

**The History of Sexuality:**  
**an Introduction,**  
**volume 1**

**by Michel Foucault**

Outline by Philip Turetzky, turetzky@colostate.edu

**Part One: We “Other Victorians”**

- 1) Before 17th C was supposedly an age of frankness w/o shame re: bodies.
- 2) After 17th C (a) couple (i) has right to speak and remain silent (ii)sexuality centers on procreation, (b) Home = single locus of sexuality. (c) all else shameful, abnormal, penalized.
- 3) Triple edict re: sex (a) taboo --> brothel & mental hospital yield profit if not production (b) non-existence, e.g. child's sex (c) silence: if not non-existent, at least, shut up about it. (a) + (b) + (c) = repression.
- 4) We won't be entirely free of repression w/o a whole view of economy & revolution & new mechanisms of power. [Freud did a little, Marcuse and Sade require more (p.5)].
- 5) The story makes sexual repression and the need for production coincide when repression is placed w/the beginnings of capitalism: re: (a)repression is easily analyzed (b) the positivity of sex is more difficult (c) so the demand for liberation is valorized politically.
- 6) The Speaker's benefit: If sex is repressed, then speaking is itself revolt.
  - (a) So speaker place's self outside power and anticipates freedom,
  - (b) Speaker's role like prophesy of pleasure,
  - (c) So, pleasure, revolution, & enlightenment (knowledge) are linked.
  - (d) market value of an ear to listen, i.e. much demand to talk, & a small supply of listeners.
- 7) What is essential is not the market, but discourse linking sex, revelation of truth, revolt against laws, proclamation of new day and pleasure - a new theology in sex.
- 8) The notion of repressed sex is linked with the social economic and political mechanism which claims to reveal truth.
- 9) Aim = to show strategies and intent that supports the discourses affirming that we have negated, sex, verbosely proclaims its silence, and denounces and tries to liberate from the very laws that make it function.
- 10) Objection: repression is affirmed and silence proclaimed because repression is so entrenched and reinforced politically/economically especially re: useless energies and so long in history.
- 11) Replies: (a) Historical question: Is repression an historical fact? (b) Historical theoretical question: Are prohibition, censorship and denial really the workings of power? (c) Historical political question: Is the

discourse of liberation and critique a block to power or is it part of the same historical formation as “repression?” (d) Foucault is not constructing a counter thesis of liberty, tolerance and political denunciation of critique.

12) Instead, put the repressive hypothesis in context of discourses & the effects of power. These discourses generate links with pleasure, i.e. define a regime of power-knowledge-pleasure sustaining discourse on sex (p.11), & how this regime of power permeates individual modes of behavior and will to knowledge.

13) The negative elements and tactics of repression, defenses, censorship and denials are not central, but only parts of the discourse, technology of power and will to knowledge re: sex.

14) We should disengage analysis from the economy of scarcity and look for discursive production, production of power and propagation and circulation of knowledge. Results:

(1) not silence, but mechanism have been put in place to generate more and more discourse on sex, [Part Two, Ch. 1]

(2) not restriction, but techniques of power have acted to discriminate polymorphous sexualities, [Part Two, Ch. 2]

(3) not taboo, but knowledge generates a science of sexuality [Part Three].

## **Part Two: The Repressive Hypothesis**

### **Chapter 1) The Incitement to Discourse**

1) The modern age supposedly imposed silence about sex.

2) But, if we actually look we find that there is an explosion of discourse re: sex, but one that also codified a language of allusion and restricted where when and among whom such things could be said.

3) Institutional discourses proliferated (even as illicit discourses were valorized).

4) The language of the confessional was refined and made more discrete.

5) But while the language was more discrete, the effects and correlations of sex were pursued in every detail: everything had to be told. Desire rather than the act became the primary evil; the meeting line of the body and the soul had to be traced.

6) Transforming desire into discourse became required of every Christian, not just monks. Censoring vocabulary may only have been a device to make that vocabulary technically useful in producing discourse.

7) Literature, from scandal to Sade to My Secret Life, requires that sex and its accompaniments be told in every detail. Victorian reticence was only a tactic in the process of turning sex into discourse.

8) The incitement to discourse produced effects of displacement, intensification, reorientation and modification of desire; An organization and deployment of sex inexplicable by a principle of prohibition alone.

