"Society Must be Defended" 1-8

Lecture 1 (7 January 1976)

I. Introduction (1-3)
    A. Institution of the Collège de France
    B. Crowds at F's lectures
    C. "Scattered" nature of F's recent research
II. Recent social / intellectual history (since 1960) (3-12)
    A. "dispersed and discontinuous offensives"
        1) Sites of revolt: Anti-psychiatry; "sexual revolution"; Anti-prison movement; the book / event that was *Anti-Oedipus*
        2) Withering of global theories
            a) Marxism and psychoanalysis only effective locally
            b) When their global character has been checked
    B. "Insurrection of subjugated knowledges": "historical knowledge of struggles" (forecast of theme of lecture course) /
        1) Buried historical content
        2) Disqualified or nonconceptual knowledges
    C. "multiple genealogical investigations"
        1) played off against the discredited global theories
        2) against "centralizing power-effects" of institutionalized science
            a) examples of Marxism and (later, p. 12) Soviet psychiatry
    D. Archeology = analysis of local discursivities; genealogy = use of desubjugated knoweledges released by archeology
III. Question of power (13-18)
    A. "Economism" in theories of power
        1) Classical juridical / liberal theory
            a) Power as commodity that is possessed
            b) And can be transferred by contract to sovereign
        2) Marxism
            a) Political power has its *raison d'être* in the economy
            b) Perpetuate relations of production / reproduce class domination
    B. Not many available tools for a noneconomic theory of power
        1) Power as repression (Reich)
        2) Power as war (Nietzsche): inversion of Clausewitz's dictum ("war is politics by other means") into "politics is war by other means"
            a) Social power relations anchored in a given historical war so that politics "sanctions and reproduces" the result of that war
            b) Political struggles are continuations of that same war
            c) Final decision that ends politics can only come in a final battle
    C. Recap of economism vs war-repression models
    D. F's recent work inscribed w/in struggle-repression model
        1) F was forced to rethink this model and perhaps will have to abandon it
        2) F has always been suspicious of repression model
IV. Forecast (18-19)
    A. War as model for power
    B. Course outline:
        1) Dismissing "false paternity" of social war discourse: Machiavelli and Hobbes
        2) Racial binarism of social war discourse
        3) Racism and class struggle

Lecture 2 (14 January 1976) Summary of past work on discipline: the "how of power"

I. Triangle of "power, right, truth" (23-27)
    A. juridical thought centered on royal power as sovereignty since Middle Ages

          1)   Either royal power was grounded in a basic right
          2)   Or that it had to be limited

   B.   F's inversion of juridical thought: bypassing problem of sovereignty
          1)   Stressing the fact of domination
          2)   Showing how right is an instrument of domination

II. Methodological precautions (27-34)
   A.   Look to exercise of power at real extremities, not at formal center
   B.   Study the multiple peripheral bodies rather than the Leviathan at center
   C.   Look at how power circulates through individuals, constituting them as subjects, i.e., as "subjected to" and as "active subjects," rather than being applied to an inert substance (F as anti-hylomorphic)
   D.   Ascending analysis of power:
          1)   Methodology of ascending analysis
              a)   begin with "infinitesimal mechanisms"
              b)   show investment by general mechanism and forms of domination
          2)   Examples of vacuity of descending analysis
               a)   Bourgeoisie not interested in mad, sexual children, or delinquents
              b)   But in the mechanisms of power that control them and that yield
                  (1) Economic profit
                  (2) Political utility
   E.   Look to actual instruments of power, not their ideological trimmings

III. Juridical theory of power and its relations to disciplinary power (34-37)
   A.   "massive historical fact": sovereignty theory dates to Middle Ages
   B.   Four roles of this theory
          1)   Referred to actual power mechanism of feudal monarchy
          2)   Instrument to constitute and justify monarchical administration
          3)   Became a weapon on both sides of Wars of Religion
          4)   In 18th C, became alternative model to absolute monarchy
   C.   Birth of disciplines in 17th and 18th C incompatible with relations of sovereignty
          1)   Disciplines as opposite of sovereign power
               a)   Exercised on bodies and capacities, not on land and its products
              b)   Minute calculation vs absolute expenditure
           2)   But sovereignty theory still organized juridical codes of 19th C
               a)   Permanent critical resource against monarchists
              b)   Allowed for
                  (1) concealment of mechanisms
                  (2) erasure of fact of domination
                  (3) the "democratization of sovereignty"

