

Outline by John Protevi
protevi@lsu.edu

Part One: "We 'Other Victorians'" [3-13]

- 1) "Repressive hypothesis": Renaissance openness become Victorian prudery [3-8]
 - a) Repression of sexual discourse; concessions to sex traffic for profit
 - b) Our supposed liberation is only partial and halting, bcs of great political stakes (Reich)
 - i) sex repression tied to development of capitalism
 - ii) Thus demand for sexual freedom is important political cause
 - iii) And sex discourse has thrill of transgression: thus modern solemnity and preaching
- 2) Foucault's intention: examine power/knowledge dispositif of modern sexuality [8-10]
- 3) Three doubts about repressive hypothesis [10-12]
 - a) history: was sex repressed?
 - b) historico-theoretical: is power repressive?
 - c) historico-political: is critique of sex repression part of sex system? (cf DP)
 - i) less refutation than putting in "general economy of modern sex discourses"
 - ii) = "regime of power-knowledge-pleasure"
 - iii) = "overall 'discursive fact'"
 - iv) = "polymorphous techniques of power" {includes incitement}
 - v) = "will to knowledge"
- 4) Clarification: F does not claim sex has not been repressed, etc. [12-13]
 - a) But he does claim repression is only "component part" in a power/knowledge *dispositif*
 - b) He wants to disengage his analysis from principles of scarcity / rarefaction and find
 - i) Discursive production (also administers silences)
 - ii) Production of power (which is sometimes prohibitive)
 - iii) Propagation of knowledge (often causes misconceptions to circulate)
- 5) F's "first survey":
 - a) Discourse: Increasing incitement to "putting into discourse" of sex
 - b) Power: dissemination and implantation of polymorphous sexualities
 - c) Will to knowledge: constituted a science of sexuality

Part Two: "The Repressive Hypothesis" [17-49]

Section 1: "The Incitement to Discourse" [17-35]

- 1) Vocabulary, rhetoric, propriety, enunciation: a restrictive economy re: sex [17-18]
- 2) Level of discourse: a "discursive explosion" [18-23]
 - a) Not so much birth of modern pornography industry and sex insult, etc.
 - b) But multiplication of sex discourse w/in field of exercise of power
 - i) Catholic pastoral and penance after Council of Trent:
 - (1) Emphasis on discretion in questions
 - (2) But increase in scope of confession: tracking down "insinuations of the flesh"
 - (a) twofold evolution: flesh as root of all evil

- (b) and important moment not the act but the beginning of stirrings of desire
 - ii) 1st injunction to general Western “nearly infinite task” of telling the truth about sex
 - (1) Literature
 - (a) Sade
 - (b) *My Secret Life*
- 3) Power mechanisms that supported and relayed this discursive injunction [23-33]
 - a) Political, economic, technical incitement to sex discourse: administration / policing
 - b) Examples:
 - i) The discourse on “population”
 - ii) Children’s sex
 - (1) silence as element in sex-discourse economy
 - (2) Schools: architecture, discipline, internal organization
 - iii) Medicine, psychiatry, criminal justice
- 4) Example of Jouy
 - a) pettiness of the act vs immensity of power/knowledge dispositif brought to bear
 - b) transformation of sex into discourse and person into a "case"
- 5) Genealogical analysis [33-34]
 - a) Multiplicity of power/knowledge sex field (tangled genealogical descent)
 - b) “Series of tensions, conflicts, efforts at adjustment ...” (force-field of emergence)
- 6) Reply: must examine inciting role of theme that sex is outside discourse [34-35]

Section 2: “The Perverse Implantation” [36-49]

