns, of working-class housing estates with their grid patterns and organisational design (Foucault, 1997: pp. 223–4; 2003b: pp. 250–1). This was similarly discussed in *Discipline and Punish* where the model of the military camp was adopted for domestic and civilian usage.

Anticipating later concerns with what he would come to call governmentality Foucault argues that governments are not simply concerned with their territory and the individuals within it – as might be dated to around the seventeenth century – but with the problem of the collective, the problem of population. Population is a political, economic, scientific, biological problem, it is a problem of power (Foucault, 1997: pp. 218–9; 2003b: p. 245; see also Foucault, 1976: pp. 35–6; 1978: p. 25). Population can be usefully conceived as bodies in plural, and while discipline works on the individual body, a multiplicity dissolved, the new technology of power works on the bodies accumulated, as a multiplicity, a species (see Foucault, 1994a: vol. IV, p. 194; 1997: p. 216; 2003b: pp. 242–3). This might be said to be the transition that takes place between *Discipline and Punish* on the one hand and "*Society Must Be Defended*" and *The Will to Knowledge* on the other, continuing into the work on governmentality. Foucault suggests this can be understood as two series:

The series body – organism – discipline – institutions; and the series population – biological processes – regulatory mechanisms – State. An organic institutional ensemble: an organic-discipline of the institution, if you will, and on the other side, a biological and statist ensemble: bio-regulation by the State.

(Foucault, 1997: p. 223; 2003b: p. 250)

Foucault is keen to stress that there is not a clear separation of institution and state here: the disciplines tend to overflow their

institutional context; the state is involved in the disciplines (Foucault, 1997: p. 223; 2003b: p. 250). Equally, as the editors of the course underline, there is not a separation of these two understandings of power – as discipline and normalising biopower – in Foucault's work. They are not independent of each other, or successive to each other, but rather are two conjoined modes of the functioning of knowledge/power (Fontana and Bertrani, 1997; Fontana in Foucault, 2003b).⁴ We have moved from,

a symbolics of blood to an analytics of sexuality. Clearly, nothing was more on the side of the law, death, transgression, the symbolic, and sovereignty than blood; just as sexuality was on the side of the norm, knowledge, life, meaning, the disciplines and regulations.

(Foucault, 1976: p. 195; 1978: p. 148;
see also Foucault, 1994a: vol. III)

Biopower had been a concern since at least 1974, but it is particularly in "*Society Must Be Defended*" that the concept is developed at some length. Biopower involves the building up of profiles, statistical measures and so on, increasing knowledge through monitoring and surveillance, 'extremely meticulous orderings of space', and control through discipline. Birth and death rates and measures of longevity become important; fertility, illness, diet and habitation become measured; statistics and demographics come together with economics and politics (Foucault, 1997: pp. 215–16; 2003b: pp. 241–2; see also Foucault, 1976: p. 36; 1978: p. 25). This use of figures was pronounced in medical campaigns at the time. Foucault suggests that the end of the eighteenth century saw a shift from a concern with epidemics to endemics 'the form, nature, extension, duration, and intensity of the illnesses prevalent in a population' (Foucault, 1997: p. 217; 2003b: p. 243). As Foucault notes, 'the body is a bio-political reality; medicine is a bio-political strategy' (Foucault, 1994a: vol. III). The campaigns against masturbation and incest, which allow power to infiltrate the heart of the family are examples here (see Elden, 2001: pp. 99–100; and Foucault, 1999: pp. 219–56). The creation of norms, by which the individual body can be measured and disciplined, and the social body can be measured and regulated, is central (Foucault, 1997: p. 225; 2003b: pp. 252–3).⁵ The use of medical language is important. Because certain groups in society are conceived of in medical terms society is no longer in need of being defended from the outsider but from the insider: the abnormal in behaviour, species or race. What is novel is not the mentality of power, but the technology of power (Foucault, 1997: p. 230;

2003b: p. 258). The recoding of old problems is made possible through new techniques.⁶

The Constitutions written throughout the world since the French Revolution, the Codes drafted and revised, all this continual and noisy legislative activity should not deceive us: these are the forms which make acceptable this essentially normalising power.

(Foucault, 1976: p. 190; 1978: p. 144)

We should not forget that, despite the common assumption, Foucault's work here can be usefully related to Marx, if not Marxism. He suggests that the control of childhood masturbation or the exclusion of the mad is not important to the bourgeoisie in itself, but that the 'techniques and procedures of their exclusion...the mechanisms of exclusion, the surveillance apparatus, the medicalisation of sexuality, madness and delinquency' could prove to be useful (Foucault, 1997: p. 29; 2003b: p. 32). 'At a given moment, and for reasons that have to be studied, they generated a certain economic profit, a certain political utility, and they were therefore colonised and supported by global mechanisms and, finally, by the entire system of the State' (Foucault, 1997: p. 29; 2003b: p. 33).

