

Foucault Studies

© Sverre Raffnsøe, Alain Beaulieu, Barbara Cruikshank, Knut Ove Eliassen, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Thomas Götselius, Daniele Lorenzini, Hernan Camilo Pulido Martinez, Johanna Oksala, Clare O'Farrell, Rodrigo Castro Orellana, Eva Bendix Petersen, Alan Rosenberg, Dianna Taylor, Sille Høker Neumann & Asker Bryld Staunæs

ISSN: 1832-5203

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v25i2.5571>

Foucault Studies, No. X, i-viii, October 2018

EDITORIAL

Sverre Raffnsøe, Alain Beaulieu, Barbara Cruikshank, Knut Ove Eliassen, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Thomas Götselius, Daniele Lorenzini, Hernan Camilo Pulido Martinez, Johanna Oksala, Clare O'Farrell, Rodrigo Castro Orellana, Eva Bendix Petersen, Alan Rosenberg, Dianna Taylor, Sille Høker Neumann & Asker Bryld Staunæs.

The editors of *Foucault Studies* are extremely pleased to publish this issue of *Foucault Studies* amounting to no less than 23 contributions amounting to more than 400 pages. In addition to the special issue on "Foucault and Philosophical Practice," comprising four articles with a shared introduction, the issue contains a section with eight original articles, a review section, and a section containing a significant interview with Foucault from 1979 published in English as well as in French plus contextualizations by both the translators and the original interviewer.

SPECIAL ISSUE 'FOUCAULT AND PHILOSOPHICAL PRACTICE'

Issue No. 25 opens with the special issue entitled "Foucault and Philosophical Practice," guest-edited by our own Sverre Raffnsøe (Copenhagen Business School, Denmark) and Alain Beaulieu (Laurentian University, Canada). While acknowledging that Foucault had a complex and ambivalent relationship with philosophy, the four articles gathered in this special issue support the evidence of a Foucauldian way of practicing philosophy.

The articles are: "Philosophical Practice as Self-modification: An Essay on Michel Foucault's Critical Engagement with Philosophy" authored by Sverre Raffnsøe, Morten Thaning Sørensen and Marius Gudmand-Høyer (all Copenhagen Business School, Denmark); "Philosophical Practice following Foucault" by Verena Erlenbush-Anderson (Morgan State University, USA); "Freedom in the Archive: On Doing Philosophy through Historiography" by Réal Fillion (University of Sudbury, Canada); and "The Role of Descartes's Dream in the *Meditations* and in the Historical Ontology of Ourselves" by Edward McGushin (Stonehill College, USA). The focus of this special issue and the content of its specific contributions are further described in the introduction to the special issue following this general editorial.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

In addition to the contributions composing this special issue of *Foucault Studies*, issue No. 25 also brings eight original articles that contribute to Foucault scholarship more broadly.

The first of these articles, "Towards an Analytic of Violence: Foucault, Arendt & Power" by Jacob Maze (Charles University, Czech Republic), incorporates Arendt's critique of violence into a Foucauldian paradigm. The main thesis is that if power is productive to the extent that it provides the potential to act otherwise, then Arendt situates violence as the prevention of this, in a similar way to Foucault's account of domination. Ultimately, Maze argues that it is the concept of freedom and the ability to act otherwise that tie Arendt and Foucault together.

In the second article, "Bibliopolitics: The History of Notation and the Birth of the Citational Academic Subject," Matthew Sharpe & Kirk Turner (Deakin University, Australia) bring a genealogical approach to the growing body of critical research on bibliometrics. The article situates bibliometrics as a new technology of neoliberal, biopolitical governmentality by analysing other 'metrics' (biometrics etc.), and by investigating bibliometrics' antecedents (for example, marginalia) in prior notational practices. The article delineates the specific features of bibliometrics as a new form of notation. Sharpe and Turner highlight how forms of notation have political valences tied to projects of control and subversion, and how bibliometrics are increasingly summoned into being as one of the latest ways to modulate academic subjectivity.

