

# THE FOUCAULT EFFECT

STUDIES IN  
GOVERNMENTALITY  
*WITH TWO LECTURES BY AND AN INTERVIEW WITH  
MICHEL FOUCAULT*

*Edited by*  
Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon  
and Peter Miller

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637

© 1991 Editors and Contributors

All rights reserved. Published 1991

Printed in the United States of America

14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 6 7 8 9

ISBN: 0-226-08045-5 (paperback)

---

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

---

The Foucault effect : studies in governmentality : with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault / edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-226-08044-7 (cloth). — ISBN 0-226-08045-5 (pbk.)

1. Reason of state. 2. Welfare state. I. Foucault, Michel. II. Burchell, Graham. III. Gordon, Colin. IV. Miller, Peter, Ph.D.

JC131.F63 1991

320'.01'1—dc20

91-10456

CIP

---

Ⓢ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992.

# Contents

	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
	<i>Preface</i>	ix
1	Governmental Rationality: An Introduction <i>Colin Gordon</i>	1
2	Politics and the Study of Discourse <i>Michel Foucault</i>	53
3	Questions of Method <i>Michel Foucault</i>	73
4	Governmentality <i>Michel Foucault</i>	87
5	Theatrum Politicum: The Genealogy of Capital – Police and the State of Prosperity <i>Pasquale Pasquino</i>	105
6	Peculiar Interests: Civil Society and Governing 'The System of Natural Liberty' <i>Graham Burchell</i>	119
7	Social Economy and the Government of Poverty <i>Giovanna Procacci</i>	151
8	The Mobilization of Society <i>Jacques Donzelot</i>	169
9	How Should We Do the History of Statistics? <i>Ian Hacking</i>	181
10	Insurance and Risk <i>François Ewald</i>	197
11	'Popular Life' and Insurance Technology <i>Daniel Defert</i>	211

12	Criminology: The Birth of a Special Knowledge <i>Pasquale Pasquino</i>	235
13	Pleasure in Work <i>Jacques Donzelot</i>	251
14	From Dangerousness to Risk <i>Robert Castel</i>	281
	<i>Index</i>	299

## Acknowledgements

Chapter 2 originally appeared in the French journal *Esprit*, no. 371 (May 1968) pp. 850–874. An English translation first appeared in the journal *Salmagundi*, no. 20 (Summer–Fall, 1972) pp. 225–48. A revised translation by Colin Gordon originally appeared in *Ideology and Consciousness*, no. 3 (Spring, 1978). The present version has been further extensively revised.

Chapter 3 originally appeared in Michelle Perrot, ed., *L'impossible prison: Recherches sur le système pénitentiaire au XIXe siècle* (éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1980). The translation by Colin Gordon, reproduced here with minor corrections, originally appeared in *I&C*, no. 8, *Power and Desire: Diagrams of the Social* (Spring 1981).

Chapter 4 is a lecture given at the Collège de France, February 1978. The first publication was in an Italian translation by Pasquale Pasquino, in the journal *Aut . . . aut*, no. 167–8 (September – December 1978). An English translation by Rosi Braidotti originally appeared in *I&C*, no. 6 (Autumn 1979). A French version, re-translated from the Italian, appeared in *Actes No. 54* (été 1986) pp. 7–15. The present version was revised by Colin Gordon.

Chapter 5 was given as a paper to a seminar organized at the Collège de France by Michel Foucault in 1978. A translation by Colin Gordon originally appeared in *Ideology and Consciousness*, no. 4 (Autumn 1978). The present translation has been extensively revised.

Chapter 7 originally appeared in *Aut . . . aut*, no. 167–8 (September–December 1978). A translation from the Italian by Jennifer Stone originally appeared in *Ideology and Consciousness*, no. 4 (Autumn 1978). The present version has been extensively revised by Colin Gordon.

Chapter 8 was written for a conference on neo-social democracy held in 1982. The translation by Colin Gordon appears here for the first time.

Chapter 9 originally appeared in *I&C* no. 8 (Spring 1981). The text and notes for this version have been revised by the author.