9) The technique of turning sex into discourse was supported and relayed by power mechanisms of analysis and classification. These mechanisms were proclaimed publicly necessary (even if personally disapproved). Sex had to be administered, and became a police matter not as prohibition but as regulated by a maximizing order of public discourses.

10) E.g.s “population” became an economic and political problem with its specific variables (rates of birth, fertility, death etc. p.25) at the intersection of features of life and institutional effects.

11) The new discourses made the sexual conduct of the population an object of analysis and a target of intervention. Analysis re: the determinations and effects at the border of biological and economic realms. Interventions re: population size made sexual conduct into economic and political behavior.

12) Talk of sex and children was not silenced but displaced into a new regime of discourses saying things in different ways, by people in different roles for different goals.

13) E.g. The architecture, rules of discipline and organization of schools was preoccupied w/sex, as shown by its internal discourses and the proliferation of political discourses (clinical cases, outlines for reform, medical advice etc.). For the children, a discourse of truth was required (Basedow “festival” e.g. p. 29).

14) Schools have multiplied forms of discourse on children’s sex, established points of implantation, coded contents and speakers, and generally intensified intervention linked w/multiplied discourses. Children’s sex became an area of contention: constituted as a problem.

15) Other areas began to produce discourses: medicine, psychiatry. criminal justice, other social controls made people aware of sex as a danger inciting further discourses about it.

16) E.g. the farm hand who became the object of medical, legal intervention and theoretical discourse. He was required to talk and made a permanent object of medical confinement and scientific analysis.

17) The author of *My Secret Life* and this farmer share the imperative: put sex into words.

18) Discourses on sex, therefore, arose out of power not against it. Our society may be the most long winded.

19) Our age has multiplied discourses and mechanisms around sex. The unity of the confessional has been scattered through a series of tensions, conflicts, and attempts at adjustment and recoding.

20) Obj: Weren’t all of these minority resistances to the overall repression of sex? Reply: the very claim that sex is outside of discourse and that talk about it breaks its secret is just what needs to be examined. These discourses make sex into a secret to be divulged. The interesting question is re: the mechanics of these incitements (the fable of the secret that then requires that we speak).

## Chapter 2) The Perverse Implantation

1) Objection: Isn't it a mistake to ignore the types of the imperatives imposed on sex, and focus on the fact of speaking of sex? Aren't all of these discourses and interventions in the service of economic reproduction?

2) Whether or not economic reproduction is the aim, dispersion and multiplication of "perversions," rather than reduction, has been the means.

3) Until the 19th C, the codes of canonical law, Christian pastoral and civil law regulated sex and focused exclusively on marital relations.

4) Violations, under this regime, were conceived of juridically re: natural law, all deviations were treated the same, surveillance scrutinized marriage.

5) 18th & 19th Cs changed the focus on monogamous heterosexuality: no efforts were made to discover its secrets. However, all the figures of "deviance" came under exhaustive scrutiny.

6) "unnatural" activities become autonomous re: marital rules. The pervert and sexual madness, containing a nature gone awry, separate off from libertines and seducers. The laws of marriage are separated from the order of desires.

7) A world of perversion emerged on the border of law and medicine, a new category of people not simply marked by moral offense, but also of crime and strange impulses akin to madness.

8) Repression gives no clear picture of the attention paid to perversions. Codes re: sexual offenses were more lax & referred to medicine, but mechanisms of surveillance and control multiply. Medicine intervenes by creating a pathology of sexual practices and undertakes to manage them.

9) Consider the form of power exercised rather than indulgence vs. repression: rather than a ban, four operations:

1. Extension of sexuality via penetration: Tactics to control children's sex were not merely destined to fail, but had the effect of propagating the extent of control and penetration and surveillance of children's lives. The sex of children supported multiplication, relays and effects of power relations; while the target expanded and divided.

2. Constitution of specific individuals: Perversions become embodied and a new specification of individuals emerges: the homosexual becomes a type of person, a history and a biology, rather than a type of act (like the act of sodomy). Such classifications of natures multiplied first in medicine then in law. They produce, not exclusion, but permanent realities under modes of conduct.

3. Attraction of sexuality: This form of power demands observation, exchange of discourses (Q & A), and proximity. It implies pleasure in the exercise of power, sensualized power renews the need to observe and draw closer. Power singularizes and intensifies its object, increasing and doubled by the pleasure it provokes.

