

PHILOSOPHICAL — POLITICAL REFLEXIONS AND (PRE) TEXTS OF *BIOPOLITICS* (II)¹

VIORELLA MANOLACHE*

Abstract. *The present study approaches the hypothesis according to which, biopower and biopolitics denounces the paradigm of (historical) explanation of the mechanism between / of (political) power and life (bios). In this sense the second part of the subject will follow the history of emotions route, establishing that, nowadays, the term biopolitics is (re)created (only!) out of love for biology considering that bios remains the binder of all people. In fact, most European-contemporary interventions consider biopolitics (apart from the Foucaultian implications) just a process of international cooperation, a bio-technological review of human potential, a stabilizing mark of the XXI century.*

Keywords: *Biopolitics, Biopolicy, Biorights, Biolegislators, History of Emotions.*

Biopolitics: a handyman term

As a result of the entry into the circuit of Foucaultian thinking (in the late 70's) of the *biopower* and *biopolitics*, the terms (coinciding only partially) reconfirm their interest of definitive settlement² within strong fundamentals of philosophical and political thinking. Subjected to a logics of acceleration the assumptions which had become explicit beginning with 1976 by the “Will to Know” (with an emphasis on the enrollment of the history of sexuality in the analysis of power — subjectivity relations) or by the course “We need to protect the society” (pointing to / towards politics and analysis of power relations), the term of biopolitics is folded to new uses as a sub-discipline of political sciences, by distortion or attachment of other semantic-pragmatic chains.

* PhD, scientific researcher III, Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, Romanian Academy, Bucharest, viorella.manolache@ispri.ro.

¹ The present study (the second part of the study, the first one published in the *Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International Relations*, no. 1/2013) represents the preliminary approaches of a book focused on the theoretical backgrounds of biopolitics, in order to be published at ISPRI Publishing House (2013).

² See in this sense, the thematic numbers of *Multitudes Review* — “Biopolitica și bioputerea” [*Biopolitics and Biopower*] (*Exils*, martie 2002, Paris) or *Cités Review* — “Michel Foucault: de la războiul raselor la bioputere” [*Michel Foucault: from the Rases War to Biopower*] (PUF, Paris, 2001).

The Review *Research in Biopolitics* (published since the 90s, in an obvious allergy to the Foucaultian ideas), argues, on the political science field, for the closer alliance (for efficiency of national and international governance forms) among / between biology and politics (public administration, international relations, law, economics) on the field of terminology derivatives — *biopolitics*, *bioeconomics*, *biopolicy*. We cannot evade in this record, Foucault's view, in which, the very research of reason of this word's creation — biology meeting — politics — confirms that, entering into conjunction, none of the terms no longer retains its original meaning.

Moreover, on the chain of Canguilhem, the upgrading of the biologic field aims bios that does not reduce itself to the physical-chemical mechanisms, to impulses or mathematical moments, but is subsumed to the Nietzsche allegation of error, translated by Foucault by pathological abnormality / abnormal, disease or marginality. Stated marks are related to political philosophy, as far as bios are accepted as common denominator for social fragmentation, for the need for coherent politics that can ensure the legitimacy of democratic institutions.

Under the pressure dictated by Western modernity movements, life finally enters within strategic (long term) relationships circuit. Biopolitics and / or biopower denounces the paradigm of (historical) explanation of the mechanism established between / of (political) power and life (*bios*), in the equation of politicization of biological life, that is, positivity of bios by the power³. Foucault's late writings confirm the subordination of biopolitics to the technologies of power, which integrate / reduce life to biological continuity of the species to the objectification of individual body or investigation of self-techniques, that would allow (beyond the corset of the institutional), the (re) affirmation of subjectivity as a force / form of resistance.

Harmonizing Foucault and Agamben regarding the technology politics relationship — subjectivities techniques, we are put in the evidence according to which, the French philosopher anchors the creation of biopolitics and the biological threshold by western societies, in the eighteenth century, when bios invades the field of politics, and power moves sovereignty from / to the territory to/towards population.