IV. Right of sovereignty / mechanics of discipline (37-40)
   A.   two limits to exercise of power
   B.   human sciences found at their intersection
   C.   conflict of disciplinary normalization and sovereignty-based rights
          1)   recourse to sovereignty-based rights traps us in bottleneck
          2)   we need a new, anti-disciplinary and non-sovereignty-based right

Lecture 3 (21 January 1976)

I. Recap of previous lecture and last five years of F's work: "manufacture of subjects, not the genesis of the sovereign" (43-46)
   A.   Presuppositions of theory of sovereignty ("juridical theory of power")
          1)   subject-to-subject cycle
          2)   unitary power as basis of transforming *puissances* into political *pouvoirs*
          3)   cycle of legitimacy and law
   B.   F trying to analyze power outside the juridical / sovereignty theory
          1)   Analyze power at points of exercise of domination
          2)   Analyze field of real exercise of power, rather than its formal source / apex (F's anti-representationalism or his "nominalism")

3) Identify the technical instruments of exercise of domination
II. Preliminary sketch of social war discourse (46-52)
    A. Forecast of future questions
    B. Clausewitz's principle:
        1) Not who inverted C's principle
        2) But who formulated the principle that C inverted?
    C. In other words, "politics is war by other means" existed long before C
        1) Paradox: when war becomes monopoly of State, social war model arises
        2) History of key moments in social war model:
            a) Bourgeois revolutionaries in English Civil War (1640s)
            b) Rearguard struggle of French aristocrats against Louis XIV (@ 1690s)
            c) Nationalist discourse during French Revolution (1790s)
            d) Class struggle theories in mid 19th C
            e) Racial purity and eugenicists in late 19th and early 20th C
        3) Content of the social war model
            a) War presides at birth of States
            b) War continues to rage beneath the law in all mechanisms of power
            c) Binary structure of society
        4) Novelty of the social war model:
            a) first historical-political discourse in post-medieval Europe
            b) perspectivalism: you have to be on one side or the other: no neutrality
            c) singular rather than universal rights
III. Epistemology of the social war model (52-59)
    A. Questioning of identification of truth with peace or neutrality
        1) De-centering brings better ability to interpret truth, denounce errors
        2) Truth as a force to be deployed on basis of relation of force
        3) Speaking subject as one fighting a war
    B. Inverts value of explaining from above
        1) Now we explain from below, on basis of what is confused and chaotic
        2) Thus war is supposed to explain peace
            a) A series of brute physico-biological facts
            b) A series of accidents or contingencies
            c) A bundle of psychological / moral elements
        3) Rationality grows out of these elements
            a) becoming more and more abstract and illusory as it grows
            b) becoming more and more tied to cunning and wickedness of the victors
    C. Develops solely w/in historical dimension
        1) Does not judge historical events by reference to an ideal standard
        2) But wants to "rediscover the blood that has dried in the codes"
    D. Bound up with myths
        1) Lost age of great ancestors
        2) Imminence of the new times
        3) Millenary revenge
    E. Hegelian-Marxist dialectic as philosophical colonization of social war discourse
IV. Forecast (59-62)
    A. Get rid of the "false paternities" of Machiavelli and Hobbes
    B. Dual birth in the 1600s: racial struggle or even "race war"
        1) English revolutionaries in the 1630s
        2) French aristocrats in the 1690s
    C. French revolution and nationalist history (early 1800s)
    D. Two 19th C transcriptions
        1) Marxist / socialist inscription: class struggle
        2) Darwinist biological inscription:
            a) Full bio-social racism: splitting of single race into super-race / sub-race
            b) Race struggle becomes discourse of central State power: State racism
               (1) Struggle against deviation from the norm