4. Sexual saturation: Multiple, fragmentary and mobile sexualities permeate and saturate the household and family relations. Educational and psychiatric institutions distribute the interplay of powers and pleasures, but are also sexually saturated areas.

10) Summary: The power applied to the body and sex did not have the form of the law nor the effects of taboo, but multiplied sexualities. It did not restrict, but extended sexuality along lines of indefinite penetration. It did not exclude, but included sexuality in the body of individuals. It did not avoid, but attracted sexuality when pleasure and power reinforced each other. It did not set up a barrier, but produced sexual saturation.

11) Polymorphous conducts did not suddenly attract notice when they were needed for reproducing labor power. The classification and use of perversions were produced by types of power acting directly on bodies and pleasures. New rules of power reveal, isolate, intensify, and incorporating bodies & pleasures.

12) This implantation of perversions in bodies is an instrument-effect (p.48). They serve to optimize a form of power by serving as a surface of intervention. Pleasure and power seek, overlap and reinforce each other via complex devices of excitation and stimulation.

13) So the repressive hypothesis is inadequate because of the explosion of sexualities and especially because these are not controlled via a law of prohibition.

### **Part Three: Scientia Sexualis**

1) Q: has the proliferation of discourses and the implantation of polymorphous sexuality served only to hide and evade sex? Did not the science of sex serve to divert attention to perversions and create fears?

2) The science of sex seems to be more interested in serving order than in discovering truth. But it also set itself up as dictator of hygiene and moral cleanliness, eliminator of degenerate populations, grounding racist policies in truth.

3) It seems that the medicine of sex exhibited a will to non-knowledge radically at odds with the will to truth of the biology of reproduction.

4) But this will to ignorance was itself a paradoxical manifestation of the will to truth; its evasions mere local tactics. Charcot's clinic, e.g., was a vast mechanism for observation and incitement to discourse, an apparatus for producing truth (even if it was masked at the last moment). Sex was a matter of truth and falsehood, a problem of truth. Evasions and misunderstandings presuppose the effort to tell the truth re: sex.

5) Procedure for producing the truth re: sex #1: *ars erotica* = truth is drawn from pleasure as accumulated experience re: intensity, quality, duration and returned to increase pleasure of the body. Secrecy here

serves its effectiveness. Esoteric teachings enhance mastery of body against death.

6) Procedure for producing the truth re: sex #2: *scientia sexualis* = knowledge-power aimed at people telling the truth, viz. the confessional.

7) Confession, in the west; development of techniques of interrogation and administration (rather than accusatory procedures - guilt tests, trials of bravery or sainthood). The avowal of ones own actions and thoughts rather than the warrant given by others constitutes individuals by power.

8) Confessional practices have become the most valued technique for producing truth. Such practices pervade western civilization (p. 59 evidence), and if confession is not forthcoming then connect it to torture.

9) The obligation to confess is so deeply rooted in us that we no longer see it as the effect of power. Confessional practices reduce truth to an ever present secret to be extracted and power to silencing restriction. Truth becomes connected with freedom, and its saturation with power unnoticed.

10) Only if one is in thrall to confessional practices can one see commands to tell the truth as liberation. People are subjected (become subjects), by the demand to confess.

11) Truth and sex are linked in confession. The obligation to conceal sex is linked with the duty to admit one's individual secret. Transforming sex into discourse and reinforcing polymorphous sexuality are deployment in the service of confession.

12) Re: confessional ritual: the speaking subject is also the subject of the statement; confession is a power relation, since it requires an authority or appreciator to listen and intervene (pp. 61-62); truth is verified by overcoming resistance; expression alone modifies the person expressing. ( $\neq$  erotic art = education and initiation, where discourse comes from the master). Discourse comes from above not below, but domination doesn't come from the one who speaks.

13) Confession has lost its ritual and exclusive location. Now it takes place in many venues and with various forms, motivations and effects. It links the thoughts images and desires around the act.

14) Confession soon began to deposit an archive of people's pleasures under a system of classifications. A confessional science took shape, raising problems of theory and method concerning the validity of the evidence of self consciousness. These problems focused on the fact of too much discourse.

15) Q: How did confessional rituals get constituted in scientific terms?