- 1) Introduction [36-37]
 - a) [Reichean] econo-repression hypothesis: perversions repressed in favor of econ utility.
 - b) Econ utility may have been objective, but reduction needs to be replaced by dispersion / implantation hypothesis.
- 2) Historical development [37-41]
 - a) 3 major pre 19th C sex codes: canon law, pastoral, civil law
 - i) Focused on marriage relation
 - ii) illegal acts were as much non-marital as perverse sex
 - b) 19th C discursive explosion brings two major modifications
 - i) marriage became less discursively provocative
 - ii) the "others" stepped forward: “unnatural” becomes a specific dimension of sexuality
 - (1) Fragmentation of religious sins
 - (2) Fragmentation of civil “debauchery”
 - c) Hence we see split w/in sex rules btw marriage rules and rules of desire qua “natural”
 - i) Example of Don Juan
 - ii) “Discovery” underneath the libertine (18th C) of the pervert (19th C)
 - iii) 19th C “sub-race” of “perverts”: “friends w/ delinquents; akin to madmen”
 - iv) Medical displacement of Church interest in the couple and its normality
- 3) Form of modern sex-power: 4 operations of power in the perverse implantation [41-45]
 - a) lines of penetration [of power]: child sex constituted around masturbation:
 - i) it was not enemy, [for the campaign was bound to fail]
 - ii) but support for increased power relation
 - b) incorporation of perversions and new specification of individuals

- i) sodomite vs. homosexual [juridical subject vs. species w/ essence]
- ii) strange collection of “minor perverts”
- iii) not to suppress but to provide foothold for power [a reality for drs to deal w/]
- c) perpetual spirals of power and pleasure [hide and go seek]
- d) devices of sexual saturation [19th C family as network of power/pleasure]
- 4) “Perversity” of modern society [47-48]
 - a) Fact: “manifold sexualities” as “correlates of exact procedures of power” B. Direct: implantation of sexualities as “instrument-effect”
 - i) Via isolation/intensification/consolidation of perversions that sex-power expanded
 - ii) Economic interests [of sex business] ensure and relay pleasure/power net
- 5) Conclusion [49]: must abandon repressive hypothesis to see how extra-legal power/pleasure centers have proliferated

Part Three: *Scientia Sexualis* [53-73]

- 1) Introduction: “impressions” given about the 19th C sex-discursive explosion [53-55]
 - a) {psychoanalytic}: it was defensive; seeking to conceal sex, evade harsh truth of sex
 - b) {Marxist/critical}: it was only disguised morality that ended up justifying state racism
 - c) {history of science}: it was a will to non-knowledge vs. biology of reproduction
 - 2) Foucault: all these are only tactics of a fundamental “will to truth” [55-57]
 - a) Charcot’s lab: misunderstandings w/in context of incitement to discourse and truth
 - b) Not a threshold of rationality w/ Freud, but transformation of interplay of truth and sex
 - i) [= locating Freud w/in la longue durée of sex power/knowledge]
 - ii) [Cf: end of MC, intro to AK]
 - 3) Procedures for producing truth of sex: ars erotica and scientia sexualis [57-58]
 - a) *Ars erotica*:
 - i) truth drawn from pleasure itself:
 - ii) pleasure evaluated and used to shape sexual practice;
 - iii) esoteric practice guided by master
 - b) West seems to have no ars erotica [but cf 74ff], but is only one w/ a scientia sexualis
 - 4) Confession: power/knowledge form at base of our S.S. [58-60]
 - a) Brief historical sketch of confessional practices
 - b) Modern “confessional society”: justice, medicine, education, family, love ...
 - c) Cultural symptoms
 - i) Metamorphosis in literature: from epic to confession
 - ii) And in philosophy: consciousness as basis: [again, F’s antipathy to phenomenology]
 - d) We miss power relations of confessional practices bcs we see power as repressive
 - 5) Sex-confession: part of “immense labor” of “subjection” [*assujettissement*] [60-63]
 - a) Sex as privileged theme of confession:
 - i) linking discursive incitement
 - ii) and proliferation of perversions
 - b) Ritual elements of confession
 - i) Speaking subject is also subject of statement
 - ii) Unfolds w/in a power relation: interlocutor is an authority
 - iii) Truth corroborated by obstacles and resistances to be overcome
4. Expression produces intrinsic modifications in confessing person