For Agamben, biopolitics can provide explanatory parts to the fluctuations of modernity, through bare life — hidden ground of sovereignty. In agreement with the last lecture of Foucault (1976), the paradoxes of biopower would relate to an imbalance which provides that: increasingly justifying from the protection of life, biopower is moving with the same rhythm towards death, towards the possibility / ability of (self) destruction. Mentioning that neither Foucault nor Agamben sees any need to operate a clear distinction between democratic and totalitarian states (securing and insuring states). In an allusive-metaphorical way, the extermination camp becomes political paradigm of the modern West, because

³ Ciprian Mihali, *Drept de viață, drept la viață, postfață* [Right of Life, Right to Life. Afterword] in Michel Foucault, *Biopolitică și medicină socială* [Biopolitics and Social Medicine], Idea Design&Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2003.

only a non-state policy could allow the existence of bios of potency and power. Agamben relies on a minor biopolitics, which is acting in an indistinct area between public / private, between the political and biological body. Moreover, in a radically way, biopolitics action of the state power aiming the (de)subjectivities — it is the one that disturbs and disrupts, leading to confusion, distinctions with which were operating the academic/classicists politics.

A side view towards / from the history of emotions

Suspected of abuse of philosophical instruments, loaded with existentialism that separates it from the Sartre and Heidegger model, the Foucaultian variant of biopolitics becomes more of a philosophical approach⁴ to (re)assess, both, the immanent politics of history from the politics of truth. Such a background of knowledge is approximated by Lucian Popescu⁵ to a scripting dandyism, justifying the claim according to which Foucault was never postmodern, recurrent myth maintained precisely by the constant appeal to a hermeneutics with personal touches.

(Re)interpreted (in the same hesitant key) also by LaCapra⁶, as a dominant system / ideology of the left discourse of the 60s, the term *pouvoir-savoir* maintains itself in a Foucaultian manner in the transformed overall stance, sheltered nevertheless from the operating rules of Marxist principles. Power remains a diffuse process, circular and unpredictable, exercised on the epistemic-moral background of the imperative of its ownership. The inextricable relationship knowledge-power (in counter-Platonian sense), is loading valences which are stating that “behind any knowledge of what it is at stake is the struggle for power” or “all knowledge has in it a struggle of power”⁷.

If the Kantian problem of getting out from minority would target the socio-political structure of the individual, Foucaultian panoptic maintains the intersecting method of the *Politik* with the economics⁸, opposite epistemic notions — development of the individual vs. society as a perfect mechanism, which interweaves in the area of political ideology (under the disguise of liberalism and socialism).

According to Foucault, “the state is in charge of society, a civil society and the management of the civil society must uphold the state”⁹. Inverse relationship would establish that civil society has as its task the modern political state, its institutional mechanisms being monitored by civil society, to the extent that (in the beginning was the society then followed state), the idea of progress of European societies has been translated by the necessity of creating the states to represent them.

⁴ The retreat of Foucault inside the philosophical models remains confirmed by the refusal to support Mitterand in his election campaign from 1981!

⁵ Lucian Popescu, *Foucault, cunoașterea și istoria* [Foucault, Knowledge and History], Institutul European Publishing House, Iassy, 2011.

⁶ D. LaCapra, *Surroundings in Critical Theory*, Cornell Univeristy Press, Ithaca & Londra, 1989.

⁷ Michel Foucault, *Ce este un autor?* [What is an Author?], Idea Design & Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2004.

⁸ The return of the economic theory in/towards labor and production at the end of the 18th century has created, in a Foucaultian way, the necessary conditions for transposing the modern knowledge into a psychology of represented needs and an anthropology of natural finiteness.

⁹ Michel Foucault, *Securitate, teritoriu, populație* [Security, Territory, Population], Idea Design & Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2009, p. 295.

Beyond such a statist vision, increasing of power relations / human politicization of the late eighteenth century, would aim the very invasion of the *Politik* as an effect of perpetuating minority status, by forced categorizing of the servitude knowledge. Restored, as a necessary imperative, within the perverted models, the notion of truth (truth observation — demonstration — event, translated by the triad history-science-society) would target archaeological approach in the archive, system that establishes statements as events.

Maurice Blanchot¹⁰ stated that, apart from indulging in the illusion of autonomy of discourse, what remains essential with Foucault, is the multiple relationship knowledge-power, the obligation to become aware of the political effects produced, or in Nietzsche language, to pay the price of truth. On the route submission — subject, for Blanchot, the very rigorous frames is the one that disarticulates the body, but is forced to rebuild, having as its model the Benthamian utopia. Reconstruction is visible, both as tragic of the fact that it is under surveillance and as mechanism — following the rules and having a productive — useful nature — which is equivalent to the human condition itself. The transition from a society of blood from one of sex denounces the biologic fantasy, which is hiding the right of ownership granted to a hypothetical Indo-European society whose ultimate manifestation would be the Germanic society¹¹.

