RETRACING FOUCAULT'S DISPLACEMENTS:
THE BIOPOLITICS AND GOVERNMENTALITY ROLE FOUCAULT'S
DISPLACEMENTS[1]

João Leite Ferreira Neto[2]
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Brazil

ABSTRACT. The aim of this study is to describe the displacements made by Foucault in his work, getting to understand what new problems they were supposed to answer. We search for highlighting his political reflection on the use of biopolitics and governmentality notions. We analyze parts of Foucault's work which resulting from synthesis made by him on his journey, focusing the displacements occurred in the period of the power genealogy, in dialogue with contemporary authors. It is discussed the resumption of contemporary biopolitics notion and the heuristic value of the concept of governmentality. With this concept, Foucault sought a more operational analytical tool, which could enable him to the macro-social analysis supported by the perspective of powers microphysics. We argue that Foucault has privileged the theorizing process instead of the final theoretical synthesis. Therefore, we defend a reading orientation for the primacy of methodological dimensions over the theoretical and thematic ones. We point out the importance of using Foucault's theoretical tools not only in particular thematic studies but also on macro political level investigations.
Keywords: Foucault; power; methodology.

RETRAÇANDO OS DESLOCAMENTOS DE FOUCAULT:
O LUGAR DA BIOPOLÍTICA E DA GOVERNAMENTALIDADE

RESUMO. Este estudo tem o objetivo de descrever os deslocamentos realizados por Foucault em sua obra, entendendo-se a que novos problemas eles respondiam. Busca-se também realçar sua reflexão política no uso das noções de biopolítica e de governamentalidade. Optou-se por analisar trechos da obra que resultem de sínteses feitas por Foucault sobre seu percurso, focalizando os deslocamentos ocorridos no período da genealogia do poder em diálogo com comentaristas. Discute-se a retomada contemporânea da noção de biopolítica e o valor heurístico da noção de governamentalidade. Com ela, Foucault buscou um instrumento analítico mais operacional, que lhe permitisse fazer uma análise macrossocial sustentada pela perspectiva da microfísica dos poderes. Argumenta-se que, em Foucault, o processo de teorização é privilegiado em relação à síntese teórica final. Assim, defende-se uma orientação de leitura pela primazia da dimensão teórico-metodológica sobre a teórico-temática. Aponta-se a importância de se utilizar as ferramentas teóricas de Foucault tanto em estudos temáticos particulares quanto em estudos de uma escala macropolítica.
Palavras-chave: Foucault; poder; metodologia.

---

[2] *E-mail:* jleite.bhe@terra.com.br

VOLVIENDO A TRAZAR LOS DESPLAZAMIENTOS DE FOUCAULT:
EL LUGAR DE LA BIOPOLÍTICA Y DE LA GUBERNAMENTALIDAD

RESUMEN. El objetivo de este estudio es el de describir los desplazamientos realizados por Foucault en su obra y entender los nuevos problemas que responden. Se trata también de destacar su reflexión política al utilizar los conceptos de biopolítica y de gubernamentalidad. Se optó por analizar trechos de la obra que resultan de las síntesis hechas por Foucault sobre su trayectoria, con un enfoque en los desplazamientos ocurridos en el periodo de la genealogía del poder, mediante un dialogo con comentaristas. Se discute la reanudación contemporánea del concepto de biopolítica y el valor heurístico del concepto de gubernamentalidad. Con ella Foucault buscaba una herramienta más operativa y analítica que le permite un análisis macro-social apoyado por la perspectiva de la microfísica del poder. Se argumenta que en Foucault el proceso de teorización se privilegia con relación a la síntesis teórica final. Así, se defiende una orientación de la lectura de la primacía de la dimensión teórico-metodológica sobre la teórico-temática. Se destaca la importancia de utilizar las herramientas teóricas de Foucault no solamente en los estudios temáticos particulares, sino también en los estudios de una escala macropolítica.

Palabras-clave: Foucault; poder; metodología.

There is a relative consensus in the literature around a Foucault's work periodization in three moments: Archaeology of Knowledge, Genealogy of Power, and Constitution of the Ethical Subject. Foucault himself used this tripartite in some moments (Foucault, 1984, 1998). Although Foucault defended the idea that every research should be performed from the construction of specific tools, and that the theory should not be thought as a system, but as a toolbox, he often sought to rethink and to align his studies trajectory, building, *a posteriori*, a coherent theoretical and methodological design. In his final texts, this design takes the form of three analytical axes that deal with one another: knowledge, power and subjectivity (Foucault, 1984). These analysis axes operate three major displacements. However, these displacements were not the only ones carried out by Foucault. Castro (2014, p. 74) considers that, in Foucault's work, "there was always displacements" through the formulation of new hypotheses, of new subjects, of new issues, and the review of previous works. This became more evident with the posthumous publication of his lectures at the *Collège de France*, in which the method issues and the variations in the analysis strategies were always discussed.