Foucault's collaborative projects

In order to broaden the analysis of this course, explicitly around these themes of normalisation and the mechanisms of peace, I want to provide a reading of three of Foucault's collaborative projects. The first dates from the early 1970s, and was a series of projects undertaken with Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and François Fourquet into urban infrastructure and related themes, which led to the book *Les équipements du pouvoir*. This was a collaborative work by Lion Murard and François Fourquet to which Foucault contributed only briefly, but which makes use of many of his ideas and doubtless inspired others. Developing from this project, Foucault's own research and another research project under the leadership of Bruno Fortier, the second is the collective work *Les machines à guérir (aux origines de l'hôpital moderne)* published in 1976 and then reissued in 1979. The third is a study Foucault edited entitled *Politiques de l'habitat (1800–1850)* from 1977.

These are the key collaborative projects of this period, which are in various ways related to his work at the Collège de France, but were not the only ones he was involved in. Others include one where although he was the titular head, Robert Castel actually led the research team. This was research in 'resistance to medicine and the reduction [*démultiplication*] of

the concept of health'. Conducted in the late 1970s, Castel and his research team – which initially comprised Jean Carpentier, Jean-Marie Alliaumé and Jacques Donzelot – analysed the way in which medicine exceeded a narrow definition as concerned with sickness and began to engage with a much wider set of concerns, including mental health, well-being and public health.⁷ The working hypothesis was that resistance to medicine was more than 'a simple refusal' but was targeted against precisely this 'proliferation of new means of intervention'.⁸ Psychiatry and psychoanalysis accordingly were a major part of their concern, as they traced the way that health became more than the simple 'reverse [*envers*]' of illness.⁹ While the final report did not exactly say what they originally intended, it comprises a series of papers on the outlined themes.¹⁰

Equally there was a potentially fascinating project which appears to have only got to proposal stage, which aimed to analyse the 'green spaces' of Paris.¹¹ Foucault was also involved in research projects in his role as visiting professor at other universities. The best known output from these is probably the *Technologies of the Self* volume from the University of Vermont (Martin *et al.*, 1988), but there is also at least one other volume where he acted as an inspiration but did not contribute a text himself, from his time at the Catholic University of Louvain (Tulkens, 1988). And there was the Berkeley project of which Gandel's project outline on waging peace was drawn.

The equipment of power

Chronologically the first, I will begin with the project that led to the book *Les équipements du pouvoir*. In its published form this deals with towns, territory and other collective means of social organisation, and though Fourquet and Murard wrote the bulk of the material, Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari contributed in discussion sections. However the archives of IMEC show that this was originally five interlinked analyses, led by Fourquet, Deleuze, Guattari and Foucault. Funded by the Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire, de l'équipement, du logement et du tourisme, this was a project undertaken under the auspices of the Centre d'Études, de Recherche et de Formation Institutionnelle (CERFI), a group founded in 1967 by Guattari, as a formalisation of the 1965 Fédération des Groupes d'Études de Recherches Institutionnelles (FGERI). The five projects were as follows:

- 1 Collective equipments and their social uses, looking especially at new towns such as Evry and Marne la vallée (Fourquet).
- 2 Two studies – mining towns and green spaces (Guattari).

- 3 The emergence of 'collective equipments' (Deleuze).
- 4 Urban 'equipments' in urban planning (Foucault).
- 5 A genealogy of 'equipments of normalisation' – health and schools (Foucault).¹²

In sum, over a million francs was projected for this work, worth about 773,000 euros today,¹³ enough to support a fairly large team for a few years.¹⁴ Various outputs came from this work, culminating in the book *Les équipements du pouvoir* which was originally published as a special issue of the journal *Recherches* in 1973, and then reissued in 1976.¹⁵ *Recherches* was the house journal of CERFI, and although all the projects clearly influenced the work, this is very much based on Fourquet's research project.¹⁶ The equipments of power analysed in this book are the three items in the subtitle: towns, territories and 'collective equipments' – *équipements collectifs*. By these Fourquet and Murard mean something akin to public amenities or the infrastructure of society. These are tools or utensils that are utilised collectively – roads, transportation and communication networks, and the more static apparatus of towns. Circulation necessarily plays a crucial role, with the flux and flow of people, goods and capital as money (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 35). For Fourquet and Murard, these elements of infrastructure are means of production, or perhaps more accurately the means by which production can be achieved (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 32). The town is in their terms a 'collective equipment', 'and the network [*réseau*] of towns distribute capital across the whole of the national territory' (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 35). Foucault himself takes place in two dialogues in the book, after the outlining of various ideas by Fourquet and Murard.¹⁷ In the English translation of the dialogues the order is reversed, and the accompanying material left aside. This makes for a peculiarly decontextualised discussion.