- c) Differences of confession with other forms (education or initiation)
- d) Power elements in confession thus different from these other forms:
 - i) Direction of discourse from below
 - ii) Secrecy from its general baseness
 - iii) Veracity guaranteed by bond of speaker and listener
 - iv) Domination by the listener/questioner
 - v) Effect on one from whom truth is wrested
- 6) Transformations in confessional practice [63-67]
 - a) Spread & intensification of confession: constitutes great archive of sex/pleasure
 - b) solidified by medicine, psychiatry, pedagogy: paradox of a confessional science
 - i) Problems:
 - (1) conflict of two modes of producing truth: confession vs. science
 - (2) validity of introspection; lived experience as evidence, etc.
 - ii) Solution via 5 procedures:
 - (1) clinical codification of inducement to speak [=combine conf. w/ exam]
 - (2) postulate of general and diffuse causality [=sex behind everything]
 - (3) principle of sexual latency [=sex hides itself from confessee]
 - (4) method of interpretation [=self-blindness redressed by confessor's interpret]
 - (5) medicalization of effects of confession [=catharsis as cure of pathology]
- 7) "Broad historical perspective" [67-70]
 - a) sexuality as correlative of scientia sexualis
 - i) Its features are not ideological mis-representations [Marxist/Reichean] or taboo misunderstandings [psychoanalytic]
 - ii) But functional requirements of a discourse producing its truth
 - (1) Thus "naturalness" of sexuality is effect of power-knowledge
 - (2) Characteristics:
 - (a) susceptible of pathology and hence object of normalization
 - (b) field of meanings to be deciphered
 - (c) site of processes obscured by certain mechanisms
 - (d) focus of indefinite causal relations
 - (e) an obscure speech to be listened to
 - iii) Thus sexuality must be seen as part of history of discourses [their "economy"]
 - b) F's "general working hypothesis"
 - i) 19th C society set up "an entire mechanism for producing truth about sex"
 - ii) this demand for truth sets up suspicion of sex as secret, cause, sign ...
 - c) Two linked processes of sex-truth
 - i) sex must speak the truth [even if it must be interpreted]
 - ii) sex must tell us OUR truth [the buried truth of the supposed truth of our self-ness]
 - d) knowledge of the subject produced confessional sex-truth
 - i) knowledge of what causes subject to be ignorant of himself
 - ii) unness of subject; truth in the other, etc.
 - iii) "tactics of power" in sex discourse [sex-truth as power/knowledge]
- 8) Interplay of ars erotica with scientia sexualis [70-72]
 - a) Not in the promised paradise of a medical or political good sex
 - b) But pleasure in the truth of pleasure: incitement/confession/teasing/questioning ...
- 9) Conclusion [72-73]

- a) Inadequacy of econo-repressive hypothesis [Marxist/Reichean]
- b) Historical inquiry to decide between psychoanalytic and Foucaultian perspectives
 - i) Whether sexuality dispositif is only a mechanism of repression [psycho]
 - ii) Or whether repression is a mechanism of sexuality power/knowledge dispositif [F]
- c) F's methodology for studying "political economy of will to knowledge" of sex-truth
 - i) Study positive mechanisms of knowledge, discourse, pleasure, power
 - ii) Investigate conditions of their emergence and operation
 - iii) Discover relation of interdiction and concealment to them

Part Four: The Dispositif of Sexuality

Introduction: *Les Bijoux indiscrets*

Section I: Objective

- 1) Lacanian objection: law doesn't repress sex; entry into law = entry into desire
 - a) Rehearsal of Lacanian critique of Foucault
 - b) Foucault: not a theory of power, but an "analytic"
 - i) Must bracket juridical representation of power
 - ii) Which commands both Marxist-Freudian and Lacanian links of law/power/desire
 - (1) leading either to a "liberation"
 - (2) or to a resignation
 - iii) And is very often found in political analyses of power as well
- 2) Principal traits of juridical representation of power
 - a) Negativity: repression and limit [Marxist-Freudian] or absence and lack [Lacanian]
 - b) Rule: [structuralism]
 - i) Binary system: "order" as form of intelligibility ties decipherment of sex to law
 - ii) And sees enunciation of the law as the form of power
 - c) Prohibition
 - d) Censorship logic: doesn't exist, shouldn't exist, can't talk about it
 - e) Unity of dispositif: same form of power at all levels: analogy of family, society ...
 - i) Commanding head
 - ii) Obedient subject
 - f) Summary:
 - i) Juridical representation of power as "anti-energy"
 - ii) [F wants to be able to analyze power as energetic/productive/positive]
- 3) Why is this representation so wide-spread in political thought?
 - a) General/tactical reason:
 - i) Concealment of power's mechanisms = condition of acceptability
 - ii) Lets us see ourselves as essentially free and only limited by outside negative power
 - b) Historical reason
 - i) Medieval monarchies: power [*pouvoir*] to say no to feudal multiplicity [*puissances*]
 - (1) Principle of right [droit]:
 - (a) unitary power
 - (b) will of sovereign = law
 - (c) mechanisms of interdiction and sanction