This study makes a lot of effort into describing the most remarkable displacements in the Foucault´s thought, to understand what new problems they were supposed to answer, and retrace the cohesion of this investigative process driven by him. It is argued that his displacements do not constitute ruptures, but a movement that reorganized, provisionally, the set of his thought. It is also searched, in critical dialogue with contemporary authors, to emphasize the importance of the governmentality notion and its heuristic possibilities in the study of macropolitical issues, still little discussed by Foucault's literature in Brazil.

In Brazil, in the research in psychology, the reference to Foucault is extensive and increasing. In a survey conducted in March 2014, in the SciELO database, using the descriptor "Psychology" combined with the name of various philosophers, Foucault appeared in 89 entries, followed by Deleuze, 32 and Adorno, 26. However, this extensive use of Foucault by this area presents problems, and some of which we will stress in our analysis.

For Foucault, it was to research from a localized empirical field and, at that level, putting the crucial questions in order to elaborate generalizations and broad concepts in a second time. His formulation prescribed that "theoretical stakes are elaborated starting from a certain empirical domain", what he called "problematization" (Foucault, 1989/1984, p. 295). When some of his main methodological formulations present in his lectures and books are screened, it is highlighted that these work axes are central through his work. What is argued, when monitoring elements of his trajectory, is that, on the one hand, each research gave rise to the construction of specific methodological tools; on the other hand, his work style maintains a relatively stable fit. As he himself stated: "My way of working hasn´t changed much; but what I expect from it is that it continues to change me" (Foucault, 2000c/1981c, p. 458).

A description of his way of work, and the importance of the displacements that continually reorganized his conceptual architecture can be found in his lecture *The Government of the Living*. Firstly, he emphasizes the defense of procedural theory over systematic theory:

> for me, the theoretical work does not consist in establishing and fixing a number of positions on which I would keep myself and whose link among these different positions, in the supposed coherent link, could form a system. My problem, or the only possibility of theoretical work I feel, would be to leave only the design the most intelligible as possible, the movement trace by which I am no longer in the place where I was just now (Foucault, 2011, p . 69).

Thus, there is the development of a moving theoretical body, constantly changing. Each research put into question his previous journey, which culminated in modifying positions, because the goal was not to sustain postulates, but transform what was thought from the new questions that were revealed by the work. Hence, Foucault describes his theory of movement as a "perpetual need to emphasize, in any way, the waypoint that each displacement risks to modify, if not all, at least the way we read or in which one apprehends what may have as intelligible "(Foucault, 2011, p. 69). This sought intelligibility resulted from his commitment to the ongoing research, which put in the background his previous theoretical framework, and subjected it to changes. His focus was not the construction of a theoretical system, but a work that makes in the daily life of every search.

This paper is organized according to the more conventional approach of the three central pillars of his work. Within each of these movements from his work, we seek to highlight and to retrace his displacements in order to understand what theoretical problems they were trying to solve. We attempted to locate the work sections that had a synthesis character made by Foucault on his journey. Secondly, we chose to focus displacements occurred in the period of the generation of power, in which notions of strong political bias were prepared , such as biopolitics, governmentality and security. Finally, we sought to explore some contemporary uses of the lectures devoted to biopolitics and governmentality, subjects that, despite having not been included in books by Foucault, they have been widely used by Anglo-Saxon literature.

Archaeology of the Knowledge

By observing the whole of Foucault's publication, it is clear that his scientific communication modalities change after his entry into *Collège de France*, in which he taught his annual lectures. Foucault published eight complete books during his career, and *History of Madness*, 1961 was considered his first authorial book. During the archaeological period, 1961-1969, he wrote four books in five years. Over the next 14 years, until 1984, he published only four others. In the genealogy of power, he wrote two books (*Order of Discourse* is, actually, the transcription of a lecture) and, on the axis of subjectivity, he wrote two more books. Thus, the delay in the publication of the following volumes of *History of Sexuality* can not be attributed only to a theoretical "impasse" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 109). Even though this impasse has existed, it is known that it was not the only reason. Apparently, what led him to neglect the book as the main vehicle of scientific communication space were his commitment to write and to teach annual lectures on his ongoing researches, combined with the increase of interviews and small articles in addition to intensifying his travels as a visiting professor in different continents. This situation happened after the archaeological period and the beginning of a new task. From the second hiatus, another thing to remember was his contest with his publisher *Gallimard*, in 1976, when he decided not to publish it during the term of his agreement, lasting over five years (Defert, 1999, p. 46).

During the archaeological period, Foucault showed disinterest in the epistemological debate about the validity of propositions, driving himself to the enunciation conditions or the rules of objects and discourses formation. These formation rules are not purely internal to discourse, but have intradiscursive, interdiscursive (correlations with other knowledge) and extra-discursive (correlations among economic, political and social conjunctures) "dependencies" (Foucault, 1991/1968, p. 58). It stands out here the notion of "correlations", that is analytical strategies that will become a constant instrument in his later researches.

In addition, the prospect of rules or regulations that makes up the event or object under study is maintained, although with some modifications, during the rest of Foucault´s journey. For example, when analyzing a 1968 text, from the archaeological period, and another from 1984, from the subjectivation period, it is clear that while the axis of discussion has marked differences, his work involves so many similarities. In the first text, Foucault deals with the analysis of discourse within its perspective of the knowledge archeology (Foucault, 1991/1968); the second one deals with the critical history of thought in the relationship between subject and object (Foucault, 1998/1984).