    (2) Theories of degeneracy and eugenics: permanent purification

Lecture 4 (28 January 1976)

I. Intro: in praise of discourse of race struggle (65-66)
  A. Racist discourse is only a single episode in long history of race war discourse
  B. Race war discourse as counterhistory
II. History as justification and reinforcement of [monarchical] power (66-69)
  A. Two purposes:
    1) Recounting history to establish juridical link btw kings and power
    2) Use intensity of glory of historical exploits to fascinate men
  B. Three traditional axes
    1) Genealogical: demonstrate ancient, uninterrupted line of sovereign right
    2) Memorialization: each act of king a law and an obligation
    3) Exemplification: examples as "glory made law"
  C. Two aspects of power map onto Indo-European binary representation
    1) Juridical: power binds into a unity by oaths, bonds, law
    2) Magic: power blinds and petrifies by dazzling displays
III. Race discourse as anti-Roman history, as "counterhistory" (69-73)
  A. No more link btw people and king / nation and sovereign (binding)
    1) Sovereign no longer binds into a unity
    2) Instead it enslaves
    3) Heterogeneous histories
  B. No more continuity of glory (dazzling)
    1) Light is now divisive: it illuminates and it darkens
    2) Counterhistorical is a disruption
    3) Appeals to a prophetic rupture
  C. This anti-Roman history looks like mythico-religious history of the Jews
    1) Bible as weapon of poverty and insurrection
    2) Biblical form of prophecy and promise
  D. New function of memory
    1) Disinter something that has been hidden bcs of deliberate misrepresentation, that is, the origin of States in war
    2) Show that "laws deceive, kings wear masks, power creates illusions, and historians tell lies"
  E. An attack on power and a demand
    1) Power is unjust bcs it does not belong to us
    2) Declare war by declaring rights
IV. Summary hypothesis (73-76)
  A. Roman sovereign history now constrained by Biblical history;
  B. Discourse of rebellion and prophecy that challenges Roman legacy
    1) Counterhistory seeks to unmask Rome as new Babylon
    2) Rome had been constant presence in Middle Ages
      a) National myths of Trojan descent: all are brothers of Rome
  C. New European historical consciousness
    1) new beginnings in war and conquest
    2) new peoples: Franks, Gauls, Celts
V. Comments (76-80)
  A. Race discourse is not necessarily that of the oppressed
  B. "race" is not simply biological in this discourse
  C. Two great forms of historical discourse
    1) Roman style: sovereignty and Biblical style: servitude and exile
    2) Intersection of those styles provided discursive explosions
      a) English Civil War: Saxons vs Normans
      b) French aristocracy vs absolutist monarchy
      c) 19th C: history of peoples vs that of regimes
  D. Idea of revolution

                1) Its origins and content still enigmatic
                2) Cannot be separated from the practice of counterhistory
                3) Provides clue why historical discourse becomes problem in 19th C

VI. Birth of racism (80-83)
    A. Thiers transformed race struggle into class struggle
    B. At same time race in bio-medical sense is born
        1) Evolutionary sense of struggle for existence
        2) Society as biologically monist
            a) Foreigners have invaded / infiltrated
            b) Deviants are produced w/in society as degeneration
    C. State plays new role
        1) No longer instrument of one race against another
        2) But now protector of integrity, superiority, purity of the national race
    D. Racism as inversion of revolutionary discourse
        1) Race discourse had been weapon against State [Roman] sovereignty
        2) Racism now used by State to protect its sovereignty via medical normalization
    E. 20th C transformations of racism
        1) Nazi state racism
            a) inscribed in prophetic discourse from which race struggle once emerged
            b) Nazi myths of popular struggle:
                (1) Germans victimized by Versailles treaty
                (2) Awaiting new Reich: apocalypse, end of days
        2) Soviet scientific racism
            a) Class enemy becomes biological threat
            b) Medical police eliminates class enemies as if they were bio threat