- (2) This is only a representation: real power is "another thing"
 - ii) Since 17th and 18th C we have critiqued monarchy as non-right
 - (1) But this forgets that right was the representation with which monarchy grew
 - (2) Even if its real mechanisms lay elsewhere
 - c) Thus modern political thought is caught in the juridical representation of power
 - (1) 18th C liberal reform: critique monarchical political power vs. pure juridical system
 - (2) 19th C radical critique: political power qua system of right is form of violence
 - d) F wants to analyze power as real production [machinic heterogenesis in bodies politic]
 - (1) Modern power manages the life of men as living bodies [heterogenous multiplicities]
 - (a) whose subjection by disciplines and sexuality [often beyond the State and law]
 - (b) [will install virtual patterns and thresholds] via techniques, normalization, control
 - (2) Vs. juridical representation of power [= hylomorphic production]
 - (a) Legislative command
 - (b) Obedience of juridical subject [essentially free and limited from above]
 - (3) Vs. reductive Marxist critique of power [violence as real destruction]
 - ii) Juridical-discursive representation of power at work in all contemporary theories of sex
 - (a) Both Marxist-Freudian and Lacanian theories share juridical representation
 - (b) Power as enunciation of the law
- 4) Circularity of F's project [=sex w/o law and power w/o king]
- a) Read history differently through a different theory of power
 - b) Move to a different theory of power through a closer reading of history

Section 2: Method

- 1) Conception of power to be pursued in HS1
 - a) Negatively defined: Avoid the presupposing that power is given as
 - i) Sovereignty of the State
 - ii) Form of law
 - iii) Global unity of domination
 - b) Rather, power is to be seen with regard to the following
 - i) Multiplicity of force relations immanent to domain of exercise and organization
 - ii) Process of transforming, reinforcing, inverting those relations
 - iii) Systematic supports and isolating break
 - iv) Strategies whose institutional crystallization are embodied in
 - (1) State apparatuses
 - (2) The legislative process
 - (3) Social hegemonies
 - v) Moving support of force relations
 - vi) Omnipresence
 - vii) Permanence: emergent effect [*l'effet d'ensemble*] w/in complex strategic situation
 - viii) Its coding in war or politics as strategies for integrating force relations

- 2) Propositions about power enabled by this perspective
 - a) It is exercised rather than possessed
 - b) It is immanent to economic, scientific, sexual relations as reciprocal effect-condition
 - i) Not super-structural prohibitions
 - ii) But is directly productive
 - c) It comes from below rather than from on high
 - i) It supports the great divisions rather than reflects them
 - (1) Although they cross them and tie them together
 - (2) And they redistribute them by forming convergent/divergent series
 - ii) The grand dominations are thus hegemonic effects sustained by local confrontations
 - d) It is both intentional and non-subjective
 - i) [critique of hylomorphism]: global effects of local actions w/o central direction
 - ii) "Local cynicism of power" [vs. representations of disinterested State power]
 - e) It is accompanied by resistance, which is never external to power, but immanent
 - i) Avoiding defeatist Lacanian and Hegelian theories
 - ii) Multiplicity of points of resistance
 - iii) Activity of resistance: the "other term" in power relations
 - (1) If power = patterning of virtual of bodies politics
 - (2) Then resistance =
 - (a) static from pre-existing patterns ["custom"]
 - (b) novel self-organization via complexity ["freedom"]
 - (3) i.e., bodies politic are too complex for discipline to create a virtual tabula rasa
 - iv) Mobility of resistance: across groups and individuals [bodies politic]
 - (1) Inflaming certain points of bodies, moments of life, types of behavior
 - (2) Breaking bodies politic AND remodeling them
 - (a) no "freedom" from power
 - (b) but some resistance can be creative
 - v) Immanence of power/resistance
 - (a) Power as dense web in and between apparatuses and institutions
 - (b) Resistance points as swarming across social stratifications and individual unities
 - vi) Revolution: strategic coding of resistance; State as institutional integration of power
 - f) By this perspective one escapes the Sovereign/Law ["juridical"] notion of power
 - i) Machiavelli thought power outside law (but still in form of sovereignty)
 - ii) We must go beyond the Prince and think power outside sovereignty
- 3) Sex-discourse-power: 4 rules
 - a) Immanence [power/knowledge]
 - b) Continuous variations ["matrices of transformation"]
 - c) Double conditioning [emergent effects via global/local interaction: strategy / tactics]
 - d) Tactical polyvalence of discourse [can give rise to resistance and "counter-discourse"]
- 4) [NB: F will come to distinguish power from domination]
 - a) Power is relation of free subjects:
 - i) Attempt to pattern the virtual of another
 - ii) But this means working w/ pre-existing patterns and w/ chance of complex novelty
 - b) Domination: overcoming power relation: total control of virtual; foreclosure of options
 - c) Thus political struggles cannot aim at liberation from power, but at no domination