1) Clinical exams and personal histories codified the inducement to speak.

2) A general and diffuse causality was postulated, where any event in one's sexual history could be a cause any event in medical

history an effect; the danger made telling everything necessary and justified.

3) Sexuality was deemed intrinsically hidden, not just hidden out of shame but elusive by nature. So forcing confession became scientific practice.

4) The interpretation of the listener, in addition to the revelation of the subject, was necessary for the validation of the obscure truth of sex. The confession became a sign which the scientist had to decipher.

5) Confession and its effects became a medical matter, under values of the normal and the pathological. Confession was required for diagnosis under a classification of diseases.

16) Summary (pp. 67-68). Apparatuses for producing true discourses about sex have been constructed in the last 150 yrs.

17) "Sexuality" emerged as a functional domain of scientific discourses that must produce truth (not as an ideologically distorted domain), where confessional techniques and scientific discourses intersect.

18) Modern society has produced a technology for producing true discourses about sex. We demand sex speak the truth (and we decipher the truth of this truth) and that sex tell us the truth about ourselves (sex gives that truth about ourselves which escaped us). The interplay of these two has constituted us as subjects, ignorant of ourselves. Knowledge-power of the subject is deployed in the discourse of sex, constituted by the power in this discourse.

19) Q: Has *scientia sexualis* functioned to produce pleasures as an *ars erotica*? Well, at least, a new pleasure in the truth, the discourse, of pleasure.

20) Analysis, instead, of the promises of bio-pleasure and sexual release is the unique locus of pleasures.

21) The repressive hypothesis is inadequate to explain the reinforcements, intensifications, proliferation of discourses tailored to power, the solidification of the sexual mosaic, and construction of technologies of mandatory confession and knowledge; spreading of sex over things and bodies.

22) Therefore a historical inquiry on the way knowledge of sex is produced should be undertaken. Don't assume the dynamic of repression and ignorance, but begin with positive mechanisms producing knowledge, multiplying discourses, inducing pleasures, and generating power; and investigate the conditions of their emergence and operation, and how taboo and concealment are distributed re: these conditions.

#### **Part Four: The Deployment of Sexuality**

1) The west has located knowledge pleasure in sex and demanded that its truth be extracted and yet that this truth remain forever beyond its grasp.

2) We have come to direct the question of what we are to sex, which brings our individuality and history under a logic of lust and desire.

3) It is pointless to repeat the affirmation of sex hidden in the question: why is it secret.

4) Ask instead: Why search for the truth of and the truth in sex?

5) What game of power is located in our making ourselves and others speak of sex? Why has it become so insistent, that to insure our subjugation we are brought, ironically, to believe our liberation is at stake?

### **Chapter 1) Objective**

1) Repression has been criticized by psychoanalysts, when they deny the simplicity of a binary opposition of a natural energy rebelling against a repressive order. Law constitutes both desire and lack, power is already present in desire.

2) Objection: this confuses law and repression. It accepts the basic premise of power-as-law that power is inescapable, always-already present?

3) Reply: the aim is to define the domain of power relations and provide the tools for an analytics of power (not a theory). This requires abandoning the juridical-discursive representation of power that repression and the law of desire accounts share, and which leaves only the options of liberation of that we are always-already trapped.

4) This general approach to political analyses assumes:

A) All connections between power and sex are negative. Power can only say no.

B) Power dictates a binary rule of licit/illicit. Power orders sex re: law. The rule of law is maintained by speech, viz. a juridical legislation.

C) Power only employs a law of prohibition aiming at having sex renounce itself under a threat of punishment = suppression of sex; a taboo playing on alternation between suppression and self suppression.

D) A law of censorship links and enjoins inexpressibility, non-existence, and non-manifestation, each as principle and effect of the others.

E) Power over sex always works in the same way by law, taboo and censorship from top down, in the juridical form of transgression and punishment. Its effects are defined as submission and subjugation (subject).

5) Power is defined as limited in resources, only says no, only sets limits, and exercised juridically via statements of law and operations of taboos.

6) Why, in a society that makes more positive, productive, resourceful technologies of power than any other, is power conceived of only as juridical, as law and prohibition?



7) A: Power is only tolerable, acceptable, and so can only work, in proportion that it hides its own mechanisms, insofar as it is seen as purely a limit on freedom.