The tragic evidence derives from the Freudian theory of prohibited consanguinity of the sovereign Father, approach that renders the law (at the expense of the norm) its prior rights, without sacralizing the repressive state. Such evidence reinforces the ambiguity of the psychoanalytic approach, either by rediscovering the importance of sexuality and its deviations, or by appealing to desire — the anachronism of locating into modernity and approximated at Foucault by historical retroversion.

The approach is not unknown for René Girard, by assimilating the world to post — to an existence which constantly complains its own violence, ritual, by transposing the conflicts into the language of innocent victims. Although the nihilisms of extreme left are as the ones of extreme right, their ideology prevents reinstatement into rights of the concern for victims (from the failure of Nazism, no deconstruction, demystified hasn't been attacking this value!). That is why we are placed, according to René Girard, in a world of pseudo-nihilisms, in a caricature ultra Christianity of the other totalitarianism (the one which claims its Judeo-Christian aspirations and which instead of opposing Christianity, exceeds it to the left)¹².

In the context of release from the religious pressure, Pascal Quignard¹³ invites us to look sideways, using the fascination, as a perception of the blind spot of

¹⁰ Maurice Blanchot, *Michel Foucault așa cum mi-l imaginez [Michel Foucault as I Imagine Him]*, in *Biopolitică și medicină socială [Biopolitics and Social Medicine]*, Idea Design&Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2003.

¹¹ *Idem*, p. 16.

¹² René Girard, *Prăbușirea Satanei [Satan Fall Like Lightning]* Nemira & Co Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006, pp. 202-205.

¹³ Pascal Quignard, *Sexul și spaima [Sex and Terror]*, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.

speech. From this laterality, Eros appears as substituted to the religious, archaic board, pre-human, addressing the content of emerging human language acquired and of voluntary mental life, as fear and laughter. Erotic anguish becomes fascination, and Erotic laughter — sarcasm of *ludibrium*. Beyond contagious religions, laughter and fear become what Sandor Ferenczi approximated by erotic passion — battle of retrieval of the old *domus*. According to Quignard, only to the end of the *anahorese*, the ego converts into an intimate *domus*. Private space becomes *mouseion*, incineration — burial, tough opposition, irreparable between *villa* — *polis* — *urbs*, diluting itself¹⁴. Noting that, eroticism and reproduction (re)bring to the fore, the profile of discontinuous beings.

For Georges Bataille¹⁵, what is at stake in eroticism is a disintegration of established forms, regular life, social order, which found the discontinuous order of definite individualities.

Transgression, as an overcome and completion of the interdiction, defines the new social life. The interdiction corresponds to labor economics: in the profane time of labor, society accumulates its resources; sacred time is celebration par excellence. In the perspective of economics, holidays consume resources accumulated during labor. Gathering and celebration are two phases opposite of the religion, part of a dynamic in which the recession requires the leap forward¹⁶.

For Bataille, the rational man is stirred (just on the outside) by the religious facts, and eroticism is imposing easier than the old demands of religion, establishing that we are placed on the route-with-unique-sense, from the largeness of modern — Christian views /towards the fear of sexuality¹⁷.

Opposing to the erotic state *teopatia*, Bataille believes that eroticism becomes dialectical and mutually, an alternative to the obsolete philosophy. With a mentioning: the ultimate philosophical interrogation coincides with the peak of eroticism, establishing that the post society becomes, essentially, marked by the history of emotions!¹⁸

Actual biopolitics — more than politics

Relating to the Foucaultian biopolitical model, placing it in the laterality of the approach launched by the *Biopolitics International Organization*¹⁹, we can establish that, diluting itself (by rolling at the edge of political — philosophy, but

¹⁴ Viorella Manolache, *Homo Posthistoricus — Profil filosofico-politic*, Editura Astra Museum, editată Techno Media, Sibiu, 2012.

¹⁵ Georges Bataille, *Erotismul [Erotism]*, Nemira & Co Publishing House, Bucharest, 2005.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 79-80.

¹⁷ The history of emotions opposes two types of taylorism: the impact and seuction of generations by Elizabeth Taylor vs. the other taylorism, as an enrollment of workers in factories. Thus, it is decreed as imperative, the need for historians of taste and for geographers of emotion (see Georges Duby, *Amor și sexualitate în Occident [Love and Sexuality in Occident]*, Aramis Publishing House, Bucharest 1991).