Chapter 12 was written for a seminar organized at the Collège de France in 1979 by Michel Foucault. The translation by Colin Gordon, reproduced here with minor modifications originally appeared in *I&C* no. 7, *Technologies of the Human Sciences* (Autumn 1980). The present version has been further revised.

Chapter 13 originally appeared in Jean Carpentier, Robert Castel, Jacques Donzelot, Jean Marie Lacrosse, Anne Lovell and Giovanna Procacci, *Résistances à la médecine et démultiplication du concept de santé* (C.O.R.D.E.S./Commisariat Général du Plan, Paris 1980). The translation by Colin Gordon originally appeared in *I&C* no. 9, *Life, Labour and Insecurity* (Winter 1981–1982).

Chapters 1, 6, 10, 11 and 14 are published here for the first time.

## Preface

An effect of this kind is by no means an appearance or an illusion. It is a product which spreads or distends itself over a surface; it is strictly co-present to, and co-extensive with, its own cause, and determines this cause as an immanent cause, inseparable from its effects, pure *nihil* or *x*, outside of the effects themselves. Such effects, or such a product have usually been designated by a proper or singular name. A proper name can be considered fully as a sign only to the extent that it refers to an effect of this kind. (Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, p. 70)

Michel Foucault's contemporary and friend Gilles Deleuze glosses here a practice in scientific nomenclature, the naming of certain special physical phenomena, such as the Kelvin effect or the Compton effect. He is also hinting something about individuality: that its fullest achieved form can embody the same kind of impersonal singularity as that designated by the physicists' name for an 'effect'. Our title for this collection of studies invokes this idea. The 'Foucault effect' documented here is – briefly stated – the making visible, through a particular perspective in the history of the present, of the different ways in which an activity or art called *government* has been made thinkable and practicable.

Our title also intends justly to convey what, personal connection aside, our authors have in common, something rather different from membership of a school or subscription to a manifesto. What they share is a particular exploratory passion, a striving to capture and analyze, across a range of its modern manifestations (reason of state, police, liberalism, security, social economy, insurance, *solidarisme*, welfare, risk management and others) a dimension of historical existence which Michel Foucault, perhaps, did most to isolate and describe.

We think there is something in this work which is still new, which has not been digested or staled by the intellectual trends of the past decade, and which can help us to understand, to respond to and perhaps even to look beyond our present. Foucault wrote in 1976 that in political analysis we have still not cut off the king's head – meaning that thought about politics is trapped by the antitheses of despotism and legitimation, repression and rights. In Britain, critical political culture now espouses the aims of a written constitution and a Bill of Rights. Certainly Foucault

did not mean that these were futile objectives. But government is not just a power needing to be tamed or an authority needing to be legitimized. It is an activity and an art which concerns all and which touches each. And it is an art which presupposes thought. The sense and object of governmental acts do not fall from the sky or emerge ready formed from social practice. They are things which have had to be – and which have been – invented. Foucault observed that there is a parcel of thought in even the crassest and most obtuse parts of social reality, which is why criticism can be a real power for change, depriving some practices of their self-evidence, extending the bounds of the thinkable to permit the invention of others. The ‘Foucault effect’ may, or such is our hope, contribute to a renewal of these powers of critique.

## Governmental rationality: an introduction

Colin Gordon

Between 1970 and 1984, Michel Foucault delivered thirteen annual courses of lectures at the Collège de France in Paris. Foucault’s duties at the college, as professor in a specially created Chair in the History of Systems of Thought, were not to teach a syllabus but to report on the results of his own researches. Several of these lecture series, Foucault’s own official summaries of which have been republished as a volume by the Collège de France,<sup>1</sup> are preliminary explorations of themes taken up in various of Foucault’s later books. But others contain rich seams of material which he never chose or had time to work up in a final written form. Perhaps the two most remarkable annual courses of which this is true were those of 1978 and 1979, entitled respectively ‘Security, territory and population’, and ‘The birth of biopolitics’. One of the 1978 lectures was published (although not in French) in Foucault’s lifetime, and is reprinted in this volume (Chapter 4). A provision in Foucault’s will has been interpreted by his literary executors as precluding posthumous publication of the complete lecture series; but the exceptional interest of the 1978 and 1979 courses has been recognized by the recent publication on cassette tape of the initial lectures of the two series, and a complete tape edition of the two series is currently under consideration. Complete recordings of these lectures are available to researchers in the Foucault archive at the Bibliothèque du Saulchoir in Paris.