What can we find in 1968 related to the level of analytical procedures, is that he pointed out his three discourses analysis criteria: 1) the "formation", owing to rules of formation for all its objects, for its operations, its concepts and its theoretical options; 2) the "transformation" or threshold, in order to define "at what threshold of transformation new rules of formation came into effect"; 3) the "correlations", which locate the discourse both in the context of other discourses, as the "non-discursive context in which it functions (institutions, social relations, economical and political conjuncture)" (Foucault, 1991/1968, p . 54). Already in 1984, the objects "rules of formation " are called "games of truth", but there is a new object of interest in research, which is the subject, "what are the processes of subjectivation and objectivation that make it possible for the subject qua subject to become the object of knowledge" (Foucault, 1998/1984, p. 460). There is, therefore, consistency in the methodology fits (rules of formation / games of truth), but a new set of concepts and analytical axes, that had not been explored in the 1960s has appeared, such as the power and subjectivity.

Foucault defines, in the same text, the scope of his piecework as:

> To determine, what the mode of existence of discourses and particularly of scientific discourses (their rules of formation, with their conditions, their dependencies, their transformations) must have been in Europe, since the seventeenth century, in order that the knowledge which is ours today could came to existence, and, more particularly, that knowledge which has taken as its domain this curious object which is man (Foucault, 1991/1968, p. 70).

It is noteworthy that, in Archeology, within a historical research, there was an explicit concern for our present, plus a peculiar object, defined as the "discourse" with its rules of formation and possible changes; and a historical and geographical specific marking: Europe, from XVII to XIX centuries. Therefore, when studying the file, Foucault sought peculiar conditions of emergence of events.

In the interview in 1968, Foucault responds to a question about whether his work allowed conditions or not for progressive policy. In his reply, he stated that such a policy depends on the historical knowledge of the formation rules of practices; it does not make the subject its universal operator, as he understands that the discourses of all orders are practical and does not take the scientific discourse as sovereign over the others (Foucault, 1991/1968). Therefore, the policy concern in the analysis of discourses was already presented in the archaeological period.

From the arguments discussed above, this study partly distances itself from a current interpretation that Foucault, in his early archaeological work, had an "exclusive emphasis" in the descriptive analysis of the discourses, and that only in the genealogic period, he emphasized that which conditions, limits and institutionalizes the discursive formations (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 184). This argument is relevant only in the second statement. Indeed, there is an emphasis displacement and a further exploration of non-discursive institutions, but they are not absent from the genealogical period, and this is particularly incisive in his first book about madness. However, we must ask what the reasons from this displacement of knowledge to power-knowledge are.

Power genealogy

After all, how must the archaeologist deal with the analysis of discourse in its political dimensions? In an interview in 1977, Foucault estimated that, contrary to popular belief, he had great difficulty in formulating the question of power, even this theme permeates, but not in an explicit way, his earlier work. He attributed his "inability" to the political situation of that time, as it was tensioned between a right-wing (which accused the Soviet socialism as totalitarian) and a left-wing (who denounced

capitalism as class domination). However, in this bias, the power mechanics was not analyzed. Moreover, that analysis was able only after 1968, with the emergence "of daily struggles and maintained them at the base" (Foucault, 2014/1977, p. 19). Before that, he had not isolated this central problem of power.

Therefore, while the theme of power was implicit in some of his studies, he took a long time to isolate it as a research problem, among other reasons, by the way that the debate, at the time, put the problem, as a manacheistic confrontation and, consequently, axiological. His effort, from there, was to build a power analytics that does not reduce to a widespread dualism, and to allow him to investigate complexes, plurals, and corrupted correlations processes in a concrete and local level. This was not an easy task and, at first, he himself was accused of supporting a "rigid and dualistic model of power", based on the categories of power and resistance (Castro-Gómez, 2011, p. 21). The desired overcome of the dualism does not happen in one movement, but requires a constant effort[3] . Indeed, even against the express intent of Foucault, the pair power-resistance implies an antagonistic polarity and even axiological. As a result, later, another displacement occurred in his work, with the use of more pluralistic notion of governmentality.

Another element that contributed to the construction of this new axis in his research was the use of Nietzsche, "the one who gave me as a key target, I can say, from philosophical discourse, the relationship to power [...] who could think about the power without closing himself within a political theory to do it"(Foucault, 2003/1975, p. 174). Thus, the historical events, such as the uprising in 1968 and, in his case, with the testimony of what happened in Tunisia, where he taught in May, and extracted contributions from philosophical literature, allowed him to carry out this important, but tumultuous, displacement. It was considered tumultuous due to have a diagnosis, shared by many, of a crisis in his thoughts in the years 1976-1977, associated with the preparation and the publication of the first volume of *History of Sexuality* (Kelly, 2014).

In fact, his first theoretical effort of study on power was roundly criticized, which can be measured even in some interviews given by him in 1977. Most of the criticism focused on the reading of a power omnipresence in his work, which would produce an anaesthetizing   effect among those who fought for changes (Castro-Gómez, 2011). Deleuze suggests that Foucault was closing himself into power relations, as if what he so hated fascinated him and the resistance notion statute was not enough to make him shake off from this impasse (Deleuze, 1995, p. 109).

