

1. On the question of disciplinary technology, see *Surveiller et punir*.
2. On all these questions, see *Cours au Collège de France, année 1978-1979: Le Pouvoir psychiatrique*, forthcoming.
3. Foucault comes back to all these disciplines, especially in *Cours au Collège de France 1977-1978: Sécurité, territoire et population* and *1978-1979: Naissance de la biopolitique*, forthcoming.
4. Foucault refers here to the theory elaborated in mid-nineteenth-century France by certain alienists and in particular by B.-A. Morel (*Traité de dégénérescences physiques, intellectuelles et morales de l'espèce humaine* [Paris, 1857], *Traité des maladies mentales* [Paris, 1870]); V. Magnan (*Leçons cliniques sur les maladies mentales* [Paris, 1893]); and M. Legrain and V. Magnan (*Les Dégénérés, état mental et syndromes épisodiques* [Paris, 1895]). This theory of degeneracy, which is based upon the principle that a so-called hereditary taint can be transmitted, was the kernel of medical knowledge about madness and abnormality in the second half of the nineteenth century. It was quickly adopted by forensic medicine, and it had a considerable effect on eugenicist doctrines and practices, and was not without its influence on a whole literature, a whole criminology, and a whole anthropology.
5. As early as 19 March, Hitler had drawn up plans to destroy Germany's logistic infrastructure and industrial plant. These dispositions were announced in the decrees of 30 March and 7 April. On these decrees, see A. Speer, *Erinnerungen* (Berlin: Propyläen-Verlag, 1969) (French translation: *Au Coeur du Troisième Reich* [Paris: Fayard, 1971]; English translation by Richard and Clara Winton: *Inside the Third Reich: Memoirs* [London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970]). Foucault had definitely read J. Fest's book *Hitler* (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, and Vienna: Verlag Ulstein, 1973) (French translation: *Hitler* [Paris: Gallimard, 1973]; English translation by Richard and Clara Winton, *Hitler* [London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974]).
6. In this connection, see in particular Charles Fourier, *Théorie des quatre mouvements et des destinées générales* (Leipzig and Lyon, 1808); *Le Nouveau Monde industriel et sociétaire* (Paris, 1829); *La Fausse Industrie morcelée, répugnante, mensongère*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1836).

## COURSE SUMMARY

IN ORDER TO MAKE a concrete analysis of power relations, we must abandon the juridical model of sovereignty. That model in effect presupposes that the individual is a subject with natural rights or primitive powers; it sets itself the task of accounting for the ideal genesis of the State; and finally, it makes the law the basic manifestation of power. We should be trying to study power not on the basis of the primitive terms of the relationship, but on the basis of the relationship itself, to the extent that it is the relationship itself that determines the elements on which it bears: rather than asking ideal subjects what part of themselves or their powers they have surrendered in order to let themselves become subjects, we have to look at how relations of subjugation can manufacture subjects. Similarly, rather than looking for the single form or the central point from which all forms of power derive, either by way of consequence or development, we must begin

---

First published in *Annuaire du Collège de France, 76ème année, Histoire des systèmes de pensée, année 1975-1976* (1976), pp. 361-66; reprinted in *Dits et écrits*, vol. 3, pp. 124-30. An alternative translation, by Robert Hurley, appears in *Ethics: The Essential Works*, vol. 1, pp. 59-66.

by letting them operate in their multiplicity, their differences, their specificity, and their reversibility; we must therefore study them as relations of force that intersect, refer to one another, converge, or, on the contrary, come into conflict and strive to negate one another. And, finally, rather than privileging the law as manifestation of power, we would do better to try to identify the different techniques of constraint that it implements.

If we have to avoid reducing the analysis of power to the schema proposed by the juridical constitution of sovereignty, and if we have to think of power in terms of relations of force, do we therefore have to interpret it in terms of the general form of war? Can war serve as an analyzer of power relations?

This question masks several other questions:

- Must war be regarded as a primal and basic state of affairs, and must all phenomena of social domination, differentiation, and hierarchicalization be regarded as its derivatives?
- Do processes of antagonism, confrontations, and struggles among individuals, groups, or classes derive in the last instance from general processes of war?
- Can a set of notions derived from strategy and tactics constitute a valid and adequate instrument for the analysis of power relations?
- Are military and warlike institutions, and more generally the processes that are implemented to wage war, the nucleus of political institutions in either an immediate or a remote sense, in either a direct or an indirect sense?
- But the first question that has to be asked is perhaps this: How, when, and in what way did people begin to imagine that it is war that functions in power relations, that an uninterrupted conflict undermines peace, and that the civil order is basically an order of battle?