Piotr Sobolczyk's (Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland) historical article, "Foucault: Madness and Surveillance in Warsaw," investigates the work of Remigiusz Rzyziński. By doing so, Sobolczyk's also aims to revise the biographical data about Foucault's stay in Poland from 1958-1959. The article develops hypotheses as to why Polish authorities expelled Foucault from Poland, even as it examines the relationship between communism and homosexuality. Sobolczyk also advances a critical argument suggesting the decisiveness of sexual paranoia, and invites speculation as to why Foucault did not elaborate on this further.

In the fourth article, Alex Feldman (Pennsylvania State University, USA) sparks the debate on Foucault's contribution to the critical theorization of race and racism. Foregrounding the theme of race in Foucault's lectures on *The Punitive Society* and *Psychiatric Power*, "The Genesis of Foucault's Genealogy of Racism: Accumulating Men and Managing Illegalisms" argues that the concepts of "accumulation of men" and "management of illegalism" found in these enrich Foucault's outline of a genealogy of racism. In conclusion, Feldman argues that indications in Foucault's lectures point to an analysis of racism as an integral factor in making acceptable the larger system of power characteristic of the normalizing capitalist society.

The fifth article, "Vrais Amis: Reconsidering the Philosophical Relationship between Foucault and Deleuze" by Christian Gilliam (University of Surrey, UK), argues that there is a real and enduring consistency between Foucault and Deleuze; and it aims to overcome often replicated lines of difference or contrasts by presenting an ontological affinity between them. The consistency is to be found in the use of an ontology of 'pure' or 'disjunctive' immanence. Derived from and through the use of Nietzsche's genealogical approach, this pure and disjunctive immanence permits the construal of power and subjectification in a manner where pleasure and desire is taken as the affective inside of power. Nevertheless, Deleuze and Foucault differ in the preferred language for conceptualizing this kind of affective-virtual immanent multiplicity. Whereas Foucault opts for 'pleasure' to avoid psychoanalytic idealism and the idea that there is desire free from power, Deleuze opts for 'desire.' This semantic difference leads to a slight, though tangible divergence with regard to politico-ethical and practical possibilities in need of further exploration.

The sixth article “Listening to Unreason: Foucault and Wittgenstein on Reason and the Unreasonable Man” by Liat Lavi (Bezalel Academy for Arts and Design & Bar Ilan University, Israël) examines Wittgenstein’s appeals to madness in *On Certainty* in the light of Foucault’s *Histoire de la folie*. Both works can be read as investigations into the grounds of reason. In both, moreover, the boundaries of reason are not only perceived as vague but also as largely founded upon the relations between the reasonable person and the unreasonable person. The investigation of the character of these relations – perceived as social in Foucault and as socio-linguistic in Wittgenstein – reveals a curious state of affairs in which the reasonable person dominates discourse and social relations and still remains deeply dependent upon the unreasonable person and the possibility of rejecting him or her. Whereas Wittgenstein claims that the boundary between reason and unreason is a matter of necessity upon which discourse depends, Foucault’s account raises the question of whether this boundary in its received form is at all necessary and thus seems to question Wittgenstein’s thesis. Liat Lavi makes this difference between Wittgenstein’s and Foucault’s account graphic by examining the differences in their discussion of Descartes’ meditations and specifically Descartes’ treatment of madness.

In the seventh article, “The Third Modulation: Foucault, Security and Population,” Richard Togman (Lakehead University, Canada) investigates Foucault’s examination of security as a third modulation of power radically departing from previous conceptions of sovereign and disciplinary power. The article explains and analyses Foucault’s conceptualization of security power to demonstrate how a proper understanding of security power permits a number of critical insights into modern forms of governance and the new language of governance. In particular, an insight into the conceptualization of security power permits to understand the propagation of government attempts to control fertility as they can be detected in, for instance, inter-war France and post-colonial India. These cases not only illustrate the workings of a new model of power but also highlight the difficulty of resisting this novel type of governmental control.