Fourquet and Murard note that the three key terms that they are interested in thinking through are power, territory and production, particularly in their interrelation (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 7). The stress on power and territory within a broadly Marxist analysis allows for a 'displacement' rather than a revision or critique (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 8). This context is supplemented by an interest in Deleuze and Guattari's work *Anti-Oedipus*, and earlier texts which the authors received while working on this, and an interest in Foucault's work on madness and the clinic (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 10). The original title of the work, *Généalogie des équipements collectives* (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 9) perhaps betrays this Foucaultian influence – a

Foucault then engaging with Nietzsche's ideas in detail. Indeed in the extended introduction, Fourquet and Murard acknowledge Deleuze and Foucault's readings of Nietzsche, as well as the pioneering work of Bataille and Klossowski (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 17). All sorts of Foucaultian themes are found in this work – the use of the panopticon, relations of power and knowledge, surveillance, control of population and normalisation of individuals and so on. The dating of the material to the early 1970s shows that this relation was not solely a one-way influence. Murard and Fourquet utilise Foucault's research on madness, medicine and other issues, but the bulk of the material predates *Discipline and Punish*, although there is some editing between the 1973 journal article and the 1976 book. Some of Foucault's ideas about the division of space in schools and the control of children's bodies and medical plans for towns are discussed in this work (see Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 197–8, 210). A range of other contemporary thinkers are utilised, including those of a more obviously Marxist perspective such as Lefebvre (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 55–6) and Castells. The ideas of normalisation are explicitly related to Canguilhem, just as Foucault does in his *Les Anormaux* lectures (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 155, see 7). But the other key role is played by Fernand Braudel, who is mentioned in a number of places (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 7, 10).

The book is organised on the following plan:

- *La ville-ordinateur* – the town-machine
- *La ville-métaphore* – the town-metaphor
- *Les territoires* – territories
- *Formation des équipements collectives* – formation of collective equipments or facilities
- *Le discours du plan* – the discourse of the plan
- *Économie politique sans famille* – political economy without the family.

In the second dialogue Foucault takes the example of a road, and suggests that it plays three strategic functions: to produce production, to produce demand, and to normalise. While the first two are unsurprising from a Marxist perspective, the third is perhaps most interesting. Production requires transport, the movement of goods and labour, and the levies or tithes of state power and tax collector. The bandit is an 'antithetical person' in these relations. Demand requires 'the market, merchandise, buyers and sellers', it creates a whole system of coded places of business, regulates prices and goods sold. The inspector,

controller or customs agent face-to-face with the smuggler of contraband, the peddler (Foucault, 1996: p. 106; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 215–16). Both production and demand are the subject of the procedure of normalisation, in the adjusting and regulation of these two domains. Foucault talks about the *aménagement du territoire*, the control and planning of the land or territory of the state that the road allows. The role of engineers is important both as a product of normalising power – their education and authentic knowledge – and as its privileged agent. In opposition to them are those who do not fit the allowed circuits – the vagabond or the sedentary: ‘in both cases, abnormal’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 216; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 107).

Foucault stresses that this is merely one example of the kind of collective equipment that Fourquet and Murard are analysing. He suggests that the chronology of the industrial and the disciplinary state – we should note that it is of the state, not society, that he is speaking – do not match up, although they are correlatives. ‘Education produces producers, it produces those who demand and at the same time, it normalises, classes, divides, imposes rules and indicates the limit of the pathological’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 107; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 217–18). Deleuze responds to this, suggesting that the three aspects are rather investment, treating someone as a producer in potential or actuality; control, treating someone as a consumer; the public service aspect, the citizen as a user. Utilising concepts that he and Guattari would develop in their collaborative work, Deleuze suggests that ‘the highway today is channelled nomadism, a partitioning into a grid, while public service implies a general nomadism’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 107; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 217–18).

Foucault’s point in response is that the state is tasked with the balancing of production of production (i.e. supply) with the production of demand. The state’s role in other areas, such as the normalisation undertaken by the police, hospitals, treatment of the insane, is ambiguous: on the one hand the state’s role expands, but on the other private corporations are part of a process of de-statisation. Foucault’s telling point is that the difference between socialist and capitalist utopias is that the latter worked. But now, instead of private ventures of this kind, there are ‘housing projects’ that the state must control, that ‘depend on the State apparatus. The deck has been reshuffled’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 108; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 218–20). Murard and Fourquet give their own examples, of hospitals that act as means of production in terms of producing the healthy workforce required by capital.