¹⁸ Viorella Manolache, *Obiectivitatea puterii și refuzul suveranității: (re)găsirea identității la Georges Bataille*, in *Convorbiri literare*, January 2009, nr. 1 (157), pp. 138-143.

¹⁹ *Biopolitics International Organization (B.I.O.)* was founded in 1985, as a solution to the environmental problems, of acceleration of implementing the effective theories regarding the ground, as a motor of development of international politics for guarantee of universal harmony and economic growth. The organizations summons representatives from over 165 countries (including Romania).

centered in the area of interest in current issues) the term biopolitics is (re)created (only!) out of love for biology (*sic*) and the belief that the bios remains the binder of all people. *Biopolitics International Organization* acknowledges the key role of biopolitics (as long as it manages to define it) as a constructive tool for sustainable solidarity, by switching from conventional means to legal norms, by creating cooperation regarding bio-environmentalist means, using international laws of conflict resolution and adopting formal — multilateral agreements.

In the view of the Organization, solidarity is claimed as strength of the French Revolution, declared reaction against the feudal Europe. Beyond national (class) solidarity would exist another — an international one — a positive purpose for integration in an interdependent world. In this context, biopolitics is translated as a unifying concept, mediated by bio-diplomatic channels, disposed of drawing (strongly) political borders and their defense, relying on the complementarity of legal — institutional instruments and the moral-ethical ones. Sustainable development would be the alternative to an economic process out of control and of the population growth.

Moreover, bio-diplomacy would operate in the field of international cooperation, within the environmentalist protection, as interdependence of the life forms, subsumed to the open circuit diplomacy-people-decisional factors at national and local level, in the presence of erosion of the centric states and of the unchaining of the margin. Organization is not afraid to consider bio-diplomacy as a common aspiration for sovereign states and civil society, to (re)find biological binder and intercultural diversity²⁰.

On the trail of the reorganization efforts of the European Council in terms of increasing the role of local and regional authorities, through careful development of the principle of subsidiary, as the primary part of the Maastricht Treaty, the European project of bio-politics, relies on the principles of decentralized Europe, translated by bio-environmental imperative, as an interdependent and harmonious response given to contemporary realities. The imperative is reduced to the image of the human body, consisting of a single cell, loaded with / of the same genetic material, the essence of biopolitics representing, according to the “doctrinaire” of the organization (Vlavianos-Arvantis), the growth model of quality of life, in the presence of increased and accelerated degree of the specializations, of technological escalade.

Taking such evidence and anchoring it to the register of the legal sizes, Haim Klugman (Consultant of the Ministry of Justice of Israel) examined, from the perspective of bio-politics, concepts such as consumer protection, the right to safety, the right to closing of the business and / or employment responsibility in the manufacturing sector. Review of legislative measures in terms of bios, reaffirms the need for a shared vision of biopolitics (biopolicy) as Environmental Ethics, aspect of a necessary and healthy political management.

²⁰ Using as an educational form the biocentric model, outside of the conventional sciences, translated by the *International University for the Bio-Environment* (I.U.B.E.), the Organization can not distance itself from a certain rhetoric, lacking a minimal theoretical placement into (pre)established patterns, considering, for example, a program as *Bio-Syllabus for European Environmental Education*, as an educational pioneering act!

In fact, most European-contemporary interventions consider (apart from the Foucaultian implications) biopolitics just as a process of international cooperation, a bio-technological review of human potential, a stabilizing mark of the 21 century. Such a manifest recalibrates the exhausting — “old” latent models, (tyranny, democracy), the reactive “alternative” ones, (socialism, communism, capitalism) and the “new” option located in concentric range of bios, as part of a dynamic equilibrium, of multidimensional models, as potential vectors of the notion of biopolitics.

Changes initiated by the reactivation of the bio model, would require, imperatively, its mediation by biolegislators agencies, another placed term, as well as the entire European attempt of delivery of a bio-artificializing pattern (handy in all matters), only at the surface of political-philosophical direction and in biological dimensions only.

Bio-legislators are invested with the title of delegates in setting ethical boundaries, within which, morality can be legally justified and analyzed. Besides, the generalized view would consider that bio-policies aim the protecting and improving the quality of life.

