

Foucault Studies

© Sverre Raffnsøe, Alain Beaulieu, Alex Feldman, Barbara Cruikshank, Clare O'Farrell, Daniele Lorenzini, Dianna Taylor, Edward McGushin, Eva Bendix Petersen, Giovanni Mascaretti, Hernan Camilo Pulido Martinez, Johanna Oksala, Knut Ove Eliassen, Leonard Richard Lawlor, Martina Tazzioli, Rodrigo Castro Orellana, Thomas Götselius, Verena Erlenbusch, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Alan Rosenberg, Sille Høker Neumann & Asker Bryld Staunæs

ISSN: 1832-5203

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v27i27.5887>

Foucault Studies, No. 27, pp. i-vi, December 2019

EDITORIAL

Sverre Raffnsøe, Alain Beaulieu, Alex Feldman, Barbara Cruikshank, Clare O'Farrell, Daniele Lorenzini, Dianna Taylor, Edward McGushin, Eva Bendix Petersen, Giovanni Mascaretti, Hernan Camilo Pulido Martinez, Johanna Oksala, Knut Ove Eliassen, Leonard Richard Lawlor, Martina Tazzioli, Rodrigo Castro Orellana, Thomas Götselius, Verena Erlenbusch, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Alan Rosenberg, Sille Høker Neumann & Asker Bryld Staunæs

The editors of *Foucault Studies* are pleased to publish this issue of *Foucault Studies* containing seven original articles and three book reviews.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

Among the themes highlighted in the seven original articles are: norms, normalization, normativity, law and rule; genealogy and the diagnosis of the present; regimes of truth and truth-telling; ethics, ethical invention and transformation; the Panopticon and surveillance; as well as the relationship between Foucault and Deleuze, and Sartre and Foucault.

The first of the original articles is "What's In a Norm? Foucault's Conceptualisation and Genealogy of the Norm" by Mark Kelly (Western Sydney University, Australia). The article undertakes a survey of Foucault's observations on norms, abnormality and normalization across his oeuvre to reconstruct his terminology and his genealogical account of the emergence of the norm as they are developed; also in prolongation of his discussion of Canguilhem's work on normativity and normation. The article argues that Foucault consistently conceives the norm as a model of perfection that operates as a guide to human action in any particular sphere of human activity. Conceived in this way, norms are a specific modern form of normativity. They differ from older forms of normativity such as laws or rules that restrict human behavior as they establish binary discriminations.

Foucault's genealogy of the norm traces the emergence of the norm to medieval processes for dealing with the plague. As they become disseminated and generalized, these processes later contribute to producing a normalizing society. In the society of the norm, characterized by a proliferating production of models of perfection for all areas of human life, binarily discriminating rules remain important insofar as norms are used to ground binarizing condemnations of abnormal cases.

The second article, "Foucault, Normativity and Freedom: A Reappraisal" by Dr. Giovanni Maria Mascaretti (University of Kurdistan Hewlêr,) contributes to the debate concerning the normativity of Foucault's genealogical method and his genealogical critique of Modernity. Since the 1980s, scholars have criticized Foucault for lacking the normative resources necessary to justify his critique of and resistance against modern forms of power due to the allegedly non-normative and descriptive nature of his genealogical approach. Contrary to this reception, the article argues that Foucault does indeed make normative claims. Since the specific kind of normativity that he opts for cannot easily be reconciled with the requirements for normativity put forward by his critics, however, this is easily overlooked. The article maintains that Foucault's largely implicit model of critique consists in a practice of problematization geared to emancipate us from our captivity in a regime of truth. Resulting from the convergence of the discourses of humanism with the governmental mechanisms of modern biopolitics, a system of intelligibility moulds our experience of the world and limits our capacity for thought and action. Whereas Foucault criticizes biopolitics and the traditional normative grammar of humanism, his attempt to revitalize the emancipatory project of Enlightenment modernity and its ethos goes to show that he remains normatively committed to an ideal of freedom as self-transformation. The ultimate motivation for Foucault's critical attitude and problematization of the existing normative commitments is thus his aim to transform them, so as to give new impetus to the emancipatory claims of Enlightenment modernity. Even though the article in general argues for the soundness of Foucault's strategy, it ends by highlighting certain serious shortfalls and incongruencies of Foucault's normative approach. The article discusses the position on normativity voiced by the author of the previous article, Mark Kelly, but as it has been articulated quite recently in his book *For Foucault. Against Normative Political Theory* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2018) and not as it is detailed in the article.