Foucault’s examples of the road and the windmill demonstrate that he is both willing to consider issues outside his usual scope and that in 1973 his thinking is still rather inchoate. Three points emerge from this. First, that despite the standard reading that Foucault ignores the state, is anti-Marxist and does not take into account the question of production, his analysis always recognises these as the background, the indispensable foundation of the types of analysis he is making. But rather than replicate the work done elsewhere, Foucault is interested in changing the angle, tightening the focus and concentrating on the small, the detail, the workings on the level of the everyday, the micro-physics, here stressed as the third question of normalisation.¹⁸ Second, Foucault is in a questioning mode here. His comments in the first dialogue are questions: what property relations are involved in collective equipment; how do they function; what type of production is involved; what relationship of power is at play; how do effects follow from this: ‘the genealogical implication?’ (Foucault, 1996: pp. 111–12; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 45–7). Although power and genealogy are well-known Foucaultian issues, again there is a stress on production, property and function. Third, in both Foucault’s comments and those of his interlocutors, perhaps especially here Guattari, the question of territory or more broadly the question of issues of spatiality is important. Guattari discusses the way in which the city as a collective equipment radically alters the territorial issues of more primitive communities: ‘the territoriality of the city becomes deterritorialisation of fluxes’. But, and simplistic readings of Deleuze and Guattari on deterritorialisation often miss this, ‘Equipments as machines are reterritorialised at the same time. Deterritorialised fluxes constitute the city, material fluxes support deterritorialised fluxes, and the city reterritorialises the most deterritorialised fluxes of any given period’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 109; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 40–1).¹⁹ On this point we can also look at his brief comments on the city as a spatial projection, ‘a form of reterritorialisation, of blockage’, where the ‘original despotic city is a military camp where soldiers are enclosed to prevent the flux of soldiers from spreading out’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 110; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 44), which anticipates the analysis in *Discipline and Punish*.

Hospitals and normalisation

Foucault’s project on ‘equipments of normalisation’, in its CERFI plan, looked beyond the institutions of hospitals and schools to wider concerns with sanitary norms and ‘the power of the state in the

determination of sanitary mechanisms'.²⁰ This was a crucial element in the research that led to the collective book, *Les machines à guérir*, whose original title was *Généalogie des équipements de normalisation*. This volume contains Foucault's own essay 'The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century', but also brief contributions by four colleagues from his research seminar at the Collège de France, and an extensive dossier on the architecture, equipment, chronology and organisation of the hospital. The 1979 re-edition, with a commercial publisher rather than the CERFI edition, has some changes, notably to Foucault's own essay. As well as the project led by Foucault, the volume is also informed by research conducted on the politics of space in Paris at the end of the *ancien régime*, led by Bruno Fortier, with CORDA and DGRST. (CORDA is Comité de la Recherche et du Développement en Architecture and DGRST is Délégation Générale à la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique). The research from the second contract, of which Foucault was not directly involved, was published as a separate volume in 1975 (Fortier, 1975).²¹

The background to this work is the three lectures on medicine given in Rio in October 1974. It took 20 years before they appeared in French, and a further decade before English translation.²² I have found them very valuable in thinking through some of Foucault's ideas (see Elden 2003). The dating is significant: they were delivered between *Le pouvoir psychiatrique* and *Les Anormaux*. These three lectures are important for a number of reasons. One of the issues that is relevant here is how Foucault's introduction to *Les machines à guérir* is closely related to these lectures; another that the Rio lectures relate to, rather than duplicate, material presented in Paris; and more concretely that they outline a number of themes that emerge in Foucault's later work. Biopolitics is first mentioned here, for example, as is the juxtaposition of the models of the plague town and the treatment of lepers. Themes from *Discipline and Punish* and *The Will to Knowledge* are outlined, and are further explored in "*Society Must Be Defended*".

When Foucault discusses the different models of medicine in Germany, France and England, it is notable that the French model is of 'urban medicine' (compared to state medicine and medicine of the labour force). Foucault underlines three things that this particular version of medicine means. Urban medicine brings medical expertise close to sciences such as chemistry, which allows it to trade on a whole range of established scientific practices. Foucault also makes the point that

urban medicine is not really a medicine of man, the body, and the organism, but a medicine of things – air, water, decompositions,

fermentations. It is a medicine of the living conditions of the milieu of existence.

(Foucault, 1994a: vol. III, p. 22)

But in a sense it is the third idea that is most important: the emergence of a concept of salubrity. Salubrity is not a synonym for health, but rather its condition of possibility, at least its material and social basis. Public hygiene emerges at the same time. Foucault mentions a source he would refer to in the *Abnormals* course: the *Annales d'hygiène publique et de médecine légale*, which first appeared in 1829 and which was, as Foucault notes, 'the organ of French social medicine' (Foucault, 1994a: vol. III, pp. 222–3).

In the second lecture Foucault refers to the collective work at the Collège de France:

some of us are studying the growth of hospitalisation and its mechanisms from the 18th century to the beginning of the 19th, while others are concentrating on hospitals and are moving toward a study of habitat and what surrounds it: the roads system, transport routes, and the collective equipments [or infrastructure] which assure the functioning of everyday life, particularly in urban environments.

(Foucault, 1994a: vol. III, p. 208)

Les machines à guérir is therefore the product of the research contract Foucault headed, the one on Parisian space by the team apart from him, and his own interests from lectures.