Lecture 5 (4 February 1976)

I. Prelude: question of anti-Semitism (87-89)
    A. race struggle discourse not related to medieval, religious anti-Semitism
    B. anti-Semitism does enter the picture in 19th C in State racism
II. criticism of view that Hobbes belongs to social war discourse (89-99)
    A. What is Hobbes's war of all against all? (89-93)
        1) Presupposes equality: differences would preclude or rapidly conclude war
        2) Theater of war: interplay of will & representations: "primal diplomacy"
    B. And how does it found the State? (93-97)
        1) Types of sovereignty:
            a) Institution: sovereign represents by taking the place of individuals
            b) Acquisition: vanquished agree to obey; will to prefer life to death
            c) Familial sovereignty: child consents to mother's sovereignty to save its life
        2) Form of sovereignty: will to live of those afraid for their lives
    C. What is Hobbes's object in this discourse? (97-99)
        1) To erase the reality of war as historical base of sovereignty
        2) Rather, sovereignty can be deduced by reason
        3) Basically, Hobbes wants to eliminate recourse to fact of the Conquest
III. Norman Conquest (99-109)
    A. The Conquest was manifest in a variety of ways (99-101)
        1) Royal rituals invoking sovereignty by right of conquest
        2) French language of law
        3) Conflict of legends: Saxon vs Norman (rehabbed Celtic legend of Arthur)
        4) Historical memory of rebellions
    B. Social war discourse circulated among both Saxons and Normans (101-109)
        1) "discourse of the king": use Conquest as legitimation
            a) By right of conquest: king is owner of England and possessor of right
            b) "boomerang effect" of colonization: Normans colonized Saxons
                (1) CLR James: Black Jacobins radicalized the French Revolution

                    (2) Plantation work system fed back into European discipline
                    (3) If Saxons took this up, they would have to see themselves as savages?

        2) Parliamentarians: begin by denying Conquest
            a) If William is legitimate heir to England, he is bound to Saxon law
            b) The Conquest comes later, as the other Normans usurp Saxon rights
            c) Saxon right sees leader as elected war chief rather than divine king
            d) Saxon right becomes expression of human reason; "foundational utopia"
        3) Radicals: Levellers and Diggers
            a) Primary theses:
                  (1) Levellers: [unjust] Conquest means invalidates all current law
                        (a) Law as mere instrument of power
                        (b) Current property regime is unjust
                  (2) Diggers: rebellion is our response in an ongoing war
            b) Developments:
                  (1) Bring back Saxon laws bcs they are laws of nature
                  (2) But aren't Saxon laws themselves based on war and conquest?
                  (3) So all power is domination

IV. Summary: social war model as "political historicism" is Hobbes's adversary (109-11)

Lecture 6 (11 February 1976)

I. Origin myths as lessons in public right [= constitutional law] (115-124)
    A. French are descended from the Trojans:
        1) Elides history of conflict between Rome and Gaul
        2) French are rightful heirs to Romans (as younger brothers)
            a) Rights and powers of French king are those of a Roman emperor
            b) French have same rights as Rome
                  (1) French are in no way subordinate to the Germans (Habsburg emperors)
                  (2) Colonization of Gaul by Rome had to be elided
                  (3) Frankish invasions had to be elided
    B. "Germanic thesis"
        1) Circulating at time of Wars of Religion (1570s)
        2) Proposes subordination of French to Habsburgs
    C. Francois Hotman (1573)
        1) Political historicism: no more continuous genealogies of royal sovereignty
        2) Juridical / limited government as point of story
        3) Hotman's story:
            a) Gauls and Germans [Franks] are brothers
            b) Germans [Franks] come to rescue of Gauls and expel Romans
            c) Ancient German law entails popular sovereignty
        4) Hotman does not tell a binary story, but one of original unity
    D. "Radical Gallo-centrism": Gauls as motor of history
        1) Original Gauls spread out throughout Europe
        2) The returning Franks were simply then coming home
        3) In doing so, they reabsorbed Gallo-Roman absolutism
            a) King grants fiefs to his warriors in gratitude for their bravery
            b) Thus "property" of nobles due to act of royal will; king is real owner
II. These stories are related to English developments in political historicism (124-27)
    A. Commonality:
        1) invasion is historical / juridical-political issue: basis of public right
        2) contra Hobbes and the other philosophers of contract
        3) Clovis et al are now figures of rupture, not continuity
        4) "nos ancêtres les Gallois" as a lesson in public right
    B. Difference:
        1) English begin with story of social heterogeneity