8) Historically the success of monarchy and the state rose and became acceptable only because they ordered clashing forces by showing themselves as unitary regimes whose will was law that could impose sanctions.

9) The Enlightenment has trained us to think of monarchy as capricious and privileged but this ignores that these systems were constructed, expressed themselves and operated as systems of law. Though law is inadequate to describe how monarchy operated it conceived itself as working under the code of law (and so covering up the real operations of power).

10) 18th C criticized monarchy in the name of uniformity in application of laws, but juridical thinking as such, that law was the form of power, was not criticized. Even 19th C criticism of legal systems as agents of class violence did so in the name of an ideal that power naturally acted via lawfulness.

11) Juridical conceptions are increasingly incapable of representing post 18th C forms of power ensured by technique (not right), normalization (not law), control (not punishment) and not embodied in the state.

12) An analytics of power and desire must break free of the juridical model of power and desire.

13) If we are to develop a new analytics of sex, we must ask how, by what tactics, strategies, techniques, mechanisms, if not by reference to prohibition and law does power access desire? Overcoming juridical models will entail a circularly process: both sex w/o law and power w/o the king. The aim is to analyze knowledge re: sex not in terms of law but in terms of power.

## **Chapter 2) Method**

1) Power ≠ sovereignty of the state, institutions & mechanisms that ensure citizen compliance. Power ≠ form of the law, a rule contrasting with violence, Power ≠ general system of domination of one group over others pervading the social body. Power = many immanent force relations, the processes which organize, support and isolate force relations, and the strategies these force relations embed in the state, law & social hegemonies. The condition of possibility of power is in mobile unequal force relations. Power is everywhere because it is produced at every point. Power is the complex strategical situation in a society.

2) Politics is war pursued by other means.

3) Propositions re: power:

a) Power is not held but is exercised in the play of unequal and mobile relations.

b) Power relations are immanent in other social relations. They are the effects and the productive conditions of asymmetries in social relations.

c) Power comes from a multitude of points and great binary divisions of society are the effects of many force relations lining up.

d) Power relations are intentional, they are intelligible as strategies, and non-subjective, they are not the result of choices originating in a subject or group of subjects. Anonymous implicit unformulated strategies support and serve as the conditions of local explicit tactics.

e) Where there is power there is resistance, a plurality of points that enter into power as relata in the roles of target, adversary, support or handle. Resistances are multiple positive forces, not mere reactions but mobile points producing divisions, breaks, & regroupings. Often cutting across individuals, rather than being localized within them.

4) Power, then, should be analyzed in terms of relations between forces and the strategies immanent in those relations.

5) So don't ask re: sex, about states, laws or hegemonies. But ask: what were the local power relations? How did they make discourses possible? How did they support and modify power relations? How and by what strategies were these power relations linked so that they appear unitary and voluntary?

6) Four rules of method:

1) Rule of immanence: Sexuality is not an object of disinterested science. As a possible object of investigation it is constituted by power relations. Therefore, begin with local centers of power-knowledge.

2) Rule of continual variations: instead of looking at which elements of power relations occupy which positions at a time, assume that power-knowledge is a matrix of transformation and look for what changes over time.

3) Rule of double conditioning: the tactics of local power relations and the over-all strategic power relations condition each other, strategies make tactics work and the possible tactics available embody strategies.

4) Rule of the tactical polyvalence of discourses: discourses function in power-knowledge in many variable unstable ways. We must reconstruct the distribution of discourses across power relations. Discourse and silence, often with the same formulae, can serve many different tactical and strategic purposes. Therefore we don't ask what they say or what ideology discourses serve, ask what effects of power-knowledge they insure (tactical productivity) and what force relations make it necessary to use them (strategic integration).

7) Western societies have become invested in orders of power-knowledge. So study power by analyzing the aims, tactical efficacy, and mobile multitude of force relations and their strategies.

### Chapter 3) Domain

1) Sexuality is not a bit of nature resisting power. It is a very useful point through which tactical and strategic maneuvers can be transferred.]

2) Sex is not the site of a single all encompassing social strategy.

3) In the 18th C four relatively autonomous strategic unities began to produce effects and gain consistency:

1) The hysterization of women's bodies: Feminine bodies were analyzed as sexually saturated, made medically pathological, and placed in relations with the social body, family, & children. Mother as nervous woman.