This is a productive set of concerns. Blandine Barret Kriegel demonstrates how the hospital functions as a tool of cure, through its architectural design and organisation. Similar issues emerge in the public health concerns of the time, along with the emergence of the notion of population. Observation and quantification are the two privileged methods – the politics of calculation (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 22): mortality rates, birth and baptism figures, and the other mechanisms of modern demography; water, air seasons, climate, dietary regimes and their influence on mortality, and other medical concerns (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: pp. 24–5). The population emerges as a site of medical knowledge – distinct and yet dependent on the individual bodies that make it up (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 23).

To calculate is to establish a statistical quantity to the detriment of aesthetic composition, the estimation [*le chiffre*] of the physician, the

chemist and even the demographer, to the place of architectural proportion. Power is to command and realise the operation.

(Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 26)

Dispersion and circulation become the keys to the hospital – the placing of objects, bodies and equipment within the space of the hospital itself and its situation in the town and surrounding area (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 26).

Anne Thalamy's work also contributes to this general approach, noting the military model behind the hospital, with the traditional discipline, unified command and absolute hierarchy, but also more concretely to issues of circulation, the keeping of detailed notes and records, and the cataloguing of resources (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: pp. 32–3). Thalamy finds in medical writing of the time

the sign of a functional space and of a perpetually updated knowledge, which analyses the illness in the continuity of observation [*le regard*], and positions it in the duration of medical practice... It is the essential support of an illness, which becomes an object of treatment, of a hospital conceived as a space of recovery.

(Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 36)

François Béguin offers some further analysis, particularly around the object of the bed, with objectives of separation, rest and recovery. Again the idea of the physical design of the hospital comes through, with a particular stress here on architecture (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 39). Bruno Fortier's chapter again treats similar themes, arguing that the hospital is a 'political tool', a step in a wider political project of the control and organisation the population, particularly in the urban setting. Similar concerns are found in the prison and school, and 'spaces of work and exchange' (Foucault *et al.*, 1979: p. 45).

This importance is for a number of reasons, principally both for the creation of a disciplined society, but also as is often neglected in studies of Foucault (as opposed to Foucault's studies, but not perhaps for Foucaultian studies) for capitalism. In the second Rio lecture he makes this linkage clear: 'capitalism ... started by socialising a first object, the body, as a factor of productive force, of labour power' (Foucault, 1994a: vol. III, pp. 209–10).

The control of society over individuals was accomplished not only through consciousness or ideology but also in the body and with the

body. For capitalist society, it was biopolitics which is above all important, the biological, the somatic, the corporal.

(Foucault, 1994a: vol. III, p. 210)

This is why he contends that 'the body is a bio-political reality; medicine is a bio-political strategy' (Foucault, 1994a: vol. III, p. 210).

Habitat

Politiques de l'habitat (1800–1850) contains little Foucault, in fact only a brief introduction, but does include detailed analyses of cholera epidemics, public health initiatives, housing projects and the emergence of the notion of habitat. What we find in this book, as well as other pieces of Foucault's own work of the same time is an attempt to broaden the institutional analysis of prisons, hospitals and asylums to society as a whole. In his 'Avant-Propos' Foucault lists the topics which make the determining factors of the urban environment or habitat: 'medicine and hygiene, architecture, civil engineering, the social sciences and jurisdiction' (Foucault, 1977b: p. 3). Again this was the product of a research project, this time on 'the history the appearance of the notion of habitat in the architectural thought and practice of the 18th and 19th century'.²³

The initial themes of this research included the notion of habitat-clubbrity and the establishment of health norms, procedures of normalisation that followed from that, and administrative practices and social habitat.²⁴ Originally planned in the summer of 1975, this project included many of the same colleagues as the previous projects, along with the architect Bernard Mazeret, who did not contribute to the published volume. The CVs of the team show it to be interdisciplinary in nature, and the research proposal itself makes much of the inclusion of architects and architects, because of the importance of the analysis of architectural techniques and plans.²⁵ The CVs also offer some interesting anecdotal information, including that, in 1975 Foucault intended to present the work of a seminar entitled *L'architecture du surveillance*. This seminar is likely to refer to *Discipline and Punish*, which appeared earlier that year, and is more likely to be an early description of the *Les machines à surveiller* project.²⁶ A later reference to this project supports this, using the seminar as an indication of the team's suitability for this project.²⁷ The CVs also indicate the continuity of concerns, stressing the relation between these earlier architectural analyses of hospitals, work on prisons and the work to come.

The work included in this volume on the notion of habitat includes studies of medical epidemics, statistical measures used to combat disease, the production of urban space and the mechanics of the transition to public spaces within towns and the organisation and control of these spaces. Foucault's colleagues provide rich empirical work to supplement and enhance the work that Foucault himself had done, both in *Birth of the Clinic* and the Rio lectures. It is notable that the volume has a much less obviously negative tone to it than some of Foucault's own work on these subjects, recognising the means through which environments are developed and controlled. There is an identification of the ways in which these tools of government are utilised to work on and with the urban population, to provide satisfactory environments or milieus for their habitation, in order to constitute security. One of the key themes is the spatial distribution of individuals, and the theme of public goods or collective infrastructure is continued from the earlier projects. The spectre of capitalism is of course never far behind.