2) But idea of French unity only ends at end of 17th C
III. Problem of political pedagogy / State knowledge (127-133)
    A. Boulainvilliers
        1) condenses massive report of state of France for prince
        2) puts forth theses favorable to the nobility, etc.
        3) but most importantly, he criticizes circular State power-knowledge
        4) proposes historical knowledge instead: equity of nobles and king
    B. Two enemies of nobles' historical knowledge
        1) Juridical knowledge:
            a) flattery of king's pretension to absolute power
            b) to be challenged by history of royal betrayals of noble peers
        2) Administrative knowledge:
            a) flattery of king's wealth
            b) challenged by history of unjust robbery of nobles via war, church, etc.
IV. New form of history (133-138)
    A. New subject of history: the "society" or "nation"
        1) New speaking subject
            a) Previously, only the royal flatterer
            b) Now the nobility sees itself as separate nation from others in the State
        2) New subject of history
            a) That is, new objects of historical analysis
            b) Group conflicts; history of betrayals
        3) A new pathos: (birth of what becomes French right-wing thought)
    B. Aim of this new form of history
        1) Challenge administrative power-knowledge
        2) Get between the king and his ministers
    C. In response, royal power attempts to organize historical knowledge
        1) Creation of what amounts to a ministry of history (1760 onward)
        2) History as a weapon: ministry of history
            a) Acknowledges constitution, i.e., historically basic laws of the nation
            b) But attempts to control that knowledge

Lecture 7 (18 February 1976)

I. Introduction: recap of previous lectures (141-144)
    A. Two novelties in historical discourse (contra "Roman" praise of royal power)
        1) A new object breaks historical continuity: the Germanic invasion
        2) A new speaking subject: multiple "nations" begin to speak
            a) *Encyclopedia*: "statist" concept of "nation": a people founds a state
            b) Nobles wanted a heterogeneous collection of nations w/in the State
    B. Comparison of English and French political historicism
        1) English system was a simple binary opposition of Saxons / Normans
        2) French nobles fought on 2 fronts: against monarchist and bourgeoisie
            a) Against monarchists, nobles claim [ancient Germanic] freedoms
            b) Against bourgeoisie, nobles claim rights based on victory in invasion
II. Boulainvilliers (144-155)
    A. What did Franks find in entering Gaul?
        1) Gaul had been conquered and a foreign (Roman) absolutism imposed
            a) Romans had disarmed the native Gaulish aristocracy
            b) Romans used equality as despotic trick to ally themselves w/ the people
            c) Romans then create an administrative, not warrior, aristocracy
        2) Franks thus found the Romans had to pay mercenaries
            a) This necessitated monetary taxes
            b) Creating an inflation ("devaluation")
        3) B's question is economico-political, not one of public right