In these lectures Foucault defined and explored a fresh domain of research into what he called ‘governmental rationality’, or, in his own neologism, ‘governmentality’. This work was not carried out single-handedly. A group of fellow researchers, several of whom are among the contributors to this volume, took part in seminars held at the Collège de France which paralleled and complemented the programme of the lectures. In the subsequent lecture courses in Paris, Foucault shifted his attention away from these governmental themes in the direction of the topics of his final volumes of the *History of Sexuality*. But he continued to teach and organize research seminars on questions of government on his frequent visits to the United States, particularly at Berkeley. A number of lectures, essays and interviews published in the USA during these later years provide valuable documentation of this area of Foucault’s work.

In the present essay I shall attempt a brief outline of the meaning of the theme of 'governmentality' in Foucault's work and the studies which he and others carried out under this heading, constructing a composite picture of the kinds of political and philosophical analysis which this style of working produces in the hands of a number of different and independent researchers. In some ways this is a problematic and even a foolhardy undertaking. A condensed, syncretic account may risk glossing over important differences of perspective between different individual contributions. One is describing a zone of research, not a fully formed product (although happily, it is now possible to refer to major subsequent publications by many of this volume's authors).<sup>2</sup> The inaccessibility and the informal oral structure of the lecture materials makes summarization at once an indispensable and an uncomfortable task. I can only hope that the richness of the material itself will encourage the reader to tolerate these presentational obstacles and their attendant irritations.

As well as summarizing, I shall attempt to connect and to contextualize. We are only gradually becoming aware of, and are still far from having fully documented access to, the astounding range of Foucault's intellectual enterprises, especially in the later years from 1976 to 1984. The governmental theme has a focal place in Foucault's later philosophy; an effort needs to be made to locate this as accurately as possible. To understand the theme's wider resonance, something needs to be said about the interactions between a research agenda and a contemporary political world. To help to situate its distinctive value – and on grounds of good sense – it will be advisable to resist doctrinaire overstatement of this work's unique and unprecedented character, and instead to try to establish lines of communication with twentieth-century enquiries into allied areas of political philosophy and the history of political ideas. Such points of fruitful connection are, as Graham Burchell illustrates (Chapter 6), encouragingly numerous. Finally, and taking due account of widespread extant discussion of Foucault's later published work, something ought to be said about the ethical and political considerations (if any) implicit in this way of working and thinking.

What did Foucault have in mind by the topic 'governmental rationality'? Foucault understood the term 'government' in both a wide and a narrow sense. He proposed a definition of the term 'government' in general as meaning 'the conduct of conduct': that is to say, a form of activity aiming to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some person or persons. 'The government of one's self and of others' was Foucault's title for his last two years' lectures, and for a projected, unpublished book. Government as an activity could concern the relation between self and self, private interpersonal relations involving some form of control or guidance, relations within social institutions and communities and,

finally, relations concerned with the exercise of political sovereignty. Foucault was crucially interested in the interconnections between these different forms and meanings of government; but in his lectures specifically on governmental rationality he concerned himself principally with government in the political domain.

Foucault used the term 'rationality of government' almost interchangeably with 'art of government'. He was interested in government as an activity or practice, and in arts of government as ways of knowing what that activity consisted in, and how it might be carried on. A rationality of government will thus mean a way or system of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed), capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and to those upon whom it was practised. Here, as elsewhere in his work, Foucault was interested in the philosophical questions posed by the historical, contingent and humanly invented existence of varied and multiple forms of such a rationality.