The project proposal is equally revealing, showing an interest in the organisation of space in the urban environment, and the key theme is the tracing of the evolution of public space to a more concentrated concern with habitation. The proposal sets the dates as between 1750 and 1830, while the published work limits the study to 1800–50. Concerns with surveillance and circulation reoccur here, especially as the spaces (particularly of Paris) are opened up, destroyed and renovated.²⁸ Themes from the Rio lectures and *Les machines à guerir* are also found in the interest in the relation between the police and hygiene, in particular in the police – in its Hegelian sense – as a means of intervention of the public in the private, especially in terms of the control of the circulation of elements. The point of intersection of public and private spaces – for instance pavements, roads and crossroads – are crucial here.²⁹ Issues outlined in detail in *Discipline and Punish* and elsewhere are found here, in terms of the spatial distribution of individuals, particularly as a means of social control. There is also a recognition that the development of notions of salubrity was related to that of the pathological character of the city, analysed in detail in the published work through the cholera epidemics.³⁰

This re-organisation of urban space is found in these hygiene projects, but not simply for the physical life and health of its occupants, but also because of a concern with their moral existence.³¹ In particular developments relating to earlier changes in hospitals with the emergence of 'pavillonnaire' architecture and the removal of communal beds are found in the new partitioning of domestic space.³² These were concerns in

Les Anormaux with the campaigns both against masturbation and incest. Increasingly private space contains a reserved element for state observation [*regard*].³³ To study these kinds of projects around habitation requires a look at the disciplines that surround medicine naturally – hygiene, pathology, biology – but also areas such as sociology, economics and architecture. Laws and regulations, as well as practices all need to be examined. Making use of previous techniques of analysis developed in the work on public utilities, they propose to carefully study architectural plans and commentary on those plans.³⁴ While Foucault and his team think they can date the emergence of the term 'habitat' relatively precisely, they are concerned with the notion which is later named, rather than simply its discursive constitution.³⁵

The same folder at IMEC contains an untitled article by Bruno Fortier.³⁶ Although not formally part of this research team, this article touches on a number of related themes, including concerns about cemeteries in an urban environment, the washing of the laundry of the sick in the Seine, and what he calls a 'logic of spatialisation' about the circulation of water, air and light.³⁷ One of the most interesting parts is the suggestion that dating is possible for the medicalisation of spatial categories, as follows:

- Prisons 1765–70
- Hospitals 1770–85
- Industry 1770–1810
- Houses 1830–³⁸

Clearly related to the Parisian context, this is interesting in terms of Foucault's own researches on the first two categories, and the more general research I am outlining here for the other two. Fortier also raises issues about the class relations at the heart of urban development – crucial of course in a slightly later period of Haussmann's reforms – the legal reforms and legal codings of space.³⁹ His study includes the following summary paragraph which brings together much of the work he and Foucault had been leading:

The question, at the end of the 18th century was thus not the presence of the working classes in the town, but the screen which it represents in the control, knowledge and production of space. It is a power which is concerned with confiscating, not a presence that is concerned with spatialising. The dream at the end of the 18th century, and the reality of the 19th, is therefore that of a generalised coding of

space, as transparent to the State as it would be foreign to working class knowledge.⁴⁰

Governmentality and historiography

All of these projects demonstrate the way in which Foucault was concerned with numerous techniques of normalisation, categorisation and control, with truth as a political force, and modalities of government. Such issues are obviously concerns in the two courses Foucault gave in 1977–8 and 1978–9, after the sabbatical year which followed “*Society Must Be Defended*”; *Sécurité, Territoire, Population* and *Naissance de la biopolitique*. The first begins with three lectures on town-planning, famines and smallpox, before the well-known lecture on ‘Governmentality’, and follows this with a historical analysis of the roots of modern government, through the pastoral, police and political economy. The second analyses various issues around liberal thought and modern political rationalities. These courses, now available in English, develop many of the themes discussed here, though specific treatment of them is a topic for elsewhere (see Elden 2007b).

I would add one final issue here. The work in “*Society Must Be Defended*” on the use of history as a political tool is one of the most remarkable things about the course. History can be used as means not only of reporting struggle, but as a weapon itself in the ongoing struggle, and this not merely during the war, but in the ensuing peace. How do models of war move from being the means of the constitution of society to the conserver of society, when struggle gets turned inward as a defence from within rather than against what is without? This is a society that uses war in peacetime, internally rather than externally, as a defence of society against the dangers which are born in its own body. For Foucault, this is ‘the great reversal from history to biology, from the constituent to the medical’ (Foucault, 1997: p. 194; 2003b: p. 216). This too was a concern of some of Foucault’s colleagues. Notable here is the work of Blandine Kriegel, who wrote a thesis under Foucault’s supervision on the question of historiography in France, particularly legal and political history. It was published in four volumes in 1988 (Kriegel, 1978).⁴¹ Its title is not a history of the classical age, but history in the classical age. Kriegel’s earlier *L’état et les esclaves: Réflexions pour l’histoire des états*, originally published in 1979 and revised in 1989, then translated into English in 1995 as *The State and the Rule of Law*, makes use of some similar ideas (Kriegel, 1989, 1995). This and the other discussion of collaboration is not to diminish Foucault’s work, but to suggest that seeing

him as a *sui generis* figure can be misleading. He is both inspired by others of his generation – Deleuze and Guattari, Peter Brown, Pierre Hadot, and others – and inspirational.