          a) Not, did Franks abolish Roman sovereignty?
          b) But, why were the Romans defeated?
  B. Who were the Franks who invaded Gaul?
    1) Warrior aristocracy = Frankish people itself
    2) Two leaders, both elected. Not necessarily the same person
          a) Civil magistrate for settling peacetime disputes
          b) Warlord, only in times of war
    3) Warrior freedom: the "blond beasts"
          a) These free warriors would never let warlord become an absolute monarch
          b) Thus each warrior directly benefited from invasion by claiming land
    4) Vase of Soissons: Clovis as civil magistrate could only distribute booty
    5) How did Franks succeed? (portrait of ideal feudalism)
          a) Isolated warrior caste w/ monopoly of weapons
          b) Demanded only payment in kind from supporting peasants
  C. What happened to the Frankish warriors vis-à-vis the monarch?
    1) Nobles become caught btw monarch and people (qua mercenaries)
          a) Military success of invasion required a permanent war footing
          b) Thus dual system of warlord and civil magistrate collapses
          c) King thus had to recruit mercenaries to battle recalcitrant nobles
          d) Nobles now caught btw monarch and people he recruits as mercenaries
    2) 2nd part of the Soissons vase story
          a) Clovis strikes down the challenging noble
          b) Absolutism: Clovis's military power settles civil [property] dispute
    3) Monarch forms a second front against the nobles
          a) Monarch's alliance w/ old Gaullish aristos, now become Churchmen
          b) "language-power" system: Latin, Roman law, State
          c) Other-worldly Church seduces Frankish warriors
             (1) They become (Crusading) knights
             (2) While at home the Churchmen and monarchs plot to steal their lands
  D. What does B want the contemporary nobles to do?
    1) To become scholars of political historicism
    2) And thus insert themselves into the historical-political struggle
III. B establishes war as grid of historical intelligibility (155-163)
  A. War and foundations of right:
    1) Natural right is freedom and equality together
    2) War "conceals" such a right by showing it is unreal, abstract, fictive
          a) Historical:
             (1) There's always another war to be found
             (2) Or the inequalities resulting from a war
          b) Theoretical
             (1) Freedom essentially entails freedom to dominate
             (2) So freedom is essentially opposite of equality
             (3) Freedom only is real in a real relation of unequal forces
          c) Historico-theoretical
             (1) So any putative natural right is an abstract fiction
             (2) That is inevitably defeated in any real historical setting
    3) History (unequal forces) always stronger than nature (theoretical equality)
  B. War and battle form
    1) Unequal forces that decide war already established in structure of military
    2) Military-industrial complex is the key to analysis of society
          a) Heavily armed warriors support themselves (feudal land ownership)
          b) King can however afford an army of foot soldiers (central taxation)
  C. Invasion-rebellion system
    1) Dialectic of forces (how strong became weak and weak became strong)
          a) Victorious and strong Frankish warriors
             (1) Isolated on their estates and concerned only with war

    (2) They became separated from king
    (3) And neglected their education, Latin, etc
   b) Vanquished and weak Gaullish aristocracy
    (1) Are driven into the Church
    (2) Where they become learned in Latin and law
    (3) And thus become the king's councilors
  2) War as permanent state of society
   a) Multiple social struggles: no longer two armies, but now many groups
   b) Real war, not Hobbesian pseudo-war

IV. Conclusion (163-165)
 A. War becomes grid of intelligibility for social analysis
  1) That is, B's discourse has a truth value for our regime of truth
  2) Whereas myths of Trojan descent do not (they are neither true nor false)
 B. B is able to recuperate Machiavelli's discourse
  1) For M, relationship of force is a political technique of the prince
  2) For B, it is a historico-political object: formation of historico-political field
 C. B is origin of idea that war is historical discourse's truth-matrix
 D. Rather than ascending bourgeoisie being fathers of historical rationality, it was the dispossessed
  aristos of B's group
 E. Clausewitz could produce his dictum by inverting B's discourse

Lecture 8 (25 February 1976)