In 1977 interview, when he was asked about why so many warlike metaphors and whether there was a tendency of power analysis from the form of warfare, Foucault says, hesitantly: "I do not know yet" (Foucault, 1979/1977, p. 241). In addition, he describes what he considered, so far, the two models of analysis that were available: the Law one, which analyses power through the laws (against which he always opposed himself); and the warrior or strategic, from Nietzschean inspiration, which is seated in power relations (which he used earlier in the genealogical period). The interviewer insists on criticism of the idea "where there is power, there is resistance," suggesting that the resistance ends up establishing a 'nature' to social reality. Foucault says he does not think on power and resistance as substances, but as events that should be analyzed in their immanence. Still, around this discussion, the new displacement is imminent. Two elements of his biography contribute to promote this movement.

The first was that Foucault kept between 1976 and 1980 a private seminar at the National Library with activists of the generation of 1968, among whom were François Ewald, Alessandro Fontana and Giovana Procracci. In this seminar, they deepened their discussion about policy (Behrent, 2010), becoming a production laboratory of a new political philosophy that would work as an alternative to Marxism. Part of these studies was explored in his lectures, in 1978 and 1979, at *Collège de France*. Later, many of these students produced works on public policies and *Welfare State*, and some of them acted as consultants by the French government.

---

[3] It is known that to overcome the dualisms, which sometimes, slip into a theoretical "neomoralism", is not a simple task. One thing is to refuse them, another one is to formulate a thought that in fact escape from them. Deleuze and Guattari made this effort at the same time, but even so, there is no shortage of interpretations that *A Thousand Plateaus* formulates a dualistic philosophy (Ferreira Neto, 2015).

The second element was his sabbatical year at *Collège de France*, in 1977. When he resumed his classes in January 1978, he introduced a new displacement in relation to the theme of power, distancing himself from Nietzsche and his war model of power relations, to define power in terms of government and governmentality (Castro, 2014). In his lecture in 1978, *Security, territory, population*, Foucault introduced three new aspects about the power analysis: the "technology of security" (p. 8), his central concept of government or governmentality (p 143.), and defining the purpose of power as a way to "conduct the conduct" (Foucault, 2007/2004, p. 258).

His definition of governmentality encompassed three aspects, but the first carries out the greatest synthesis: a set of institutions, procedures, reflections, tactics, exercise of a complex power, which targeted populations; a knowledge that was the political economy and the technology of security devices. From this, it is possible to extract the intrinsic relationship among governmentality, biopolitics (its target is the population) and security (the main power technology).

During 1980, Foucault justified the need to displace the notion of power-knowledge to the notion of government: "the notion of government seemed to me to be much more operative than the notion of power; government [...] in the broad and the old sense of [...] leading the conduct of men "(Foucault, 2011, p. 53). Interestingly, this definition has approaches to the formulation made in 1961 by Robert Dahl , an American political scientist: "A has power over B if A can make B to do something that, otherwise, would not do" (quoted by Mackenzie 2011 , p. 75). There is no evidence that Foucault has previously made these readings, but the "functionality" of the notion of government as conduct of conduct, approaches to the effort of rising political science in the United States in building an assessment of the most discriminated and specific policy. It is this analytical operation that Lazzarato (2009, p 130.) appreciates: "what interests me truly in Foucault's work is the description of the techniques. That is fundamental. The techniques are specific. "

Again, it is important to remember that it is not a succession of substitutions, that is, sovereignty being replaced by the disciplinary and this for safety. What Foucault intends to build is a "history of technologies [...] of the correlations and dominant systems" in a given society (Foucault, 2008/2004, p. 8). There is, therefore, in this story of power technologies, "the system of correlation between juridico-legal mechanisms, disciplinary mechanisms, and mechanisms of security" (2008/2004, p. 8). Actually, successive displacements widened the architecture of possible theoretical arrangements of investigations conducted by Foucault. It is not a systematic, structured arrangement, but a mobile system, anchored on correlations, in constant rearrangement.

Foucault describes the *Security, territory, population* lecture as a method of experience, to demonstrate how, "from a relatively local analysis, relatively microscopic [...] of the pastorate [...], it was possible to reach the general problems that belong to the state" (Foucault 2008/2004, p. 481). After all, the state results from the men's practices involving a way of doing and thinking. Between micro and macropower, there is no a break, as both are intertwined. In addition, an analysis from the perspective of "micro-powers comes back without any difficulty to the analysis of problems like those of government and the state" (p. 455). It will be resumed otherwise in his next lecture, *Birth of Biopolitics*.

The displacement promoted by the notion of government will still be the engine of the ultimate displacement in the direction of ethical subject in which subjectivity is no longer thought as subjection, but as a practice of freedom. It is precisely the notion of government that allows Foucault to prepare this displacement towards the axis of subjectivity and ethics.Assim, os participantes foram caracterizados como uma equipe com profissionais jovens, mas que possui tempo médio considerável de anos de formação (acima de 9 anos em média) e bom período de experiência na instituição (acima de 5 anos).