Viewing “*Society Must Be Defended*” in relation to the collaborative projects thus demonstrates the way in which mechanisms of security extend through the social fabric.

And the hoarse songs of the races that clashed in battles over the lies of laws and kings, and which were after all the earliest form of revolutionary discourse, become the administrative prose of a State that defends itself in the name of a social heritage that has to be kept poor.

(Foucault, 1997: p. 73; 2003b: p. 83)

Foucault’s work, and that of his collaborators, demonstrates that the formation of a knowledge and power of normalisation is a crucial part of the way in which society is defended and security attained. The struggles that characterise war are those of the politics of a society constituted through strategies of waging peace.

practices of species existence. As the political rationalities and governmental technologies of biopolitics changed so also therefore did the ways in which race functioned as a biopolitical discriminator for the regulation of populations and the promotion of species existence: from political arithmetic through demographics to biometrics. However much it therefore appeals to the unity of the human race, biopolitics continuously finds itself in need of mechanisms which will, as Foucault puts it, break into the biological continuum in order to teach it how best to promote the race. While there is biopolitics there will always be race.

Notes

Introduction

- 1 Our thanks to Luis Lobo-Guerrero for drawing this quotation to our attention.

1 Strategies for Waging Peace

- 1 While dual references are given where texts exist in English, translations have frequently been modified. Codes in the notes refer to documents archived at the Institut Mémoires d'Édition Contemporaine.
- 2 Since the research for this article, the archive has relocated to Caen in Normandy. See www.imec-archives.com/
- 3 Keith Gandel, "New Arts of Government in the Great War and Post-War Period", E.1.29/FCL2.A04-06, pp. 1, 3.
- 4 This paragraph repeats some formulations from Elden (2002: p. 146).
- 5 Foucault recognises that any interpretation predicates a norm by which it measures: even if the normal is defined in terms of what it is not, as a consequence. See Elden (2001: pp. 102–3) and Foucault (1999: p. 46).
- 6 This paragraph draws extensively on Elden (2002: pp. 145–6).
- 7 D.2.4.a/FCL2.A04-03.01, p. 1.
- 8 D.2.4.a/FCL2.A04-03.01, p. 2.
- 9 D.2.4.b/FCL2.A04-03.02, p. 18.
- 10 *Résistances à la médecine et démultiplication du concept de santé*, CORDES/Commisariat Général du Plan, November 1980, D.2.4.d/FCL2.A04-03.04. Donzelot's paper from this is translated as 'Pleasure in Work', in Burchell *et al.* (1991, pp. 251–80).
- 11 D.2.1/FCL2.A04-05. For a fuller discussion, see Elden (2007).
- 12 Taken from the files on each project and the letter from M. H. Conan to Guattari, 26 June 1973, archived at D.2.3/FCL2.A04-04.
- 13 Conversion for 1973 francs taken from www.insee.fr/en/indicateur/achatfranc.htm
- 14 See the collection of papers in *Site*, no. 2, 2002, www.sitemagazine.net/eng/no2.htm
- 15 *Les équipements du pouvoir: Généalogie du capital 1*, *Recherches*, no. 13, décembre 1973. See also *La programmation des équipements collectives dans les villes nouvelles (Les équipements d'hygiène mentale)*, Paris: CERFI, 1972.
- 16 The subsequent number of *Recherches* continued the approach. See *L'idéal historique Généalogie du capital 2*, *Recherches*, no. 14, janvier 1974.
- 17 The discussion took place in May and September 1972 (EP 47).
- 18 Following these discussions, the next two courses, *Sécurité, Territoire, Population: Cours au Collège de France (1977–1978)*, Paris: Seuil/Gallimard,