In these two years' lectures, Foucault applied this perspective of analysis to three or four different historical domains: the theme, in Greek philosophy and more generally in antiquity and early Christianity, of the nature of government, and the idea of government as a form of 'pastoral power'; doctrines of government in early modern Europe associated with the idea of reason of state and the police state; the eighteenth-century beginning of liberalism, considered as a conception of the art of government; and, lastly, post-war forms of neo-liberal thought in Germany, the USA and France, considered as ways of rethinking the rationality of government. These different and discontinuous forays were linked together for Foucault by a common focus of interest, encapsulated in the formula of one of his lecture titles: 'Omnes et singulatim' (all and each).<sup>3</sup> Foucault saw it as a characteristic (and troubling) property of the development of the practice of government in Western societies to tend towards a form of political sovereignty which would be a government of all and of each, and whose concerns would be at once to 'totalize' and to 'individualize'.

We can better locate this preoccupation of Foucault's by reconstructing some of the moves which took him there. In his preceding book *Discipline and Punish*, he had famously proposed and expounded a kind of political analysis called the 'microphysics of power', exemplified by the study of the application of disciplinary techniques as part of the invention of the modern penitentiary prison. A whole aspect of modern societies, Foucault was suggesting here, could be understood only by reconstructing certain 'techniques of power', or of 'power/knowledge', designed to observe, monitor, shape and control the behaviour of individuals situated

within a range of social and economic institutions such as the school, the factory and the prison. These ideas encountered considerable interest and extensive criticism. Foucault's responses to some of these criticisms can be read as giving some of the key directions to his subsequent work.

One objection frequently raised by the Marxist left was that this new attentiveness to the specifics of power relations and the detailed texture of the particular techniques and practices failed to address or shed light on the global issues of politics, namely the relations between society and the state. Another was that Foucault's representation of society as a network of omnipresent relations of subjugating power seemed to preclude the possibility of meaningful individual freedom. A third complaint was that Foucault's markedly bleak account of the effects of humanitarian penal reformism corresponded to an overall political philosophy of nihilism and despair.

Foucault introduced his lectures on governmentality as being, among other things, an answer to the first of these objections. The same style of analysis, he argued, that had been used to study techniques and practices addressed to individual human subjects within particular, local institutions could also be addressed to techniques and practices for governing populations of subjects at the level of a political sovereignty over an entire society. There was no methodological or material discontinuity between three respective, microphysical and macrophysical approaches to the study of power. At the same time, moving from the former to the latter meant something different from returning to the theory of the state in the form demanded and practised by Foucault's Marxist critics. Foucault acknowledged the continuing truth of the reproach that he refrained from the theory of the state, 'in the sense that one abstains from an indigestible meal'. State theory attempts to deduce the modern activities of government from essential properties and propensities of the state, in particular its supposed propensity to grow and to swallow up or colonize everything outside itself. Foucault holds that the state has no such inherent propensities; more generally, the state has no essence. The nature of the institution of the state is, Foucault thinks, a function of changes in practices of government, rather than the converse. Political theory attends too much to institutions, and too little to practices. Foucault takes the same methodological course here as in *Discipline and Punish*, where changes in the rationale and meaning of the practice of punishing are prioritized over transformations in the structure of penal institutions.

Foucault had already begun to develop his view of the links between the microphysics and the macrophysics of power in the final chapter of *The History of Sexuality*, volume 1 (1976). Here he had introduced the term 'biopower', to designate forms of power exercised over persons specifi-

cally in so far as they are thought of as living beings: a politics concerned with subjects as members of a *population*, in which issues of individual sexual and reproductive conduct interconnect with issues of national policy and power. Foucault reintroduced this theme of biopower or biopolitics in his 1978 lectures, in a way linking it intimately with his approach to the theme of government. One of the key connections here was the perception that modern biopolitics generates a new kind of counter-politics. As governmental practices have addressed themselves in an increasingly immediate way to 'life', in the form of the individual detail of individual sexual conducts, individuals have begun to formulate the needs and imperatives of that same life as the basis for political counter-demands. Biopolitics thus provides a prime instance of what Foucault calls here the 'strategic reversibility' of power relations, or the ways in which the terms of governmental practice can be turned around into focuses of resistance: or, as he put it in his 1978 lectures, the way the history of government as the 'conduct of conduct' is interwoven with the history of dissenting 'counter-conducts'.