- d) Thus neither chaotic virtual: illusion of "freedom" as no pattern
- e) Nor complete transcendently ordered virtual: attractors trap you in "black holes"
- f) But entry into zone of complex self-organization
 - i) Novel self-orderings at edge of chaos
 - ii) Inclusive disjunctions that allow dip into virtual/BwO and re-orderings

Section 3: Domain

- 1) Introduction: sexuality is not a drive, but a "dense transfer point" for power relations
 - a) Sexuality is the most instrumental domain for power
 - b) Meeting point for a multiplicity of strategies
- 2) Four strategic unities for development of sexuality dispositif/Four sex-figures
 - a) Hysterization of women's bodies: hysterical woman
 - b) Pedagogization of children's sex: masturbating child
 - c) Socialization of procreation: Malthusian couple
 - d) Psychiatrization of perversions: perverse adult
 - e) Thus, sexuality = historical dispositif; a "great surface network" linking together P/K:
 - i) Stimulation of bodies
 - ii) Intensification of pleasures
 - iii) Incitement to discourse
 - iv) Formation of knowledges [connaissances]
 - v) Strengthening of controls and resistances
- 3) Dispositif of sexuality vs various dispositifs of alliance [both link people by sex relation]
 - a) Sexuality is superimposed upon and tends to supplant alliance
 - b) Opposition of two systems [alliance vs sexuality]
 - i) Rules vs techniques
 - ii) Reproducing form of law [partners/statutes] vs extending control [bodies, pleasures]
 - iii) Economy of wealth circulating vs economy of producing and consuming bodies
 - iv) Homeostasis/reproduction of social body vs intensification of bodies/control of pop.
 - c) Theses to be admitted on basis of these oppositions
 - i) Sexuality is tied to recent dispositifs of power
 - ii) It has been growing since the 17th C
 - iii) It is not oriented to reproduction, but to intensification of body as object of P/K
 - d) Sexuality does not replace alliance but is added onto it
 - i) Penance/confession
 - (1) At first concerning sex as support of permissible relations
 - (2) Passing to problematic of "flesh"
 - ii) Family as P/K center for dispositif of sexuality: exchange point: sexuality / alliance
 - (1) Sentimentalizing of family
 - (2) Family as privileged site of sexuality as "incestuous"
 - (a) all alliance societies must prohibit incest
 - (b) but it is especially central to ours, where family is major sexuality center
 - (i) it is solicited and refused
 - (ii) i.e., it must be prohibited for family to function in alliance
 1. but must be also called for so that family incites sexuality