- 2004 and *Naissance de la biopolitique* develop the analysis of the state in a much more explicit way.
- 19 There is a discussion of this point at, François Fourquet and Lion Murard, *Les Équipements du Pouvoir: Villes, Territoires Et Équipements Collectifs*, 173–4.
 - 20 D.2.3/FCL2.A04-04.
 - 21 The other contributors were Blandine Barret-Kriegel, François Beguin, Daniel Friedmann and Alain Monchablon.
 - 22 DE III 40–58, 207–28, 508–21. The English translations appear as ‘The Birth of Social Medicine’ in *Power: The Essential Works of Michel Foucault*, vol. 3, edited by James D. Faubion, London: Penguin, 2000, pp. 134–56; ‘The Crisis of Medicine or the Crisis of Antimedecine’, translated by Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr., William J. King and Clare O’Farrell, *Foucault Studies*, no. 1, November 2004, pp. 5–19; and ‘The Incorporation of the Hospital into Modern Technology’, in *Foucault and Geography*, forthcoming.
 - 23 D.2.2.a/FCL2.A04-02.01, p. 1.
 - 24 D.2.2.a/FCL2.A04-02.01, p. 1.
 - 25 D.2.2.b/FCL2.A04-02.02.
 - 26 See D.2.2.a/FCL2.A04-02.01.
 - 27 D.2.2.b/FCL2.A04-02.02; see ‘Influence des strategies administratives et hygiéniques dans l’histoire des espaces verts à Paris’, D.2.1/FCL2.A04-05, p. 15.
 - 28 ‘Exposé du sujet’, D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, p. 1.
 - 29 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, p. 2.
 - 30 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, pp. 3–4.
 - 31 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, p. 5.
 - 32 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, p. 7.
 - 33 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, p. 9.
 - 34 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, pp. 11, 12.
 - 35 D.2.2.c/FCL2.A04-02.03, p. 12.
 - 36 Bruno Fortier, Untitled, D.2.2.d/FCL2.A04-02.04. ‘Jusqu’au milieu du XVIIIème siècle...’
 - 37 Fortier, D.2.2.d/FCL2.A04-02.04, pp. 7–8, 9, 13.
 - 38 Fortier, D.2.2.d/FCL2.A04-02.04, p. 10.
 - 39 Fortier, D.2.2.d/FCL2.A04-02.04, pp. 19–20.
 - 40 Fortier, D.2.2.d/FCL2.A04-02.04, p. 20.
 - 41 On this relation see Monod (2001: pp. 72–3).

2 Goodbye War on Terror?

* Many thanks to Michael Dillon, Angharad Closs Stephens and Rebecca Palmer for comments on earlier drafts.

- 1 For example the USA PATRIOT Act 2001, followed by the USA PATRIOT and Terrorism Prevention Reauthorization Act 2005 and the USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act 2006.
- 2 For example, in the UK a system of ‘Control Orders’ under the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 replaced the detention without trial of foreign ‘terrorist

- suspects’ under the UK Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001. See www.homeoffice.gov.uk/security/terrorism-and-the-law/prevention-of-terrorism/
- 3 For example, in the UK, the Terrorism Act 2006 extended the maximum police pre-charge detention period from 14 to 28 days. This was a compromise over the 90 days proposed in the original Bill. In November and December 2007 the government revisited this to try to extend the pre-charge detention period again.
 - 4 Many thanks to Angharad Closs for highlighting this.
 - 5 Elsewhere I have argued along these lines that “*Society Must Be Defended*” reads as a preface to Carl Schmitt. See Neal (2004).
 - 6 ‘[T]heir motivation appears to be typical of similar cases. Fierce antagonism to perceived injustices by the West against Muslims and a desire for martyrdom’ (Home Office, 2006: p. 26).
 - 7 For example, ‘As everyone in this House knows, to succeed, those measures will require not just military and security resources but more policing and intelligence, and an enhanced effort to win hearts and minds’ (Brown, 2007).

3 Life Struggles

- 1 This owes largely to the extent to which the study of strategy and the function of military organisation has been contained within the military sciences themselves. The tradition of military–strategic science and organisation finds itself largely on a claim deriving from readings of Clausewitz that war can be understood simply as a continuation of state policy. However, the reading of Clausewitz on which this claim is founded is extremely narrow. See Julian Reid, ‘Foucault on Clausewitz: Conceptualizing the Relationship Between War and Power’, *Alternatives*, 28 (2003), 1–28. For a contemporary example of such a narrow rendition of the concept of strategy and the function of military organisation, see Colin S. Gray, *Modern Strategy* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 17–23.
- 2 See Charles Taylor’s reductive reading of Foucault in Charles Taylor, ‘Foucault on Freedom and Truth’ in David Hoy (ed.), *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1986), pp. 82–3.
- 3 Michel Foucault, ‘Preface’ in Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley (London, Athlone Press, 2000), pp. xi–xiv.
- 4 Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (London, Athlone Press, 1999), pp. 351–423; Julian Reid, ‘Deleuze’s War Machine: Nomadism Against the State’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 32 (2003), 57–85. On Virilio’s theory of war and modernity see Julian Reid, ‘Architecture, Al-Qaeda and the World Trade Center: Rethinking the Relations Between War, Modernity and City Spaces After 9/11’, *Space and Culture*, 7 (2004), 396–408; Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2000); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude* (New York, Penguin, 2004); Julian Reid with Keith Farquhar, ‘Immanent War, Immaterial Terror...’, *Culture Machine*, 7 (2005), <http://www.culturemachine.net>.