In these matters Foucault had some important clarifications to offer, notably in his American essays and interviews, on his views about power, freedom and hope. Foucault seems to have found fault afterwards at least with his rhetoric in *Discipline and Punish*, where this may have seemed to give an impression of certain uses of power as having an almost absolute capability to tame and subject individuals. In his 1982 essay 'The subject and power', Foucault affirms, on the contrary, that power is only power (rather than mere physical force or violence) when addressed to individuals who are free to act in one way or another. Power is defined as 'actions on others' actions': that is, it presupposes rather than annuls their capacity as agents; it acts upon, and through, an open set of practical and ethical possibilities.<sup>4</sup> Hence, although power is an omnipresent dimension in human relations, power in a society is never a fixed and closed regime, but rather an endless and open strategic game:

At the very heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom. Rather than speaking of an essential freedom, it would be better to speak of an 'agonism' – of a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyzes both sides than a permanent provocation.

Perhaps, then, what Foucault finds most fascinating and disturbing in the history of Western governmental practice and its rationalities is the idea of a kind of power which takes freedom itself and the 'soul of the citizen', the life and life-conduct of the ethically free subject, as in some sense the correlative object of its own suasive capacity. This was one of the crucial points where Foucault found himself among the inheritors of Max

Weber.<sup>6</sup> In the fresh way it re-poses the conjunction of the history of politics and the history of ethics, Foucault's later work rejoins a great theme of modern political sociology.

A little more needs to be said about the political and critical value orientation of this work of Foucault's, beginning with a note on its place and time of gestation. Foucault's 1978 course overlapped with an unexpected defeat in French parliamentary elections of an alliance of Socialist and Communist parties. His 1979 course ended a few weeks before Margaret Thatcher's election as British Prime Minister. This work was being done at a time of the fading in France of the multitudinous blossomings of post-1968 social militancy, at a time when the intellectual prestige of Marxism was about to undergo a rapid collapse (partly stimulated by the influence of Eastern European dissidents, with whose welcome and reception in France Foucault was actively involved), and when the spreading influence of neo-liberal political thought, from the Germany of Helmut Schmidt to the France of Giscard and Barre and the Britain of Callaghan and Healey, had begun to present a challenge to the post-war orthodoxies of governmental thought.

One of the conspicuous attributes of Foucault's governmentality lectures is their serene and (in a Weberian sense) exemplary abstention from value judgements. In a pithy preamble he rejects the use of an academic discourse as a vehicle of practical injunction ('love this; hate that; do this; refuse that . . .'), and dismisses the notion that practical political choices can be determined within the space of a theoretical text as trivializing the act of moral decision to the level of a merely aesthetic preference. The terms of Foucault's accounts of governmental rationalities are devoid of the implicit pejorative sarcasm which Foucault's Nietzschean affiliations have so often led readers to hear in his writing. Foucault's accounts of the liberal and neo-liberal thinkers indeed often evince a sense of (albeit value-neutral) intellectual attraction and esteem. The perspective may be libertarian, but it is not anarchist. His reproach, if there is one, is addressed to critical culture itself. Foucault does not eschew practical maxims where the obligations of thought are concerned. In a nutshell, he suggests that recent neo-liberalism, understood (as he proposes) as a novel set of notions about the art of government, is a considerably more original and challenging phenomenon than the left's critical culture has had the courage to acknowledge, and that its political challenge is one which the left is singularly ill equipped to respond to, the more so since, as Foucault contends, socialism itself does not possess and has never possessed its own distinctive art of governing. The conclusion from this exercise in critical attentiveness to the present lies in the affirmation of the possibility and necessity, for those who wish to pursue certain ends and values, of fresh acts of inventiveness.