- a. thus Western interest in incest taboo as universal form of culture
 - b. can be seen as defense against a sexuality that doesn't respect alliance
 - (c) thus incest taboo is our way of tying sexuality to alliance and law
 - (d) in other words, we see here a recoding of new power under old forms
- e) Historical recap of family as "crystal" of P/K in sexuality
 - i) sexuality moves from fringes (pedagogy/penance) to family focus
 - ii) family members become chief agents of sexuality (psychiatrization)
 - iii) new personages appear (bad alliance and abnormal sexuality)
 - iv) pleas for help from families to experts re: sexuality/alliance
 - v) family looks w/in for sexuality, opens itself to "infinite examination"
- f) Critique of family as "cause" of sexuality [seems to diffuse what it only reflects]
 - i) family is part of system
 - ii) but precisely that part which is supposed to be outside and cause of system
- g) Example of Charcot
 - i) Seeks to isolate sexuality from alliance
 - ii) Medicine seeks to assume charge of sexuality from family in which it had incited it
- h) Situation of psychoanalysis
 - i) Examined sexuality of individuals outside family (one on one session)
 - ii) But finds law of alliance at core of sexuality (incest/law/desire)
 - iii) Thus psychoanalysis allows reassuring tie of sexuality dispositive to alliance/law
 - iv) Thus F places psychoanalysis w/in history of sexuality dispositive
 - (1) Sexuality is born in Christian analyses of "flesh" supported by alliance rules
 - (2) But now it is [psychoanalyzed] sexuality that props up alliance
- 4) Conclusion
 - a) Forecast of multi-volume HS: trace history of sexuality dispositive
 - i) Christian "flesh"
 - ii) 19th C strategies
 - b) F entertains, then rejects econo-repressive hypothesis once again

Section 4: Periodization

- 1) Econo-repressive model implies two ruptures
 - a) 17th C: birth of great prohibitions, valorization of adult married sex, decency, etc
 - b) 20th C: relative slackening of repressive mechanisms, etc
- 2) Foucault's positive model does not correspond to this schema
 - a) Long chronology of techniques
 - i) Medieval penance
 - ii) Reformation analysis of "concupiscence"
 - iii) End of 18th C: new technology of sex [from flesh to organism]
 - (1) Pedagogy of children
 - (2) Medicine of women
 - (3) Demography of birth rate
 - iv) 19th C: transformations
 - (1) Separation of medicine of sex from that of body [medicalization of perversion]
 - (2) Analysis of heredity [eugenics]

- (a) tied together in theory of degenerescence
 - (b) opposed by Freud, to his eternal credit
 - b) Chronology of adoption of these techniques
 - i) Bourgeoisie adopts these first
 - (1) (vs. idea that workers' sex needed to be channeled during capital accumulation)
 - (2) First sexed family and children were bourgeois
 - ii) Workers avoided sexuality dispositif for a long time
 - (1) Birth control [end of 18th C]
 - (2) Reform of family form [1830s]
 - (3) Control of perversions as general social imperative [1890s]
 - c) Reminder then that sexuality is not limitation of pleasure of workers by ruling class
 - i) Rather, bourgeoisie tries it on itself first [struggle of two-sided stratum]
 - ii) Not an asceticism, but bourgeois political ordering of life through affirmation of self
 - (1) Intensification of body
 - (2) Problematization of health
 - (3) Technique of maximizing life
 - iii) A bourgeois body different from nobles and workers through sex technology
 - iv) That is, the formation of a bourgeois "class body": health, hygiene, descent, race
 - (1) Transposition of aristocratic "blood" into bourgeois "heredity"
 - (2) Intensification of strength, vigor: dynamic, expansionist racism
 - d) Again, contra econo-repressive hypothesis
 - i) All the concern was for bourgeois sexed and healthy body
 - ii) Workers' conditions showed only crises caused concern for their bodies
 - (1) They are only given sexuality once the surveillance of working class is in place
 - (2) Thus they can't form a prole sexuality w/ which to confront bourgeois sexuality
 - (3) Hence workers' indifference/resistance to sexuality dispositif
 - iii) Critique of econo-repressive denunciation of "hypocrisy"
- 3) Origin of theory of repression due to spread of sexuality dispositif
 - a) End 19th C: bourgeoisie had to re-differentiate itself after universal imposition of sex
 - i) Justify submission to rule of law as access to sexuality
 - ii) And highlight bourgeois privilege: our repression is so intense we need therapy!
 - b) Psychoanalysis as bourgeois-differentiation mechanism
 - i) For bourgeoisie:
 - (1) affirms universality of incest/repression/law/desire
 - (2) allows individuals to express their [oedipalized] desire in language
 - ii) At same time, a concerted effort against real incest in worker/peasant classes
 - c) Thus history of sexuality dispositif is an archaeology of psychoanalysis
 - i) Attaches sexuality to alliance
 - ii) Fights the theory of "degenerescence"
 - iii) Functions as bourgeois-differentiation mechanism
 - iv) Makes confession an injunction to lift repression: truth through challenging taboos
 - v) Allows reinterpretation of deployment of sexuality as generalized repression
 - (1) Ties repression to mechanisms of domination and exploitation
 - (2) Proposes path to freedom from
 - (a) [sex] repression
 - (b) [political] domination