Genealogy of the ethical subject

During his lecture in 1980, *The Government of the Living,* the exploitation[4] of subjectivity theme occurred, as a displacement of the government notion by the truth, through his study of the truth production procedures, which he called aleturgia. There is, in the history of the judiciary, the emergence

---

[4] Previously, in *Security, territory, population* (2007), there are mentions of subjectivity in p. 239, and in two footnotes, but without a more detailed development.

of the witness as the one who tells the truth. Thus, "we can see to appear the incrustation of the first person in aleturgia" (Foucault, 2011, p. 63). The aleturgia does not complete itself without the individuals can say "I". He concludes, "Without this point of subjectivity in the general procedure and in the global circle of aleturgia, the manifestation of the truth would remain unfinished" (p. 66).

However, his interest is not only in the aleturgic practice, which submits the subject to the statement of truth, but in the "[...] movement to separate from the power that should serve as revealing the transformation of the subject and the relationships he has with the truth "(p. 70). Here is the synthesis of the project that will take Foucault until the end of his life. In addition, that will lead him to perform concurrently a displacement of historical periods that he was studying. It is not in Christianity that this ethic, which is separated from the power, will be found, but in the Greeks. So, he will redirect, in this path, his lectures and the continuity of his *History of Sexuality*.

Kelly (2014) finds another element of continuity between politics and subjectivity, by suggesting that "Foucault's engagement with the Iranian policy was seminal for his final work" (p. 158). Kelly believes that Foucault´s fascination   by the Iranian Revolution, among other things, was due to the connection established between politics and spirituality, something absent in the West, as he himself termed "the spirit in a world without spirit." This notion of spirituality will resume in the lecture of 1981-2, *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*, defined as a technique of self, which is the central aspect of his subjectivity ethics.

Gradually from 1980, Foucault builds his displacement from politics to ethics, stating: "[...] what interests me is much more moral than political or, in any case, politics as an ethical "(Foucault, 2004/1983, p. 220). Again, this is not a displacement of fields of knowledge, but of a difference in accent, "politics as an ethical".

Perhaps the definitive arrangement of power relations has taken place in a 1984 interview entitled "The self-care ethics as a practice of freedom." In it, Foucault takes up the idea, present in many texts that the center of his research has always been the relationship between the subject and the truth, even if he has not always formulated it in this way. He considers that he examined this issue from the "coercive practices" in psychiatry and in the prison system and in the scientific field, as in *The order of things* (Foucault, 1997/1984, p. 282). Only later, he focused on the theme in practices or other techniques, with strong autonomy in relation to the   domination systems in the Greco-Roman world, which decreased "after they were taken over to a certain extent by religious, pedagogical, medic or psychiatric Institutions "(p. 282). It is this central idea of "practices" that Foucault retains as a fundamental element of his analytical, since the archaeological period. Therefore, he suspects about the general theme of liberation as a state to be achieved and emphasizes the contrast of the practices of freedom, defining ethics as "the conscious practice of freedom"; while pointing out that this is a fully political issue.

In that interview, Foucault also resumes the discussion on power, causing a breakdown of his three dimensions, taking up several of his discussions along his journey: the power relations, always mobile and reversible, which are understood as strategic games among liberties; the domination of states in which power relations are set asymmetrically, with its limited margin of freedom; and the technical government, which operates concurrently between the previous dimensions, both in the institutional dynamics of domination and in the more horizontal relations. His synthesis points to the relationship between ethics and political struggle in the face of domination states and of "abusive techniques of government" (Foucault, 1997/1984, p. 299).

Finally, Foucault displacements do not stop in mutually to rebut each other, deepening his conceptual toolbox. At the same time, they indicate that the policy thematic maintains its importance. Even the lectures on governmentality have not originated books about this subject; these studies have been intensively resumed after his death.

Biopolitics[5] and governmentality: the resume by the current literature

---

[5] We chose not to distinguish the notion of biopolitics from the biopower. If, in the lecture *In Defense of Society,* Foucault asserts that biopolitics is the pole of biopower that targets the population, in the next lecture he takes the notions as homologous: "we could call biopolitics, bio-power" (Foucault, 2007, p. 22). After the lecture, he goes on to

In this section, we deepen the debate on the place of biopolitics and governmentality notions in Foucault, in dialogue with contemporary literature, seeking to identify some problems in the current resume of the notion of biopolitics, highlighting the specificity and detailment of Foucault´s analysis on the policy.

Interviewed by Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983), about the importance of writing a "genealogy of biopower," Foucault replied that he had no time at the moment but he said: "I have to do it" (p 256). Perhaps this was a hasty answer, as Foucault himself withdrew it from the French version of this interview, and he also did other changes. This study is consistent with the position of Dean (2013, p. 40-41) and Kelly (2014, p. 137), among others, that the concept of governmentality succeeded the biopolitics in his narrative about modern conceptions of power, no longer used after 1979, as discussed below. In contrast, the notions of government and governmentality remained present until his last lectures. Therefore, he continued the genealogy of biopower from a new analytical grade.