Placing in the same equation, biopolitics and sustainable development, U.S. Commission for Development and Environment, defined acceleration, as a process / method that meets the needs of present generations, without jeopardizing the ability of future generations to satisfy their own needs. Overlapping (by incorporation) the environmental policy (although the term is not explicitly stated in the definition and benchmarks), would consider the note of the report *Our Common Future*, which refers to sustainability as a process of change in which, exploitation of resources, direction of investments, orientation of ecologic development and institutional changes become a harmonious way to ensure human needs and aspirations. Under the warning that, the definition remains dependent to the anthropocentric conception found in Principle 1 of the *Rio Declaration* (1992).

In conclusion, in an attempt to compare the elements which separates biopolitics from sustainable development, F. Liu (Former Assistant of the Secretary General of the United States), indicated marks with which operates sustainable development, having as an essential key the development of human resources in all sectors of production (mainly agriculture and industry), addressing to structural-economic changes which accompany the boom of social institutions.

Biopolitics mobilizes all sectors of society, not only the authority, through bio-education, bio-diplomacy, bio-culture, as different forms of environmental activism.

Beyond the immediate-observable differences, the sustainable development and biopolitics are not, however, entirely different, since both use economic policy instruments in order to internalize external costs. Economic sustainability would rely on the very two-dimensional economy, on finding the balance between supply-demand, while bio-politics model is three-dimensional, in which profit is measured by the progress of education, culture and quality of life. Bio-culture remains the essential sector which involves the co-evolution of humanity with its environment, providing ways for biocentric government, by guiding the placement

of the marks of what is accepted as a theory placed “beyond sustainable development”. The imperative is translated also in the activity for Bio-Environment International University (I.U.B.E), as alternative-institution for interdisciplinary analysis, a theoretical and applied infusion mode.

The economics’ model in three dimensions (no allusion to the non-Euclidean movement structure, mentioned by Poincaré, of the world with more dimensions) translates the approach of the bio-legislators to connect the biorights — obligations, an objective easily observable also in the proposals of the Union and European Commission (by *The White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment*, 1993), arguing for a combinatory model, which should regain an optimum of nature and labor, sub evaluating the labor resources and under evaluating the environmental ones. Besides, the option supported by *Biopolitics International Organization* it is not surprising, the one which is to accelerate the establishment of an International Court of Environment, in whose political project site is found global referendum, as a mobilization in issues related to environment politics, an excuse for the regeneration of functioning principles of participatory democracy. Locating politics within the *Biopolis*, a bio-architectural conception creating habitation niches, by the imperative of biological patterns and the restructuring of bio-materials, one cannot omit the imperative stated by Foucault, when drawing or distancing markers of biopolitics from the new urban policy, disguised or, on the contrary, relieved of its new equipments.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blanchot, Maurice, *Michel Foucault așa cum mi-l imaginez [Michel Foucault as I Imagine Him]*, in *Biopolitică și medicină socială [Biopolitics and Social Medicine]*, Idea Design&Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2003;
- Bataille, Georges, *Erotismul [Erotism]*, Nemira & Co Publishing House, Bucharest, 2005;
- Duby, Georges, *Amor și sexualitate în Occident [Love and Sexuality in Occident]*, Aramis Publishing House, Bucharest 1991;
- Foucault, Michel, *Ce este un autor? [What is an Author?]*, Idea Design & Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2004;
- Foucault, Michel, *Securitate, teritoriu, populație [Security, Territory, Population]*, Idea Design & Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2009;
- Foucault, Michel, *Biopolitică și medicină socială [Biopolitics and Social Medicine]*, Idea Design&Print Publishing House, Cluj, 2003;
- Girard, René *Prăbușirea Satanei [Satan Fall Like Lightning]* Nemira & Co Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006;
- LaCapra, D., *Soroundings in Critical Theory*, Cornell Univeristy Press, Ithaca & Londra, 1989;
- Manolache, Viorella, *Homo Posthistoricus — Profil filosofico-politic*, Editura Astra Museum, Techno Media, Sibiu, 2012;
- Manolache, Viorella, *Obiectivitatea puterii și refuzul suveranității: (re)găsirea identității la Georges Bataille*, in *Convorbiri literare*, ianuarie 2009, nr. 1 (157), pp. 138-143;
- Popescu, Lucian, *Foucault, cunoașterea și istoria [Foucault, Knowledge and History]*, Institutul European Publishing House, Iassy, 2011;
- Quignard, Pascal, *Sexul și spaima [Sex and Terror]*, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.