The eighth article, “The Banality of Cynicism: Foucault and the Limits of Authentic *Parrhesia*” by Gordon Hull (University of North Carolina at Charlotte, USA), discusses Foucault’s investigation of *parrhesia* (or ‘frank speech’) in his last two Collège de France lecture courses. While many readers of Foucault’s published lectures have come to wonder whether Foucault was pursuing *parrhesia* to develop a contemporary strategy for resistance, the article argues that ethical *parrhesia* modelled on either the Socratic or the Cynical model as they have been articulated by Foucault would have little traction today. This is because the current environment is plagued by problems analogous to those Plato detected in Athenian democracy and Greek society. In particular, authentication of *parrhesiasts* as a way to solve the problem of authenticity and to authenticate speech becomes intractable in a social media environment, even in the radical form of total visibility it takes with Cynicism. Insofar as contemporary society overproduces visibility, the context for authenticating *parrhesiastic* speech is one in which visibility is banalized and in which it is difficult to discern *parrhesiastic* speech insofar as there is a surplus of speech which presents itself as *parrhesiastic*. Ultimately, it is argued that the effort to import *parrhesia* into the present remains reliant on a view of subjectivity as exogenous to its social context, a view that Foucault consistently questioned.

INTERVIEW WITH FOUCAULT CONDUCTED IN 1979

In this issue, editors are delighted to include “There Can’t Be Societies without Uprisings,” the English translation of the last interview released by Foucault on the Iranian revolution and the original French interview published here under the title “Entretien inédit avec Michel Foucault, 1979.”

This interview was conducted by Farès Sassine in the summer of 1979 for the Arab-language weekly *An Nahar al’arabî wa addûwalî*, printed in Paris, which sought to permit Beirut’s main daily *An Nahar* to escape the heavy Syrian presence in the Lebanese capital at the time. In the same year, excerpts from the interview first appeared in the weekly, translated from French into Arabic. In 2013, a full transcription of the interview appeared in the second issue of the journal *Rodéo*, together with an introduction by Farès Sassine. On August 22, 2014, Sassine published the full interview on his blog under the title “Entretien inédit avec Michel Foucault” ([Entretien inedit avec Michel Foucault 1979](#)). The English translation that we are delighted to publish in this issue of *Foucault Studies*, realized by Alex J. Feldman, first appeared in a book edited by Laura Cremonesi, Orazio Irrera, Daniele Lorenzini and Martina Tazzioli, *Foucault and the Making of Subjects* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016).

The interview is of major importance for various reasons, of which only a few can be listed here – a far more detailed analysis is to be found in Laura Cremonesi, Orazio Irrera, Daniele Lorenzini and Martina Tazzioli’s scholarly introduction to the interview. Conducted in August 1979, less than a year after Foucault’s two consecutive travels to Iran (September 16-24 and November 9-15) to cover the Iranian uprising for the Italian newspaper *Corriera della Sera* in 1978, this interview sheds new light on various contemporary and still heated discussions concerning Foucault’s relationship to the Iranian revolution, Islam and the idea of political spirituality. Moreover, dating shortly after Foucault’s text, “Is It Useless to Revolt?,” originally published under the title “Inutile de se soulever?” in the French evening journal *Le Monde* (May 11-12, 1979), which is usually regarded as Foucault’s final say on the Iranian affair after its temporary conclusion, the interview with Farès Sassine takes up a central position insofar as it can now be regarded as Foucault’s final *testament*.

Somewhat surprisingly for some of his past and present interpreters, Foucault starts out the interview by underlining that what led him to take an interest in the Iranian uprising was, in fact, the reading of Ernst Bloch’s *The Principle of Hope* (*Das Prinzip Hoffnung*) originally published in 1954, 1955 and 1959, insofar as this book posed the problem of the “collective perception of history that begins to emerge in Europe during the Middle Ages.” This perception, Foucault argues, “involves perceiving another world here below, perceiving that the reality of things is not definitively established and set in place, but instead, in the very midst of our time and our history, there can be an opening, a point of light drawing us towards it that gives us access, from this world itself, to a better world.” Reading Ernst Bloch, Foucault claims to have been motivated to go to Iran “conditioned by [the] problem of the relationship between political revolution and religious hope or eschatology,” with a view to understanding this relationship better. While being inspired by interesting and striking parallels between, on the one hand, great popular revolts in Europe in the Middle Ages that reached their climax in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and which ran through all the wars of religion, and, on the other, the Iranian uprising, insofar as they are all movements that owe their