This is the question that has been posed in this year's lectures. How did people begin to perceive a war just beneath the surface of peace? Who tried to find the principle that explained order, institutions, and history in the noise and confusion of war and in the mud of battles? Who was the first to think that war is the continuation of politics by other means?



A paradox appears at first glance. As States evolve from the early Middle Ages onward, the practices and institutions of war appear to have undergone an obvious evolution. On the one hand, they tended to be concentrated in the hands of a central power which alone had the right and the means to wage war; as a result, they tended to disappear, if only gradually, from the individual-to-individual or group-to-group relationship, and increasingly became, as a result of this line of development, a State privilege. What is more, and as a result of this, war tends to become the professional and technical prerogative of a carefully defined and controlled military apparatus. In a word: a society completely permeated by warlike relations was gradually replaced by a State endowed with military institutions.

Now this transformation had no sooner been completed than there appeared a certain type of discourse about relations between society and war. A discourse developed about relations between society and war. A historico-political discourse—which was very different from the philosophico-juridical discourse organized around the problem of sovereignty—made war the permanent basis of all the institutions of power. This discourse appeared shortly after the end of the Wars of Religion and at the beginning of the great political struggles of seventeenth-century England. According to this discourse, which was exemplified in England by Coke or Lilburne and in France by Bou-lainvilliers and then by Buat-Nançay, it was war that presided over the birth of States: not an ideal war—the war imagined by the philosophers of the state of nature—but real wars and actual battles; the laws were born in the midst of expeditions, conquests, and burning

towns; but the war continues to rage within the mechanisms of power, or at least to constitute the secret motor of institutions, laws, and order. Beneath the omissions, the illusions, and the lies of those who would have us believe in the necessities of nature or the functional requirements of order, we have to rediscover war: war is the cipher of peace. It divides the entire social body, and it does so on a permanent basis; it puts all of us on one side or the other. And it is not enough to rediscover this war as an explanatory principle; it has to be reactivated. We have to force it out of the silent, larval forms in which it goes on without anyone realizing it, and we must pursue it until the decisive battle for which we have to prepare if we wish to be the victors.

This thematic, which I have so far characterized in very vague terms, allows us to understand the importance of this form of analysis.

1. The subject who speaks in this discourse cannot occupy the position of the jurist or the philosopher, or in other words, the position of the universal subject. In this general struggle of which he is speaking, he is inevitably on one side or the other. He is caught up in the battle, has adversaries and is fighting to win. No doubt he is trying to assert a right; but it is *his* right that is at issue—and it is a singular right that is marked by a relationship of conquest, domination, or seniority: the rights of a race, the rights of triumphant invasions or of millennial occupations. And while he also speaks about the truth, he is speaking about the perspectival and strategic truth that will allow him to be victorious. We have, then, a political and historical discourse that lays claim to truth and right, but which explicitly excludes itself from juridico-philosophical universality. Its role is not the role that legislators and philosophers, from Solon to Kant, have dreamed of: standing between the adversaries, at the center of and above the fray, imposing an armistice, establishing an order that brings reconciliation. It is a matter of establishing a right that is stamped with dissymmetry and that functions as a privilege that has

to be either maintained or reestablished; it is a matter of establishing a truth that functions as a weapon. For a subject speaking such a discourse, the universal truth and general right are illusions or traps.

2. We are also dealing with a discourse that inverts the traditional values of intelligibility. An explanation from below, which does not explain things in terms of what is simplest, most elementary, and clearest, but in terms of what is most confused, most obscure, most disorganized, and most haphazard. It uses as an interpretive principle the confusion of violence, passions, hatreds, revenge, and the tissue of the minor circumstances that create defeats and victories. The elliptical and dark god of battles must explain the long days of order, work, and peace. Fury must explain harmonies. The beginnings of history and right are traced back to a series of brute facts (physical strength, force, character traits) and a series of accidents (defeats, victories, the success or failure of conspiracies, rebellions, or alliances). A growing rationality—the rationality of calculations and strategies—will emerge, but it does so only on top of this tangle, and as we move upward and as it develops, it becomes more and more fragile, more and more wicked, more and more bound up with illusions, chimeras, and mystification. So we have the very opposite of those traditional analyses that try to find beneath the apparent or superficial confusion, beneath the visible brutality of bodies and passions, a basic rationality which is both permanent and related, by its very essence, to the just and the good.