I. B establishes "historico-political field" by taking "nations" as object (167-172)
 A. New speaking subject of history: the vanquished have a voice
  1) History could now become history of the people / peoples
  2) [Royal] power is now only one force
   a) A paradoxical force, one w/o force, but only power
   b) Against the primal force of the people
 B. B defines the relational character of power
  1) Challenging juridical theory of sovereignty by showing relations of force
  2) B takes over from Machiavelli
   a) For M, history is only examples for the political technique of prince
   b) For B, relations of force and power are what history is
 C. We thus see a "historico-political continuum" or "field"
  1) What did B want?
   a) B wanted a critique of King's administrative knowledge
    (1) He shows contemporary admin issues at work in history
    (2) He thus uses State's "managerial rationality" as historical grid
   b) B had a specific political goal in mind in using history as weapon
  2) B's discourse thus constitutes a historico-political field
   a) History is thus the medium and weapon of political (war) struggle
   b) Just as politics as war is the lens w/ which to read history
II. Remarks on "historicism" (172-178)
 A. Historicism has always been abjured by philosophers and human science
  1) "Historicism" is simply the war model of history
   a) History finds nothing but wars
   b) And history writing is a weapon in an ongoing war
  2) "Platonism": knowledge / truth only in peace / order, not war ("objectivity")
   a) State has reimplanted this idea in its disciplinarization of knowledge
   b) So "historicism" is now outlawed as "circular" or "biased"
 B. An objection: "history writing we now have is not simply power's song to itself"
  1) Tragedy as ritual for discussing public right
   a) Shakespearean historical tragedies used real figures
   b) French classical tragedy used ancient / mythic figures

(1) For reasons of political prudence
                    (2) Monarchic right was represented as direct descendent of ancients
                    (3) Courtly tragedy articulated with court life as another drama of power
                        (a) Tragedy undoes and recomposes courtly ritual
                        (b) Tragedy shows the shredding of person of public right
                        (c) So that he is only a man of passion
                        (d) But then the king can be reborn out of that destruction
                c) So it makes sense that Racine was official historiographer of Louis XIV
            2) System: absolutism, display of public right, tragedy, history of king
                a) Racine was first example
                b) Jacob-Nicolas Moreau: historiographer to Louis XVI in 1780s
                    (1) Scholarly defender of an embattled king when history has become medium and
                        weapon of political struggles
                    (2) In charge of central ministry of history
                        (a) Arm the king in these historico-political battles
                        (b) Establish an enforced peace in this war by coding historical discourse so it could
                            be integrated into State practice
III. Genealogy of knowledges is not the history of science (178-185)
    A. Genealogy of knowledges
        1) Cannot think in Enlightenment terms
            a) Progress toward truth
            b) And increase of knowledge vs ignorance
        2) Rather, it must see a field of battle btw multiple knowledges
    B. Examples
        1) Technical knowledge in 18th C
            a) Existence of multiple local knowledges
                (1) Limited
                (2) Held as secrets
                (3) Knowledges producing wealth
                (4) And guaranteeing independence
            b) As productive forces develop
                (1) These local knowledges
                    (a) Become more expensive
                    (b) And the struggles over secrecy / independence intensify
                (2) Processes develop whereby big industrial knowledge can take over
            c) State intervention to produce disciplinarization of knowledge
                (1) Four processes
                    (a) Eliminating and disqualifying uneconomic knowledges
                    (b) Normalizing them to make them interchangeable
                    (c) Hierarchical classification of knowledges
                    (d) Pyramidal centralization
                (2) Variety of practices, projects, institutions
                    (a) *Encyclopedia* and other surveys of knowledges
                    (b) Founding of *grandes écoles*
                    (c) Corps of inspectors
        2) Example of medical knowledge
    C. Disciplinarization of knowledge produces "science" in the singular
        1) Before, multiple sciences:
            a) Philosophy as foundation / principle of communication
            b) *Mathesis* as project of universal science
        2) In new system, we have only singular science and philosophy as handmaiden
    D. Disciplinarization of knowledge enables us to understand
        1) Transformation of university and its new disciplinary role
            a) Selection, classification, normalization, centralization of knowledge
            b) Disappearance of the amateur scholar
        2) Change w/ regard to dogmatism

     a) No more need for dogmatic control of content
     b) Now that there is a disciplinary control of "enunciatory procedures"
       (1) That is, who gets to speak, when, on what topics
       (2) Thus we move from "orthodoxy" to "orthology"
  E. We now see that discipline can be applied to knowledges as well as to bodies
IV. Conclusion (185-
  A. Moreau: tries to discipline history as historico-political field of struggle is formed
  B. But we see perpetual struggle
    1) Between disciplined State history
    2) And polemical "political historicism"