strength to “a will at once both political and religious”, Foucault takes care to emphasize that he himself has “never personally aspired [...] to a political spirituality”. On the contrary, what he saw in the Iranian revolution was a very curious and bizarre movement that, in his eyes, one could only understand by analogy with what happened in Europe and was called ‘political spirituality’, whence it had also already concomitantly become clear that one needed to be extremely wary of this phenomenon. Foucault thus claims that he was motivated to take an interest in examining the Iranian revolution as he assessed that “there’s a risk, at any rate a possibility that now, in the countries called ‘Third World’, violent and intense revolutionary movements of social and political change will try to take hold more and more on the cultural basis of these countries, rather than trying to model themselves on the West, the liberal or Marxist West. I think that’s what risks spreading. What’s in the process of spreading”.

The editors of *Foucault Studies* are most grateful to Farès Sassine, Alex Feldman, Jacob Hamburger, Laura Cremonesi, Orazio Irrera, Daniele Lorenzini and Martina Tazzioli, as well as to *Rodéo* and *Rowman & Littlefield*, for allowing the journal to make this significant text available, in English, to a wider audience and downloadable without charge. Since the original interview conducted in French was not included in the standard-setting *Dits et écrits*, the editors of *Foucault Studies* are equally keen to publish the original manuscript in French, both in order to make it widely accessible to the public and with a view to facilitating scholarly comparison. We are in debt to Farès Sassine for permitting us to publish the French original. It appears here under the title “Entretien inédit avec Michel Foucault, 1979.”

A short introduction by Farès Sassine precedes the interview and provides the specific setting of the interview and further develops various implications of it. An initial version of the text was published in French on Sassine’s blog on August 22, 2014 ([Foucault en l’entretien](#)). With the publication in this issue, *Foucault Studies* is happy to make the introduction more prominently available and publicly accessible. The editors of *Foucault Studies* are most grateful to Jacob Hamburger for translating this introduction.

REVIEW SECTION

In addition to three book reviews of recent books concerned with Foucault’s work and the work of related thinkers, the present issue contains a longer review essay.

The review essay, “Michel Foucault’s Confessions of the Flesh. The Fourth volume of the History of Sexuality” by Sverre Raffnsøe (Copenhagen Business School, Denmark), concerns Foucault’s major book-manuscript *Histoire de la sexualité 4: Les aveux de la chair*, which finally reached the book shelves earlier this year. In addition to providing an overview of the structure and parts of the book as well as its contributions and implications, the review essay gives an outline of its place within and contribution to Foucault’s wider œuvre and his *History of Sexuality*. In particular, the review essay gives an account of the gradual yet decisive shift of investigation and the overall perspective of the *History of Sexuality* that led to *Les aveux de la chair* being published as the fourth volume in this series. Providing the basis for a more comprehensive understanding of the book, the review thus also assesses the structure, contents, contribution and further implications of the fourth volume of Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*.

The reviews are: Dotan Leshem (2016): *The Origins of Neoliberalism: Modeling the Economy from Jesus to Foucault*, written by Tara Dankel (Harvard University, USA); and

two reviews of Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi (2016): *Foucault in Iran: Islamic Revolution and the Enlightenment*, written by Leila Brännström (Lund University, Sweden) and Tim Hanafin (Johns Hopkins University, USA), respectively. Based on Ghamari-Tabrizi's personal experience of the Iranian revolution and an intimate acquaintance with Foucault's work, Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi's monograph forms a weighty contribution broadening the social, political and theoretical context of the heavily politicized discussions of Foucault's voyage to Iran, which are also further discussed in the interview section of this issue of *Foucault Studies*. For this reason, the editors of *Foucault Studies* have decided to include two careful scholarly reviews of this monograph in this issue. In turn, these reviews distinguish themselves by providing different contextualizations and critiques of Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi's argument.