3. This type of discourse develops entirely within the historical dimension. It does not attempt to gauge history, unjust government, and abuses and violence by the standard of the ideal principle of reason or law; on the contrary, it looks beneath the form of institutions and legislatures, and tries to revive the forgotten past of real struggles, concealed defeats and victories, and the blood that has dried

on the codes. It takes as its field of reference the never-ending movement of history. But it is also possible for it to look for support to traditional mythical forms (the lost age of the great ancestors, the coming of the new kingdom that will wipe away the defeats of old): this is a discourse that is capable of expressing both the nostalgia of declining aristocracies and the ardor of the people's revenge.

In short, and unlike the philosophico-juridical discourse organized around the problem of sovereignty and the law, the discourse that deciphers war's permanent presence within society is essentially a historico-political discourse, a discourse in which truth functions as a weapon to be used for a partisan victory, a discourse that is darkly critical and at the same time intensely mythical.



This year's course was devoted to the emergence of this form of analysis: how has war (and its different aspects: invasions, battles, conquests, relations between victors and vanquished, pillage and appropriation, uprisings) been used as an analyzer of history and, more generally, social relations?

1. We must begin by ruling out certain false paternities. Especially Hobbes. What Hobbes calls the war of every man against every man is in no sense a real historical war, but a play of presentations that allows every man to evaluate the threat that every man represents to him, to evaluate the willingness of others to fight, and to assess the risk that he himself would run if he resorted to force. Sovereignty—be it that of a “commonwealth by institution” or that of a “commonwealth by acquisition”—is established not by the fact of warlike domination but, on the contrary, by a calculation that makes it possible to avoid war. For Hobbes, it is a nonwar that founds the State and gives it its form.

2. The history of wars as the wombs of States was no doubt outlined in the sixteenth century, and at the end of the Wars of Religion (by Hotman, for example, in France). But it was mainly in the sev-

enteenth century that this type of analysis was developed. First in England, by the parliamentary opposition and the Puritans, with the idea that English society had been a society of conquest ever since the eleventh century: the monarchy and the aristocracy—and their institutions—were Norman imports, while the Saxon people had, not without difficulty, preserved a few traces of their primitive freedoms. With this backdrop of warlike domination, English historians such as Coke or Selden reconstructed the main episodes in the history of England; each episode is analyzed as either an effect or a resumption of the historically primal state of war that exists between two hostile races which have different institutions and different interests. The revolution, of which these historians are the contemporaries, witnesses, and sometimes the protagonists, is seen as the last battle in that old war, and as its revenge.

An analysis of the same type is also found in France, but at a later date, and especially in aristocratic milieus at the end of the reign of Louis XIV. Boulainvilliers supplies its most vigorous formulation; but this time the story is told, and the rights are demanded, in the name of the victor; when it gives itself a Germanic origin, the French aristocracy claims a right of conquest, and therefore the preeminent possession of all the lands of the kingdom and absolute domination over all its Gaulish or Roman inhabitants. But it also claims prerogatives with respect to royal power, which could not originally have been established without its consent, and which must be kept within the limits established at that time. This is no longer, as in England, a history of a perpetual confrontation between vanquished and victors, and its basic categories are not uprisings and the winning of concessions; it is the history of how the king usurped and betrayed the nobility from which he was descended, and of his unnatural collusion with a bourgeoisie of Gallo-Roman descent. When reworked by Freret and especially Buat-Nançay, this schema was the focus of a whole series of polemics, and it stimulated extensive historical research until the Revolution.

The important point is that the principle of historical analysis was

sought in racial duality and the war between races. On this basis, and through the intermediary of the works of Augustin and Amédée Thierry, two types of historical interpretation developed in the nineteenth century: one will be articulated with the class struggle, and the other with a biological confrontation.

## SITUATING THE LECTURES

Alessandro Fontana and Mauro Bertani

THESE LECTURES WERE DELIVERED between 7 January and 17 March 1976, or between the publication of *Surveiller et punir* (February 1975) and *La Volonté de savoir* (October 1976), and they occupy a specific, one might say strategic, position in Foucault's thought and research. They mark a sort of pause, a momentary halt and no doubt a turning point, in which he evaluates the road that he has traveled and outlines future lines of investigation.

Foucault's course of lectures on "Society Must Be Defended" opens with a sort of survey or summary of the general features of "disciplinary" power—a power that is applied to individual bodies by techniques of surveillance, normalizing sanctions, and the panoptic organization of punitive institutions—and ends with an outline presentation of what he calls "biopower"—a power that is applied in general ways to the population, life, and living beings. In an attempt to establish a "genealogy" for this power, Foucault subsequently investigated "governmentality," or the power that has, since the late sixteenth century, been exercised through the apparatuses and technologies of reason of State and "policing." The question of dis-