In the third article, "Re-thinking Thought: Foucault, Deleuze, and the Possibility of Thinking," Wendl Luna (University of New South Wales in Sydney) examines how Foucault and Deleuze understand each other's work. The author argues that Deleuze and Foucault regard themselves as converging and are united in their common endeavor to make it possible to think again. When interpreting Foucault's work, Deleuze highlights how Foucault reconditions the possibility of thinking by positing a disjunction between the visible and the articulable. When reviewing Deleuze's works, Foucault characterizes Deleuze's thought as a disjunctive affirmation. According

to Foucault, Deleuze re-thinks thought not by aiming to conceptualize or reconceptualize it but rather by thinking difference. Insofar as there are strong similarities between Foucault's description of Deleuze's practice of thought as disjunctive affirmation and Deleuze's emphasis of the centrality of the disjunction between the articulable and the visible in Foucault, Foucault and Deleuze converge in their attempt to re-think thought and in their mutual understanding that the other re-thinks thought by thinking difference.

The fourth article, "Foucault as an Ethical Philosopher: The Genealogical Discussion of Antiquity and the Present", is written by Dimitrios Lais (University of York). The article highlights that Foucault's discussion of Antiquity is genealogical. On the one hand, Foucault's genealogical reading of Antiquity is meant to instruct contemporary discussions of power. On the other hand, the genealogical line of investigation equally affects how Foucault reads the transmitted works of Antiquity in his late works and, in particular, his final lectures on *The Courage of Truth*. While Foucault's discussion of Plato's dialogue *Laches* provides an articulation of practices of living tied to *parrhesia* that may also inspire self-care in the present, the reading concomitantly serves as a critique of the present directed at democratic theories. In line with neo-platonic conceptions of *parrhesia* that draw on a certain interpretation of the Platonic dialogue *Alcibiades*, these democratic theories prescribe technologies of the self which tie the self and its truth-telling to structures of domination. In the context of an understanding of genealogy as problematization, Foucault's genealogical discussion of Antiquity ought to be perceived as a source of self-creation with critical implications for the evaluation of regimes of truth and power in the present, including present forms of governmentality.

The fifth article, "Ethical Invention in Sartre and Foucault: Courage, Freedom, Transformation" by Dr. Kimberly S. Engels (Molloy College), explores the concept of ethical invention in Sartre's and Foucault's later lectures and interviews. The article demonstrates that a courageous disposition to invent and to transform plays a determinative role in the conception of ethics in both thinkers. For Sartre, ethical invention involves the use of our freedom to break away from harmful ideologies, transcend our current circumstances and develop a praxis directed by the goal of universal humanism. For Foucault, ethical invention requires a rejection of apparent necessities in our present landscape, a readiness to reshape our current beliefs and the willingness to develop a philosophical way of life in such a way that it results in an alteration of the relationship to oneself and to others. For both thinkers, ethical invention presupposes that we critically reflect upon ourselves in the present historical moment. Thus, ethical invention requires a rejection of the inherent value of the given world and the realization that the conditions of possibility for how we constitute ourselves as subjects are malleable.

The sixth article is “Sirens in the Panopticon: Intersections between Ainslean Picoeconomics and Foucault’s Discipline Theory” by Yevhenii Osievskyi and Maksym Yokovlyev (National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy). In this article, the authors attempt to synthesize the findings of the branch of behavioral economics known as “*picoeconomics*” developed by George Ainslie with insights of Foucauldian thought. The aim is to indicate how a richer and more nuanced understanding of strategies for self-managing human irrationality can be developed when both approaches are mobilized.