SIGNIFICANT STEPS OF IMPROVEMENT

As of Issue No. 22, *Foucault Studies* is using Digital Object Identifiers (DOI) for all articles. A DOI is a permanent identifier assigned to electronic documents. This ensures that the articles published in *Foucault Studies* can always be accessed even if the web-addresses for the articles change or the website is down for maintenance. Therefore, with the introduction of DOI, the journal can ensure access to the articles at all times.

This introduction of DOI-links requires extra steps in terms of the submission process for articles for *Foucault Studies*. The DOI system requires a list of references for all works cited in the submitted manuscript. Therefore, authors are kindly asked to provide a full list of references along with the previously required abstract, keywords and bio statement when submitting articles for *Foucault Studies*. This list of references for works cited should be in the same format and style as the main manuscript. Further, we kindly ask authors to include any DOI-link for cited articles in the manuscript after the standard citation (Example: Author, "Title," *Publication*, Vol (Year), Page. DOI link.). The DOI-links for articles are usually found on the front page of the article.

As of issue No. 25, *Foucault Studies* has updated and clarified guidelines for footnote references and bibliography. Most important to note in this respect is that the journal articles have all text references in running footnotes with most of the bibliographical information about the source, while the list of references ending each article provides all bibliographical information about the source as well as the DOI of the given piece (if there is one). With regard to the handling of articles already submitted, the introduction of these changes have unfortunately increased the workload significantly both for authors and for managing editors. The editors of *Foucault Studies* sincerely apologize for the inconvenience caused. Nevertheless, with the introduction of these changes, *Foucault Studies* has now significantly increased its service to its readers since they now have essential information ready to hand in the article and on the page studied. As a consequence, *Foucault Studies* kindly asks authors of future submissions to follow the updated guidelines before they submit articles. Complying with these guidelines will make the submission and review process as well as copy editing a lot easier and more expedient in the future. The updated guidelines are fleshed out in detail on the home page here: [Author Guidelines](#).

At present, *Foucault Studies* is listed in Ebsco's International Humanities Database, Scopus, Philosopher's Index, Google Scholar and Directory of Open Journals (DOAJ). Whereas SCHIMAGO'S Journal Ranking List for Philosophy 2017 sets off *Foucault Studies* as number 2 out of 79 OA journals, it ranks *Foucault Studies* as number 80 out of

528 listed journals. While the importance and significance of such listings should certainly not be overrated and regarded as medication to be taken *cum grano salis*, they may be taken as indicating that the journal continues to progress steadily. The former demonstrates that *Foucault Studies* is an international OA journal of the highest standing. The latter indicates that the journal makes a decisive contribution to the recognition of OA publishing, since the journal is here ranked in the upper 15%, over and above the overwhelming majority of established 'closed' access journals. Moreover, this outstanding position is the result of a sustained, steady but at times also pointed progress. In 2016, SCHIMAGO'S Journal Ranking list for Philosophy ranked FS as number 124 out of 446 journals and set off FS as number 6 out of 56 OA journals.

While the number of downloads of articles published in *Foucault Studies* in 2017 was close to 130,000, the number of views in the same year, of course, by far exceeded this figure. For authors as well as for editors, it is important to know that articles published in the journal are in fact widely read, often cited and frequently used.

In accordance with the professed policy of the journal, *Foucault Studies* aims to continue contributing to the recognition and propagation of OA publishing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The journal is most grateful to managing editors, Sille Høker Neumann and Asker Staunæs, for most reliable and highly competent assistance in running the journal. We would also like to thank Stuart Pethick for copyediting this issue of *Foucault Studies* with great care and meticulousness.

The journal is sponsored by The Danish Council for Independent Research|Social Sciences and The Danish Council for Independent Research|Humanities as well as by The Joint Committee for Nordic Research Councils for the Humanities and the Social Sciences. The editorial team is most grateful that these bodies have awarded funding for *Foucault Studies*. The continuous funding is an essential prerequisite for running the journal and makes it possible for the editorial team to look and plan ahead.