Some of these views are well attested in Foucault's later years. In an interview in 1981 where he candidly welcomes the election of a Socialist government, Foucault expressed the hope of seeing a new 'logique de gauche' in the conduct of the regime, replacing the tutelary arrogance of its predecessor towards the governed with a practice of free dialogue between government and governed, 'debout et en face' (upright and face to face). He himself showed willingness to engage in discussion about problems and contradictions in social policy, notably in a long dialogue with a CFDT trade union representative on health funding issues and the need to devise new welfare policy mechanisms capable of providing the means of individual autonomy as well as the means of security. In the course of this discussion Foucault makes an emphatic plea for a renewal of inventiveness in political culture. Foucault also retained a continuing practical concern with the problems of the prisons which had so much occupied him in the 1970s. It is a matter of record that Foucault gave private advice to one governmental figure, the Minister of Justice Robert Badinter, his longstanding ally in the 1970s campaign against the death penalty.<sup>7</sup> Foucault is said also to have been on friendly terms with Michel Rocard, whose subsequent written references to 'le gouvernement des hommes' seem reminiscent of some of our present material. On the whole, however, Foucault seems to have been disappointed by the Socialists and their preferred role for intellectuals as a supporting ideological chorus line rather than as interlocutors in a discussion about how to govern. Paul Veyne recently wrote that, at the time of his death in 1984, Foucault was 'preparing a book against the Socialists'.

I will return below to the practical philosophy contained in Foucault's later work. We must now look more closely at the 'governmentality' lectures. We have seen how Foucault distinguished his topic from that of certain forms of state theory. How does it relate to the more classic domain of political philosophy? Perhaps a classic distinction can be used to draw a doubtless oversimplified contrast. A major part, at least, of classical political philosophy, in its central concern with the legitimate foundations of political sovereignty and political obedience, is about 'the best government'. Governmentality is about how to govern. Foucault continues here his predilection for 'how' questions, for the immanent conditions and constraints of practices. The choice does not carry any immediate polemical implication. Foucault does not say that legitimation theory is empty (though in a lecture he does call the social contract a bluff and civil society a fairy story); but only that a theory of the legitimate basis of sovereignty cannot be relied upon as a means of describing the ways in which power is actually exercised under such a sovereignty.

Even here, though, the concern with 'how' is not a concern with the domain of the purely expedient or factual. Firstly, Foucault's topic is

quite as much about critique, problematizations, invention and imagination, about the changing shape of the thinkable, as it is about the 'actually existing'. Secondly, the perceived internal constraints of the activity of governing are no less capable of carrying normative meaning and content than the principles of legitimation. Thirdly, as we have already seen, the content and object of governing as biopolitics, as the conduct of living and the living, is itself already ethical. Fourthly, Foucault goes on to develop (in the first lecture of his 1980 course), the idea that government in Western cultures carries with it a concern with truth which exceeds the merely utilitarian relationship postulated in his earlier schema of power-knowledge. Extending the idea that sovereignty is seldom grounded on pure violence alone, Foucault advances the thesis of a regular, though variously actualized interdependence between the 'government of men' and what he calls the 'manifestation of truth'. One Western version of the art of government, accordingly, is 'government in the name of the truth'.

#### EARLY MODERN

Beginning his lectures in 1978 on the topic of 'pastoral power' in ancient culture, Foucault was returning in a new way to a classic theme in his own work. In *The Birth of the Clinic*, Foucault retraces the difficult origins of a style of medical knowledge structured around the interpretation of the individual case. Earlier medicine, he showed, had obeyed an Aristotelian interdict on a science of the individual: science concerned itself with genus and species; the individual difference was infra-scientific. Plato's dialogue, *The Statesman*, concerning the nature of the art of government, discusses the possibility that the ruler's art is like the shepherd's who cares for each individual sheep in his flock. In Plato, this idea is dismissed as impracticable: a ruler's knowledge and attentiveness could never extend so far as to minister to each individual: 'only a god could act thus'. Greek politics chooses the game of citizen and laws, rather than the pastoral game. The pastoral model is adopted and vastly elaborated by Christianity, as the care of souls. In Western Christianity, however, the roles of sacerdotal pastor and secular ruler never come to be unified. The focus of Foucault's interest in modern governmental rationalities consists, precisely, in the realization of what he calls the 'daemonic' coupling of 'city-game' and 'shepherd-game': the invention of a form of secular political pastorate which couples 'individualization' and 'totalization'.