The final article is “The Paradoxes in the Use of the Panopticon as a Theoretical Reference in Urban Video-surveillance Studies: A Case Study of a CCTV System of a Brazilian city” by Iafet Leonardi Bricalli (University of Genoa). The article investigates the use of the theoretical background of the panopticon in order to interpret the use of closed-circuit television camera (CCTV) systems, which have become widespread in public spaces of cities since the 1990s and 2000s, and have by now become a standard response of public administrations in law enforcement. In urban surveillance studies on the use of CCTV systems in public spaces, criticism has been voiced regarding the use of the panopticon as a theoretical reference. According to the article, this criticism is only partially pertinent. The criticism rests on a too literal interpretation of the panopticon where it is understood as an instrument of correction of individuals in closed spaces. The criticism is thus based on an implicit technological determinism. Instead, an understanding of the panopticon as a theoretical reference ought to start from Foucault’s conception of panopticism where it is understood as a metaphor for surveillance that is exerted by the multiplication of intertwined views and acts through a network. Thus, by understanding the exercise of power as a network, this conception of panopticism makes room for the importance of human labor behind and in front of the cameras. Micro-sociological studies in the control rooms where the cameras are operated have corroborated the importance of this understanding of panopticism. Research conducted by the authors in the public spaces of a Brazilian city and detailed in the article problematizes univocal conclusions regarding the system and its effects of surveillance. On the one hand, direct control over the space is minimal and people generally live as if the cameras did not exist. On the other hand, the presence of the cameras promotes a state of control over the citizens and their spaces. Understood in the way depicted in the article, Foucault’s interpretation of Bentham’s panopticon as it is conceptualized in the form of panopticism is reaffirmed as an important analytical tool that allows the diagnosis of trends of normalization and moralization in the public space.

REVIEW SECTION

The present issue contains three book reviews. The reviews are:

Sverre Raffnsøe, Alain Beaulieu, Alex Feldman, Barbara Cruikshank, Clare O'Farrell, Daniele Lorenzini, Dianna Taylor, Edward McGushin, Eva Bendix Petersen, Giovanni Mascaretti, Hernan Camilo Pulido Martinez, Johanna Oksala, Knut Ove Eliassen, Leonard Richard Lawlor, Martina Tazzioli, Rodrigo Castro Orellana, Thomas Götse-lius, Verena Erlenbusch, Alan Rosenberg, Sille Høker Neumann & Asker Bryld Staunæs

Editorials Foucault Studies, No. 27, pp. i-vi

- Colin Koopman, *How We Became Our Data: A Genealogy of the Informational Person* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2019), written by Leonard d'Cruz (The University of Melbourne);
- Tom Boland, *The Spectacle of Critique: From Philosophy to Cacophony* (New York: Routledge, 2018), written by Stephanie Martens (Laurentian University);
- *Posthuman Glossary*, editors Rosi Braidotti and Maria Hlavajova (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017), written by Asker Bryld Staunæs and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen (Aarhus University).

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

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, *Foucault Studies* 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 has 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 both 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

Sverre Raffnsøe, Alain Beaulieu, Alex Feldman, Barbara Cruikshank, Clare O'Farrell, Daniele Lorenzini, Dianna Taylor, Edward McGushin, Eva Bendix Petersen, Giovanni Mascaretti, Hernan Camilo Pulido Martinez, Johanna Oksala, Knut Ove Eliassen, Leonard Richard Lawlor, Martina Tazzioli, Rodrigo Castro Orellana, Thomas Götse-lius, Verena Erlenbusch, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Alan Rosenberg, Sille Høker Neumann & Asker Bryld Staunæs
Editorials Foucault Studies, No. 27, pp. i-vi

future. The details of the updated guidelines can be found on the home page here:
<https://rauli.cbs.dk/index.php/foucault-studies/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The journal is most grateful to managing editors Sille Høker Neumann and Asker Bryld Staunæs for their 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.