2) A Pedagogization of children's sex: children were defined as on a dangerous border between sexual and nonsexual beings, who had to be continuously controlled.

3) A socialization of procreative behavior: reproductive couples were socialized economically re: fertility, politically re: social responsibility, medically re: pathology of birth control.

4) A psychiatrization of perverse pleasure: sex instincts were reified, classified, made pathological or normal, and therapy applied to the former.

4) Four figures: the hysterical woman, masturbating child, Malthusian couple and perverse adult.

5) These strategies produce sexuality, which is not a natural given, but a historical construct which links bodies, pleasures, discourses and special knowledges.

6) In every society sex gives rise to a deployment of alliance via kinship ties, but western societies superimposed a deployment of sexuality on top of the kinship system. The former compares with the latter as rules of licit and illicit :: techniques of power / aim of maintaining law :: aim of extending areas & forms of control / links of partners and laws relevant :: concern for qualities of bodies and pleasures / linked to economy via circulation of wealth :: linked to economy via productive and consuming body.

7) The deployment of sexuality built on and then covered over the deployment of alliance. The movement from the problematic of family relations to problems of the flesh. Sexuality developed on the axes of the family (husband/wife, parent/child) which serve as anchor and support for new tactics of power re: the economy of bodies and pleasures.

8) The law forbidding incest, since 18th C, is transformed to solicit and refuse incest. The claim, that the incest taboo is universal, is insisted on to try to recode non-juridical forms of power as if they were still under the sway of the law.

9) The deployment of sexuality spread to the family which reflected and diffracted sexuality which took control of the relations of alliance, by means of the figures such as the hysteric, pervert, & precocious child turned relations of alliance gone bad into relations of abnormal sexuality.

The family feels the conflicts between alliance and sexuality, and from the 19th C on searches out its own sexuality and an audience for endless examination.

10) Tensions and problems arose in this development. E.g. Charcot tried to separate sexuality completely from alliance, by trying to reduce sexuality to neurology and not let the family speak of sex.

11) Psychoanalysis arose in this context, not trying to cover sexuality over with neurology. Yet while calling family relations into question, relations of alliance were reproduced at the heart of sexuality as principle of formation and key of intelligibility. The law of alliance in now supported by the deployment of sexuality, saturating alliance with desire, reversing their original relations.

12) The domain to be analyzed is, then, the deployment of sexuality from the Christian flesh through its four strategies to the family as a factor in sexualization.

13) 1st phase corresponds with reduction of all forces to labor capacity and its reproduction. 2nd phase to multiple channeling into the circuits of the economy [(hyper)-repressive desublimation].

14) But if the problem is a matter of the production of sexuality rather than its repression, then problems of labor and economy must be abandoned.

#### **Chapter 4) Periodization**

1) According to the repressive hypothesis a rupture occurred in 17th C which imposed prohibitions, silence and procreative sex, in 20th C a loosening of the grip of these repressions occurred.

2) Instead trace the changes in techniques which don't coincide with those according to the repressive hypothesis.

3) 1st: Techniques were formed in obligatory exhaustive periodic confessional exercises of the clergy became refined techniques for analyzing sexual desire, "the flesh," and transforming it into discourse.

4) Three areas disconnected from religious institutions emerged in the 18th C re: pedagogy of "sins of youth," medicine of women's "nervous disorders," and demographic regulation of "frauds against procreation." These reordered sex from questions of the flesh to questions of the organism: life and illness.

5) Medicine of sex was separated from medicine of the body in the 19th C, a sexual "instinct" was isolated and a catalog of "perversions" replaced old moral categories of debauchery and excess. Sex could transmit and create diseases that could be passed to future generations, necessitating medical and political administration of births and fertility [eugenics].

6) The theory of "degenerescence" allowed illnesses from the catalog were both inherited and the product of perversions. Perversion-heredity-degenerescence were the core of the new technologies of sex applied in law, medicine and social practices (state directed racism).

7) Even while it continued normalizing technologies of sex, psychoanalysis tried to free these technologies of heredity and racist politics.

8) This genealogy does not accord with the repressive hypothesis. It offers a picture of continuous expansion, and privileges 16th C techniques of examination of conscience and 19th C medical technologies of sex.