- (c) [economic] exploitation
- (3) Thus making Reich possible [F finally names his target] (1) whatever his real effects
 - (a) Reich is solidly w/in sexuality dispositif
 - (i) as proved by the lack of connection of sex lib and political revolution
 - (ii) sex lib is thus only a shift of tactics w/in sexuality dispositif

Part 5

- 1) Sovereign power: right to decide life and death (135-6)
 - a) formal derivation from absolute Roman *patria potestas*
 - b) diminished form in classical legal theory:
 - i) only when direct threat to sovereign
 - (1) external enemies: indirect exposure: defend him in war
 - (2) internal threat: direct punishment: put to death
 - ii) dissymmetrical right re: life only via death: kill or refrain from killing
 - (1) symbol is the sword
 - (2) major form of power is means of deduction (*prélèvement*)
- 2) transformation in modern West (136-8)
 - a) many forms of power, not just deduction: intensification of forces is aim
 - b) thus life is positive object of administration; death is just its reverse side
 - c) symptoms:
 - i) increased bloodiness of war: defend everyone, not just sovereign
 - ii) death penalty became scandal of power that administers life
- 3) new formula: power to foster life or disallow it to point of death (138)
 - a) two basic forms of new power: [=bio-power] (139-140)
 - i) disciplines: anatomo-politics of human body
 - ii) regulatory controls: bio-politics of the population
 - (1) joined not by speculative discourse, but by concrete *agencements*
 - (2) dispositif of sexuality one of the most important of them
 - b) bio-power and development of capitalism (141)
 - i) state: institutions of power: maintenance of production relations
 - ii) bio-power *agencements*: techniques of power at work in production
 - (1) guaranteeing domination and hegemony
 - (2) adjusting accumulation of men and capital
 - c) entry of life into history, i.e, knowledge/power system of bio-power(141-3)
- 4) consequences of shift to bio-power (143-5)
 - a) shift in scientific discourse to life/history = man [episteme change: *OT*]
 - b) shift to norm [distribution] from law [binary]
 - c) resistance appealed to "rights" of life invested by bio-power
- 5) sex as political issue (145-7)
 - a) relies on bio-power background
 - b) sex at juncture of two forms of bio-power: disciplined body / regulated population
 - c) hence the four lines of attack
 - i) sexualized children
 - ii) medicalized women

- iii) socialized couple
 - iv) psychiatrized pervert
- 6) shift from symbolics of blood to analytics of sexuality (147-9)
 - a) Factors:
 - i) blood: reality w/ a symbolic function
 - ii) sexuality: effect w/ a meaning-value
 - b) Sade and eugenists: illustrate transition from blood to sexuality
 - c) actual historical passage from blood to sexuality had overlaps, interactions, etc.
 - i) "blood" as concern of modern, bio-power racism
 - ii) psychoanalytic reinscription of sexuality into law [sovereign model of power]
- 7) possible objections: sexuality w/o sex (150-7)
 - a) sexuality analysis deals directly w/ body and power investment
 - b) "sex in itself" as biological basis is an idea produced by dispositif of sexuality
 - i) F as nominalist (152/154)
 - ii) traces imposition of "sex" in the four strategies
 - iii) four functions of "sex" in dispositif of sexuality
 - (1) artificial unity of anatomical elements, biological functions, etc.
 - (2) line of contact of sex knowledge and biology of reproduction
 - (3) fundamental reversal: "sex" lets poly-power hide as taboo
 - (4) sex as matrix of individual intelligibility, identity
 - iv) "sex" has become something desirable [mystery to be cherished, etc]
- 8) counter-attack sexuality dispositif:
 - a) not sex-desire,
 - b) but bodies and pleasures (157)
- 9) coda: the future will look back at us and wonder; smile knowingly (157-9)