Early in the lecture *The birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault states that his purpose was to provide "a lecture of biopolitics" (2008/2004, p. 21). However, after this announcement, this expression reappears only twice in class. In the first, assuming as a crawfish that goes on one side, he says ironically, "if I am lucky, we will come to the problem of biopolitics" (p. 78). In the second part of the lecture, he finally admits the intention of talking about biopolitics, but left it aside because of two methodological reasons.

The first reason was due to the notion of governmentality introduced in the previous lecture, which allowed him to build a better "analytical grid these are relations of power" (Foucault, 2008/2004, p. 186). The second reason, returning the end of *Security, territory, population*, was to test whether this grid of governmentality, previously used for analysis of power relations with the crazy, the teenagers and children, could work, on a larger scale, in the analysis of an economic policy or social management. Therefore, governmentality, with its analytical of micropowers, "is not a question of scale, and it is not a question of a sector, it is a question of a point of view", that is, it is not a question of method (p.186). As a result, the German and American neoliberalism has privileged the field of the lecture analysis. Thus, with the notion of governmentality, Foucault has undertaken two methodological advances: to build a more precise and operational analytical tool, and from it to get an expansion of its analytical scope to allow him to study macropolitical topics, such as, State, economic policy , political systems, social security, among others, by the prospect of the microphysics of power.

However, in spite of the following lectures revealed a new displacement towards the government itself and also towards the ethics and subjectivity, he did not definitively abandon his interest in the analysis of the macro-political social scale. According to Castro-Gómez (2011), before his death, Foucault planned to hold a seminar in Berkeley, which would have as its theme "the Welfare State and its particular governmentality," based on the theories of Keynes (p, 174, n.). Possibly part of that content appears in his controversial interview on the social security (Foucault, 2000b/1983). Thereby, he would meet at the same university of Berkeley, what he was announced in the interview given to Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983). However, his analytical grid would replace biopower by governmentality.

Interestingly, a proliferation, perhaps inflated, of Foucault's notion of biopolitics has seen. Lemke (2011) even considers it as a bussword, and Virno (2003) fears that it has become a "fetish word" and it can perform the function of hiding problems, rather than analyzing them. Negri and Hardt, and Agamben are the most important theoretical, responsible for this resumption of biopolitics.

Scholars accustomed to Foucault's work differ in the assessment of this trend. Some of them, such as Dean (2013), see a possible complementarity among them and Foucault´s researches. Others, such as Lemke (2011), understand there is a significant difference between Foucault's way of operating these concepts and the resumption by the authors. This second position, less present in Brazilian discussion, is explored in this review.

Lemke (2011) wrote a book on the history of use of biopolitics notions; on the one hand, he recognizes that the intensity of this debate indicates that this term captures something essential in our

refer only to biopolitics (2008/2004). Another possible interpretation is that the classification of legal, disciplinary and security (biopolitics) technologies replaced the biopower. In both versions, this distinction is unnecessary nowadays. The notion of biopolitics was the majority choice made in the resume by contemporary authors.

time. On the other, he devoted a chapter to Agamben and Negri and another one to Hardt, with incisive criticism. In each chapter, he presents a synthesis of the thought of the authors and, as a result, points out the problems that they make when using the biopolitics notion. For purposes of this article, this criticism will be directly addressed.

Lemke identifies three problems in Agamben formulations. Firstly, called the legal, he emphasizes his opposition between norm and exception, approaching Agamben to Carl Schmitt and moving him away from Foucault. While Schmitt is interested in the suspension of the norms, Foucault is concerned with the production of normality. The binary juxtaposition between *bios* and *zoé*, in the antagonism "either ... or" would also prevent Agamben to assess the gradations of bare life.

The second problem is his focus on the State. In Agamben, there would be a focus on state mechanisms and centralization in the forms of regulation. In addition, his foundation in Nazi racial politics would distort his view of present. Lemke understands that biopolitics is not only the search of government regulation, but also a field of "autonomous" subjects, demanding biotechnological options. According to Lemke, the present danger is not the body or its organs succumb to State control, but mainly, the State, in the name of deregulation, withdraws from the occupied areas, leaving the society at the mercy of commercial interests.

Finally, there was the problem of creating, by Agamben, of almost a biopolitics ontology, which would make his life notion as static and ahistorical. In his attempt of correcting Foucault, Agamben abandons the initial conviction that biopolitics is both a historical phenomenon and it is not separable from the existence of modern States and capitalism. Incidentally, this is the most present critical in the literature. Virno (2003) also opposes Agamben, by his idea of turning biopolitics in ahistorical ontological category.

The work of Negri and Hardt is most widely criticized in the literature, and has not reached the same recognition of Agamben´s. However, Lemke (2011) points out that his use of biopolitics notion is relatively little explored. Castro-Gómez (2011) condemns the totalizing diagnosis that "there is no one outside the Empire" (p. 221), and contrasts with Foucault's consideration that there is not a global rationalization for the whole of human societies, but each research must keep site and precise, since, for Foucault, there is no a single logic that determines the universe of human experience in an infrastructural mode. Finally, he states:

> It is not *to derive* the control society, the post-modernity or the neo-liberalism, from the capitalism, as they were emanations of an abstract universal, but to show that this, the capitalism, is nothing but the correlate of a number of historical practices that should be studied without its uniqueness (Castro-Gómez, 2011, p. 222).