9) 2nd: The repressive hypothesis predicts that repression should have been greater on young poor working men, but actually technologies were applied 1st most intensely to economically privileged classes.

10) Re: families, the first targeted were bourgeois women and children. "idle" women and onanistic children were first sexualized, as subjects of medicine and pedagogy.

11) The working classes were subjected to alliances, but only came under the mechanisms of sexualization (a) re: birth control (b) re: the "moral" campaigns to impose the "conventional family" (c) re: medical and juridical control of "perversions" to protect society and race. The forms of deployment of sexuality spread to all society but were not the same everywhere, nor were the (juridical & medical) instruments.

12) This shows there was: (i) no age of sexual restriction (ii) no unitary politics of sex (iii) no principle of limitation in the deployment of sexuality. Bodies were intensified, health problematized, sex and life maximized. The ruling classes affirmed and defended themselves, ordered life, provided a body to be protected and cultivated using a technology of sex.

13) The bourgeoisie sexualized its body as mysterious power, hereditary hope for the future, and sex as hiding the souls defining secret part.

14) The 19th C bourgeoisie marked and maintained its class distinction, not by blood and alliance like the aristocracy, but by medical, biological, eugenic and racist principles. Heredity of family defects served an interest in the expansion & cultivation of the future of the class.

15) The bourgeoisie converted noble blood into sound health and sexuality. So recognition of bodies and sex in exploited classes took time, and arose only out of economic crisis demanding the regulation of population flow. Only then were technologies of surveillance (public health, housing, general medicalization, insurance...) established for safe control (against resistance).

16) Sexuality is not denied 1st by the bourgeoisie & then by working classes. Sexuality is originally bourgeois and that then induced specific class effects.

17) In the 19th C, the theory of repression traces a new division, one within the deployment of sexuality, by appealing to the differential taboos re: social class and intensity of repression. According to the

repression theory sex still contains a secret truth that must be revealed, but its dangers stem from it being kept silent so long. (pp. 128)

18) Psychoanalysis, which connects the law and desire with a technique for alleviating the pathology of the incest taboo for the bourgeoisie, emerges at the same time as a systematic campaign that orders, controls, and reforms the incestuous practices of the working classes.

19) In the deployment of sexuality psychoanalysis (a) attaches sexuality to the kinship system, (b) opposes degenerescence theory, (c) differentiates classes in the technology of sex, (d) transforms confession into a means of removing repression, and (e) links truth to the task of challenging of taboos.

20) The general strategy of the deployment of sexuality took on new tactics (reinterpretation as repression, tying repression to domination and linking processes of sexual and social liberation). But changes in sexual behavior without the predicted political changes shows that we should not write the history of sexuality from the point of view of repression.

### **Part Five: Right of Death and Power over Life**

1) The sovereign exercised the right over life and death in the juridical form of requiring citizens to go to war & by being able to punish transgression with death: power over life & death was a power of subtraction, i.e. power to seize things, time & bodies, the right take hold of life in order to suppress it.

2) Power has been transformed so that the right to wage war is not based on the defence of the juridical rights of the sovereign, but in defence of the biological life of populations. The population is exposed to death in war or by nuclear threats, for the administration, control and optimization of life.

3) Again the death penalty used to be the reply of the sovereign to those who attack his will. Once power took the form of administering life, it became more difficult to invoke the death penalty. Re: life, death could only be administered to safeguard society from the criminal, rather than for the enormity of the crime.

4) As power to foster life or disallow it grew, death ceased its public form and became "private." Suicide became a conduct studied by sociology due to the incomprehension powers that administered life.

5) Power over life developed in two forms: *disciplines* which optimized the use of the body's capacities, and *bio-political regulation* which supervised interventions in specific bodies re: health, birth, mortality, & population.

6) Disciplinary power formed barracks, schools, workshops, while bio-practices focused on public health, housing, migration and demography. Bio-power developed both in the discourses of analysis of

wealth and “Ideology,” but mostly in concrete arrangements including the deployment of sexuality.

7) Techniques of bio-power were indispensable for the development of capitalism, to adjust bodies to machines, populations to economic processes, optimizing capacities and life, segregating and differentiating social orders.

8) Modernity is characterized by the use of power-knowledge to intervene and control biological existence. Life no longer opposed alien random death from famine and plague. Power gained access to bodies, and controlled them by administration when the life of the species was bet on political strategies.

9) The study of human beings developed out of the place of life out of history as biology and in history as subject of techniques of power-knowledge.

10) Normalizing technologies replaced juridical systems. Law depends on defining enemies and threatening death. Normalization depends on regulatory apparatuses which distribute value & utility, measuring, appraising, hierarchizing via administration, medicine, etc.

11) Resistance to this sort of power also relied on life; rather than appeals to restoration of sovereignty, appeal was made to needs and human potential. The rights to life, body, health, satisfaction of needs, liberty from alienation are all forms of resistance to the new procedures of power.

12) So sex was important because it stands at the juncture of the discipline of the body and the regulation of populations (p 145-6), so it was pursued relentlessly even in minute details, and in large political interventions. Sex became the point of application of a multitude of tactics.

13) The four lines of attack [cf. Part IV ch. 3 ¶ 3] combined disciplinary techniques and regulative methods. The 1st two required regulation in the name of collective welfare, the 2nd two demanded discipline for the good of the individual.

14) Earlier, power functioned around blood as reality that functioned symbolically. Now society functions via sexuality, power speaks of and to sexuality as an object of excitement & fear and target of use and control. An analytics of sexuality treated it as an effect with a meaning-value resulted from the new technologies of power.

15) Eugenists sought administration of the species for racial purity, retained only control over sex. Sade laid the analytics of sex and pleasure over the sovereignty of blood. Since sex had no norms, Sade’s sovereign man sees it as obeying a law of its own.

16) The symbolics of blood and analytics of sexuality overlapped in various ways. E.g. racism justified bio-interventions in the name of blood purity. Eugenics sought social order in intensifying micro-powers under the guise of unrestricted state control.

17) At another extreme, psychoanalysis tried to ground sexuality in the law of the sovereign father and the incest taboo. Leading to its political opposition to fascism. But casting sexuality in terms of law is “retro-version.”

18) Objection: Foucault historicizes sexuality to the point that sex disappears into groundless effects. Isn't this castration all over again?

19) Reply: the analysis of sexuality does not imply the denial of biological functions, but tries to show how deployments of power are directly connected to the body, a history of bodies where historical and biological factors interconnect in complex relations.

20) Objection: but isn't it sex which is the target of power, the other to which power is directed? Reply: no, the idea of sex-in-itself is unacceptable. Sex took form in strategies of power, not as an independent anchorage point.

21) Sex was developed as an intrinsic property underlying bodies and physiology. Re: hysteria, sex was principle and lack, its absence and presence was inscribed on female bodies, and those of children, it became the secret causality hidden in adults. (p 153 e.g.s)

22) Re: psychiatrics of perversion, sex gave meaning, teleology, to anatomy, and as instinct made perversions possible by attachment of objects. Sociologically sex linked reality and pleasure by opposition.

23) Sex was indispensable, theoretically, for grouping anatomy, biology, conduct, sensations, and pleasure, for reifying a secret causality and omnipresent meaning. Knowledge of sex gained prestige from its proximity to biology and biology provided principles of normalization. The idea of sex reversed the representation of power to sex, treating power as law and taboo dominating sex. So sex is the most abstract product of power.

24) “Sex” also serves, practically, as the point of access to our identity (from what used to be thought of as a nameless urge) and intelligibility (from what used to be thought of as madness). Leading to care and reverence for sex, a value stronger than soul or life. Sex is now worth dying for.

25) “Sex” is constituted as something desirable. So we must know it, reveal its law and power, and demand its rights against domination.

26) Summary: Sex is historically produced in the deployment of sexuality. In saying yes to sex we are not saying no to power. We must break with the idea of sex as agent, if we aim to counter the power-knowledge-economy of bodies and pleasures with their possible resistances. Focus, instead on bodies and pleasures.

27) In the future, perhaps, people will smile with perplexity, and wonder at our preoccupation with sex, and with confusion at our insistence that we are freeing from silence what we make the most noise about.

28) Future people will be amused at our mistaken chronology, the misperception of Freud as pioneer, at the strategies we employed to make



us love sex and demand its truth. We need to consider the possibility of a new economy of bodies and pleasures and reflect on the irony that in the deployment of sex we think our “liberation” is at stake.