Foucault singles out the emergence of doctrines of reason of state in sixteenth-century Europe as the starting point of modern govern-

mentality, as an *autonomous* rationality. The principles of government are no longer part of and subordinate to the divine, cosmo-theological order of the world. The principles of state are immanent, precisely, in the state itself. To know how to govern, one must know the state and the secret springs of its *interests*, a knowledge which in part may not and cannot be accessible to the ruled, and is liable to dictate governmental acts of a singular, unforeseeable and drastic character. These are the key interlocking terms of the French *politique* theorists of the early seventeenth century: *raison d'état*; *intérêt d'état*; *mystère d'état*; *coup d'état*. As Etienne Thuau has written:

The notion of state ceases to be derived from the divine order of the universe. The point of departure for political speculation is no longer the Creation in its entirety, but the sovereign state. Reason of state seems to have perverted the old order of values . . . Born of the calculation and ruse of men, a knowing machine, a work of reason, the state encompasses a whole heretical substrate . . . Set above human and religious considerations, the state is thus subject to a particular necessity . . . Obeying its own laws, *raison d'état* appears as a scandalous and all-powerful reality, whose nature escapes the intelligence and constitutes a mystery.<sup>8</sup>

The state has its reasons which are known neither to sentiment nor to religion.

A contemporary synonym of *raison d'état* (condemned by a Pope as 'the devil's reason') was 'civil prudence': part of its genealogy has been seen to lie in the transformation of the Christian doctrine of prudence, considered as the virtue displayed by a ruler capable of just action in circumstances which are singular and specific: the governor as helmsman – another of Plato's metaphors – preserving ship and passengers from the hazards of reef and storm. The meaning of prudence evolves from a context where it can be identified with a knowledge of apt precedent (the singular is never the wholly unprecedented) to a context, as in Machiavellian Italy, where the uncertain and the unexpected come to be perceived as the norm of Fortune's empire. The Machiavellian political art invented in response to this observation has, as Foucault remarks, its own inherent limit: a doctrine whose focus is merely to 'hold out', to retain one's sovereignty, however acquired, can scarcely provide assurance of holding out indefinitely. The importance of shifting the seat of political reason from prince to state is that the latter is capable of being credited with a form of secular perpetuity (itself a notion with complex Christian antecedents, explored by Kantorowicz: 'States are realities which must needs hold out for an indefinite length of time.'<sup>9</sup> 'The art of governing is rational', Foucault writes, 'if reflexion causes it to observe the nature of what is governed – here, the *state*': reason of state is 'government in accordance with the state's strength'.<sup>10</sup>

Foucault suggests that the style of political thinking which enables continental European *raison d'état* to outgrow its Machiavellian limitations and to become a knowledge of 'the state's strength' can be found most fully embodied and articulated in the corpus of theory, pedagogy and codification developed in German territories after the Thirty Years War, under the rubric of *Polizeiwissenschaft*, or 'science of police' (although the English word 'policy' is arguably a better equivalent to this meaning of *Polizei*). Perhaps one could say, very formulaically, that reason of state's problem of calculating detailed actions appropriate to an infinity of unforeseeable and contingent circumstances is met by the creation of an exhaustively detailed knowledge of the governed reality of the state itself, extending (at least in aspiration) to touch the existences of its individual members. The police state is also termed the 'state of prosperity'. The idea of prosperity or happiness is the principle which identifies the state with its subjects. Police theory shares the mercantilist economic policy of striving to maximize the quantity of bullion in the sovereign's treasury. But it emphasizes that the real basis of the state's wealth and power lies in its population, in the strength and productivity of all and each. This, Foucault writes, is 'the central paradox of police': the aim of the modern art of government, viz., to develop those elements of individual lives in such a way that their development also fosters the strength of the state.<sup>11</sup> The police state, we might say in other terms, strives towards the prudential by cultivating the pastoral.