Lemke (2011) also highlights another aspect in his criticism. The diagnosis of Hardt and Negri holds a Manichean analytical binary: only the crowd would be productive and positive, and the Empire, would be the controller and the restrictive. It is understood that it would be more appropriate to analyze a production relationship (biopolitics) that contained, in immanent mode, both poles within itself. He considers problematic the ontological interpretation of biopolitics, and his conception of the crowd as an egalitarian and progressive power. Although this aspect contributes to social mobilization; on the contrary, this way of thinking could leave the impression that political struggles are nothing more than incarnations of abstract ontological principles that almost automatically proceed without engagement, intentions or emotions of the concrete actors.

These criticisms should be assessed in two senses. Firstly, Foucault has always been resistant to totalizing theories, which were applied to all circumstances, as do Negri and Hardt. For this reason, he constantly remade the diachronic dialogue among his researches, while, he occasionally abandoned certain started routes without great fanfare. This may have been what happened in his quiet abandonment of the biopolitics notion, in function of the governmentality, as to his readers barely perceived his movement. In addition, an ontology was developed, which was entitled the "historical ontology", quite different from a biopolitics that crosses the Western history since the ancient Roman law, as proposed by Agamben. He understood that "it may be wise not to take as a whole the

racionalization of society or of culture, but to analyze this process in several fields" (Foucault, 1981 / 2000a, p. 299).

Clearly, if the simple reproduction of the concepts to which Foucault reached is not to accompany him on his investigative journey, we can not charge this type of alignment from Negri, Hardt and Agamben, after all, they use all means by Foucault to build their own investigative route. Foucault did the same when based his studies in Nietzsche and he always made use of other authors considering them as building instruments of his own arguments. So even recognizing the difference of Foucault's work mode with the notions of biopower and biopolitics, there is no reason to reprove Negri, Hardt and Agamben by using the biopolitics notion as a totalizing and transcendental concept within the specific work project of each one, much less to consider improper the resuming to the biopolitics notion that Foucault had left aside. The Foucaultians do with constancy, and Lemke himself (2011) understands that our present lacks the resumption of this notion. A careful re-reading of any concept has its merits, and it does not fit fundamentalism in philosopher reading like Foucault, or on his behalf.

What seems problematic is the tendency of some studies to build a patchwork quilt without the necessary seams, among Foucault, Negri, Hardt, Agamben, as everyone said or worked in the same way the notion of biopolitics, which is quite frequent in Brazil. Unlike this, a careful and thorough attempt from Mitchell Dean (2013) to build an analytical tool is inserted, which combines Foucault's historical immanence with Agamben's trans-historical transcendence, pointing out their differences, even though the result is not convincing enough.

It was in the Anglo-Saxon world that the notion of governmentality flourished more robustly, particularly among social science authors, creating a field of study, *Governmentality Studies*, during the 1990s, driven by the publication of a lesson on *Security, territory, population*, in which this notion is defined. Its genesis is associated with certain growing dissatisfaction in the 1980s, with the forms of analysis of classical Marxism. Gordon (2013) conducts a review of this issue, pointing out that Foucault tools brought a greater visibility to studies on power in everyday and institutional life than Marxism. They are studies without strict uniformity generating different currents; however, all of them are anchored on a reading of the notion of governmentality.

Final considerations

We sought in this work to emphasize the importance of s apprehending the movement of Foucault's thought in his displacements, avoiding a superficial reading of the stages of his career (knowledge, power and subjectivity), from an understanding of the theorists challenges that demanded such changes. One has to agree with Koopman (2013), when he says that Foucault can be best read on the basis of his analytical than in his theoretical and doctrinal legacy. If, for Foucault, the theorizing process was more important than the final theoretical synthesis, one must then guide one´s reading with the emphasis being placed on his methodological dimension in relation to the theoretical and thematic one. Therefore, it sought to emphasize that it is not just reproducing the Foucault's theories, but mainly, following his theorizing mode, his problematization analytics, which weaves the theoretical articulations from a specific empirical field in each search.

To move from the concept of the biopolitics to governmentality, Foucault sought a more operational and analytical tool that would allow a macrosocial analysis supported by the prospect of powers microphysics. It follows that the notion of biopolitics does not allow him to have the same management, perhaps by allowing a catch of macro-political look at the analysis that he intended to make in the micropolitical perspective. The current trend of giving an ontological and totalizing status to this notion indicates that he made the right choice.

The attachment to the theoretical doctrine can lead to a work moved by classifying slogans, without an analytical effort. There is no doubt about the current popularity of the biopolitics notion and, as I said earlier, its use should not be condemned. The analytical effort that accompanies it will decide its value, and, in Foucault's view, the care so that its management does not become an ontological-totalizing deductive instrument, "applied" as a Procrustean bed, to any reality.