Some citations and paraphrases from *Polizeiwissenschaft* writers by Foucault and Pasquino are eloquent on this topic. 'Life is the object of police: the indispensable, the useful, and the superfluous. That people survive, live, and even do better than just that, is what the police has to ensure.' Police 'sees to living': 'the objects which it embraces are in some sense indefinite'. 'The police's true object is man.' Police 'sees to everything pertaining to man's happiness'. 'The sole purpose of police is to lead to the utmost happiness in this life.'<sup>12</sup> Police is a science of endless lists and classifications; there is a police of religion, of customs, of health, of foods, of highways, of public order, of sciences, commerce, manufactures, servants, poverty . . . Police science seems to aspire to constitute a kind of omnivorous espousal of governed reality, the sensorium of a Leviathan. It is also (again in aspiration) a knowledge of inexhaustibly detailed and continuous control. Foucault (borrowing the title of an anti-Gaullist polemic by François Mitterrand) describes government in the police state as a 'permanent coup d'état'. Police government does not limit its action on the governed to the general form of laws: it works by the means of specific, detailed regulation and decree. The exponents of reason of state described its executive actions as those of a 'special justice'; Foucault notes as a defining characteristic of the police state the

marginalization of the distinction between government by law and government by decree.

What kind of a rationality of government is this? Perhaps one may usefully refer here to Max Weber's vocabulary of reflection on the varieties of rationality and rationalization in world history and modern history. Somewhat as Weber remarks of Chinese Confucianism, police is a 'rationalism of order', which conceptually amalgamates the ordered course of the world and the ordering activity of administration.<sup>13</sup> But police resituates both these notions within a secular, non-traditional ethos, under a reign of artifice. Meinecke, in his *Macchiavellism*, evokes the view of the state of Turkey in the writings of the Italian reason of state theorist Trajano Boccalini (1556–1613):

Turkey brought to life and exemplified what the political thought of the Renaissance had always been striving after: an artificial construction which had been consciously and purposely built up, a State mechanism which was arranged like a clock, and which made use of the various species and strengths and qualities of men as its springs and wheels.<sup>14</sup>

In a somewhat similar sense, the assurance of order in the police state is the assurance of an order which it itself has created. If the problem of Macchiavelli's prince is the securing of a new and non-legitimate sovereignty, the equivalent characteristic problem of police, in the German states newly demarcated by the Treaty of Westphalia, is, as Pasquino shows, to create a polity, as it were *ex nihilo*, out of a war-devastated no man's land. What the social market economy was for the Germany of 1945, the police state was for the Germany of 1648.

Police science, or 'Camerarism', is also, in conjunction with the allied knowledge of mercantilism and political arithmetical, the first modern system of *economic sovereignty*, of government understood as an economy. The economy emerges here, as Pasquino has put it, as a *specific*, but not yet (as for liberalism) an *autonomous* form of rationality. The economy of a functioning whole is a machine which has to be continuously made, and not merely operated, by government. This governmental theme of economy retains here from the ancient context of the *oikos* all its implications of possession, domestication and controlling action. In German, *Wirtschaft* (economy) has as its cognates the terms *Wirt* (householder/smallholder) and *Wirtschaften* (economic activity, the conduct of the *Wirtschaft*). Max Weber signalled an equivalent feature of a concept which has a key relevance for the antecedents of Cameralism, the *Stadtwirtschaft* (city economy): this was a term which, as Weber critically observed, signifies indiscriminately both a mode of *economic organization* and an *organism regulating the economy*. If it is possible for Cameralists to speak of the state as being identical with the 'whole body of society', this