The notions of government technologies, as well as the macro and micropolitics by Deleuze and Guattari, have a heuristic fertility still to be explored, particularly at a time when the macro-social analysis reveals certain exhaustion (Ferreira Neto, 2015). Therefore, the challenge about the use of Foucault´s theoretical tools in psychology remains, not only on particular thematic studies, as well as in studies of a macro-political level, as in public policy. This was initiated by Foucault group from the Seminars of the National Library in France, but still deserves to be intensified in Brazil, as has been done for the area of Public Health. There is still a lot of research work to be done in the field of public policies in Brazil concerning governmentality studies.

References

Behrent, M. (2010). Accidents happen: François Ewald, the "antirevolutionary" Foucault, and the intellectual politics of the French Welfare State. *The Journal of Modern History*. 82 (3), 585-624.

Castro, E. (2014). *Introdução a Foucault*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

Castro-Gómez, S. (2011). *Historia de la Gubernamentalidad*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.

Dean, M. (2013). *The Signature of Power: Sovereignty, Governmentality and Biopolitics*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Defert, D. (1999). Cronologia. In Foucault, *Problematização do Sujeito: psicologia, psiquiatria e psicanálise* (pp. 1-64). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.

Deleuze, G. (1995) *Negociations*. Columbia: Columbia University Press (Original publicado em 1990).

Dreyfus, H. & Rabinow, P. (1983) *Michel Foucault: beyond struturalism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ferreira Neto, J. L. (2015) *Micropolítica em Mil Platôs: uma leitura*. Psicologia USP, 26 (3), p. 397-406.

Foucault, M. (1979). Não ao sexo rei. In Machado, R. (Org.), *Microfísica do Poder*. (A. Souza, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Graal (Original publicado em 1977).

Foucault, M. (1985) The use of pleasure: Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality. New York: Vintage Books. (Original publicado em 1984)

Foucault, M. (1989) The Concern for Truth. In: *Foucault Live*. (pp. 293-308) (New York: Columbia University, 1989), (Original publicado em 1984)

Foucault, M. (1991) Politics and the Study of Discourse. *The Foucault Effect: studies in governmentality*. Burchell, Gordon and Miller (ed.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, p. 53-72. (Original publicado em 1968).

Foucault, M. (1997) The ethics of the concern of the self as a practice of freedom. *Ethics, subjectivity and truth*. (pp. 281-301) New York: The New Press (Original publicado em 1984).

Foucault, M. (1998) Foucault. In: Fabion (ed.) *Aesthetics, method, and Epistemology*. (pp. 459-463) New York: The New Press (Original publicado em 1984)

Foucault, M. (2000a) Omnes et Singulatim: toward a critique of political reason. *Power*. (pp. 298-325) New York: The New Press (Original publicado em 1981).

Foucault, M. (2000b) The risks of security. *Power*. (pp. 365-381) New York: The New Press (Original publicado em 1983).

Foucault, M. (2000c) So is it important to think? *Power*. (pp. 454-458) New York: The New Press (Original publicado em 1981).

Foucault, M. (2003a). Entrevista sobre a Prisão: O Livro e seu Método (com J.-J. Brocheir). In Ditos e Escritos IV: *Estratégia, Poder-Saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Forense Universitária. (Original publicado em 1975).

Foucault, M. (2004b). "Política e Ética; uma entrevista". In M. B. Motta (Org.), *Ética, sexualidade, política.* Ditos e escritos V. (V. Ribeiro, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária (Original publicado em 1983).

Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, territory, population*. London: Palgrave Macmillan (Original publicado em 2004).

Foucault, M. (2008) *The birth of biopolitics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan (Original publicado em 2004).

Foucault, M. (2011). *Do governo dos vivos: curso no Collège de France,* 1979-1980 (excertos). (N. Avelino, Trad.). São Paulo; Rio de Janeiro: Centro Cultural; Achiamé.

Foucault, M. (2014). Uma entrevista de Michel Foucault por Stephen Riggins. In *Ditos e Escritos IX: Genealogia da ética, subjetividade e sexualidade* (A. Chiquieri, Trad.) (pp. 13-34). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária. (Original publicado em 1977).

Gordon, C. (2013). Governamentalidade e a genealogia da política. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 39(4), 1049-1065.

Kelly, M. (2014). *Foucault and politics*: a critical introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Koopman, C. (2013). *Genealogy as Critique*: Foucault and the problems of modernity. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Lazzarato, M. (2009). Saisir le politique dans l'évènementiel, Entrevue avec Maurizio Lazzarato. *Inflexions*, n. 3, 118-140.

Lemke, T. (2011). Biopolitics: an advanced introduction. Nova York: New York Press.

Machenzie, I. (2011). *Política: conceitos chaves em filosofia*. (N. Beck, Trad.). Porto Alegre: Artmed. (Original publicado em 2009).

Virno, P. (2003) General intellect, éxodo, multitud. *Archipiélago* n.54. Recuperado em 30, de janeiro, de 2015, de http://www.nodo50.org/ts/editorial/dossierlecturasvirno.rtf%202.pdf.

João Leite Ferreira Neto: Professor of the Post-Graduate Program in Psychology at PUC Minas. Productivity grant of the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq).