

---

## FAMILY AND BIOPOLITICS: THE DESTRUCTION OF INTIMACY IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Paulo Roberto de Carvalho<sup>1</sup>  
Sonia Regina Vargas Mansano  
State University of Londrina, Brazil.

**ABSTRACT.** This article seeks to discuss the contemporary family institution from a historical approach which dates back to the period of consolidation of the bourgeois family model. We decided to analyze the family institution in perspective of power relations as proposed by Michel Foucault. Specifically, the author of biopolitics, a power which is directed to the specificities of the living body, was used. To this end, was selected the issue of sexuality as historically this element in the transformations of the family model: a closed family about you and where sexuality was repressed and veiled, it moved to the current family in which these same topics gain visibility and discussion in an expanded space. Then wonder if the effects of the family by opening a biopolitical intervention. Finally, it was possible to demonstrate that there is a systematic destruction of the biopolitical interventions initiated intimacy and led by those who resist, somehow, to power determinations.

**Keywords:** Family; biopolitics; sexuality.

## FAMÍLIA E BIOPOLÍTICA: A DESTRUIÇÃO DA INTIMIDADE NAS SOCIEDADES CONTEMPORÂNEAS

**RESUMO.** O presente artigo busca problematizar a instituição familiar contemporânea partindo de uma abordagem histórica que remonta ao período de consolidação do modelo familiar burguês. Optou-se por analisar a instituição familiar na perspectiva das relações de poder tal como proposto por Michel Foucault. Especificamente, foi utilizada a concepção do autor de biopolítica, uma vertente do poder que se dirige às especificidades do corpo vivo. Para tanto, foi selecionada a questão da sexualidade como elemento historicamente presente nas transformações do modelo familiar: de uma família fechada sobre si e na qual a sexualidade era velada e reprimida, passou-se à família atual na qual estes mesmos temas ganham visibilidade e discussão em um espaço ampliado. Em seguida, questionam-se os efeitos da abertura familiar por uma intervenção biopolítica. Por fim, foi possível demonstrar que está em curso uma destruição sistemática da intimidade iniciada pelas intervenções biopolíticas e protagonizada por aqueles que resistem, de algum modo, às determinações do poder.

**Palavras-chave:** Família; biopolítica; sexualidade.

## FAMILIA Y LA BIOPOLÍTICA: LA DESTRUCCIÓN DE LA INTIMIDAD EN LA SOCIEDAD CONTEMPORÁNEA

**RESUMEN.** En este artículo se pretende discutir la institución familiar contemporánea desde un enfoque histórico que se remonta al período de consolidación del modelo familiar burgués. Decidimos analizar la institución familiar en la perspectiva de las relaciones de poder propuesta por Michel Foucault. Específicamente, la concepción del autor de la biopolítica, un poder que se dirige a las particularidades del cuerpo viviente, fue utilizada. Para ello, se seleccionó el tema de la sexualidad como elemento históricamente presente en las transformaciones del modelo familiar: una cerrada familiar acerca de si misma y donde la sexualidad fue reprimida y velada, se trasladó a la familia en la que estos mismos temas ganan visibilidad y discusión en un espacio ampliado. Entonces, preguntamos por los efectos de la familia con la apertura de una intervención de la biopolítica. Finalmente, fue

---

<sup>1</sup> E-mail: paulor@uel.br

posible demostrar que está en curso una destrucción sistemática de la intimidad por intervenciones biopolíticas que es protagonizada por aquellos que resisten, de alguna manera, a las determinaciones del poder.

**Palabras-clave:** Familia; biopolítica; sexualidad.

---

## Introduction

The origin of the current family institution, the contemporary bourgeois family, dates back to the period of transition from feudal societies to capitalism, which covers the period between the 16th and 18th centuries. Since the mode of production was being replaced, the institutions that supported it also underwent profound changes. The emergence of the bourgeois family, an institution committed to the maintenance of the capitalist social order, dates from this time. The changes that the family underwent express the differences between feudal daily life and the then emerging ways of life. Among a wide range of issues to be addressed in the present study, we select the relationship that is established between the public space and the family life, the inside and the outside of the bourgeois home. As we will see, this relationship, as well as its modifications, will be strategic for understanding what happened to the family throughout the 20th century. In the work of Ariès, we find a description of the relation between the family and the public space at the end of the feudal regime:

The big house held a public function. In these societies without cafes, without public houses, it was the only place where friends, clients, relatives and protégés could meet and talk. As to the workers, clerics, and servants who lived there permanently, we must add the incessant wave of visitors (Ariès, 1981, pp. 258-259).

It is evident in this passage that the public space and the house were coextensive and shared functions. An important change, however, was underway. It can be characterized as an increasing investment in the context of private life, which starts to redefine the everyday life from that period (Miotto, 2015). Similarly, public space, society or even the “outside world” become something that people need to defend themselves, being therefore valued negatively. This is evidenced by the following fragment:

In the 18th century, the family began to keep society at a distance, to confine it to a limited space, distant from an ever-expanding zone of private life. The organization of the house came to correspond to this new concern of defense against the world. This was already the modern house, which ensured the independence of the rooms by opening them to an access corridor (Ariès, 1981, p. 265).

This process gains a contour in which moral sharing, which gives rise to the bourgeois family, becomes evident: private life becomes a “good” to be maintained and used in defense against the “evil” represented by public spaces of unrestricted access in the social environment. It is therefore necessary to ask some questions: What are the “evils of the world” before which the family retracts and essays its closure? We find in the work “The Fall of Public Man” by sociologist Richard Sennett (1999), a presentation of the extrafamily everyday life of that period, marked, as in all feudalism, by intense sociability. In addition, in that context, an element historically valued in a controversial way stands out: sexuality. Here is one of those, or perhaps the main one of the “evils of the world”, according to the bourgeois morality that was beginning to spread in that period. Sennett says:

Sexual *status* becomes personalized in public when strangers tried to determine whether a woman, for all her apparent decorum, provided small clues in her appearance that marked her as a “licentious” woman. Both the “gentleman” and the “licentious” woman who hides behind the respectable lady, are visually significant only as public phenomena (Sennett, 1999, p. 207).

The public space of meetings and relationships of all types, including those in which sexuality was manifested, is then identified with immorality, and sexuality is presented as evidence and justification

for this opinion. Henceforth, for the bourgeois morality that was being constituted, relationships of any nature, outside the family sphere, would be regarded as immoral. As Sennett notes,

The public as an immoral domain meant somewhat different things to men and women. For women, it was where they ran the risk of losing their virtue, of being tarnished, of being involved in “a dizzying and disorderly turmoil” (Thackeray). The public and the idea of disgrace were closely related (Sennett, 1999, p. 39).

This is the origin of the bourgeois family, the rise of a moral code whose values were profoundly effected, transforming daily practices, customs and social relationships in order to result in a significant valuation of intimacy and domestic environment. In a historical perspective, Giddens (1993) addressed intimacy by emphasizing the emotional transformations in the 20th century and highlighting the distancing from public space that prevailed throughout the first decades of that century.

Ariès also pointed out that the emergence of the new family model consolidates its withdrawal from public space. Thus,

The modern family took away from ordinary life not only children, but also much of the time and concern of adults. It corresponded to a need for intimacy, and also for identity: family members are united by feeling, custom and manner of life. The promiscuities imposed by the old sociability disgust them. It is understood that this moral influence of the family was originally a bourgeois phenomenon (Ariès, 1981, p. 278).

The withdrawal from public space is expressed in the bourgeois family as a type of autonomy, gained before the social and in which the approach to certain themes becomes the exclusive prerogative of that family nucleus. First, sexuality, but also issues such as illness and death, are now veiled, making it possible to glimpse the aim of all bourgeois morality: our bodily condition. It is it, the body, which has since become the object of a persistent moral vigilance, as showed by Foucault (1988). On our bodily condition, the family claimed autonomy before the social, which was translated into an exclusive right to speak and silence regarding the subjects related to the body. But would the bourgeois family be in a position to sustain this claim before the entire society - in the face of the institutions of political power? Could the bourgeois family closure exercise the desired independence in relation to the state and society? The present article will seek to problematize precisely this relationship between family and biopower, understood here as “body management” (Foucault 1988, p. 131), which is largely carried out by specialists and technicians of relationship, including practices of Psychology. In the course of the article it will be possible to note the gradual coordination between family, capitalism and biopower, since the latter “was an indispensable element for the development of capitalism, which could only be guaranteed at the expense of the controlled insertion of bodies into the apparatus of production” (Foucault, 1988, p.132).

### **The opening of the family: a biopolitical operation**

According to Foucault (1996), the network established between institutions responds for determinations that inscribe us, inexorably, in the context of social life. The author considers that the internal, as well as the external space to the family, permanently undergo/are permanently crossed by power relations that are spread by the whole of society. Thus, it would be impossible, in fact, to erect a space to withdraw from the social context. This is possible only in the context of the illusory claims and when the existence of power relations is ignored. This is what Foucault considers in this passage:

To live in society is, in any case, to live in a way that it is possible to act upon one another's actions. A society without “power relations” can only be an abstraction. What, by the way, makes analysis politically all the more necessary than they are in a given society (Foucault, 2014, 135).

The supposed isolation of the family institution in this period corresponds to the illusory expectation of ceasing the effects of power coming from outside the bourgeois dwellings. At another time, Foucault makes even more evident the coextensive character of power relations that actually pervade/cross institutions, including the family. This permanent crossings of the family space stems from the

realization that in relation to power there is no possibility of excluding ourselves, of putting ourselves outside it. Machado, commenting on Foucault's work, points out:

The interesting thing about analysis is precisely that powers are not located at any particular point in the social structure. They function as a network of devices or mechanisms to which nothing or no one escapes, to which there is no possible exterior, boundaries or frontiers (Machado, in Foucault, 1996, p. 14).

How would it be different with the bourgeois nuclear family? Effectively, Foucault observes, power relations have come before, are "insufficient" and, to analyze an institution, it is necessary to start from power relations. Let us see:

It is not a question of denying the importance of institutions in the management of power relations. But to suggest that institutions must first be analyzed from the relations of power, and not the other way around: and that their fundamental fixation point, even if they gain a body and crystallize in an institution, must be sought shortly (Foucault, 2014, p. 135).

Foucault's theoretical production about power has always been guided by the care to avoid that this concept was used in a generic and totalizing way. At different times (1988, 1996, 1999, 2014), the author highlighted the multiple, heterogeneous and complex character of the powers. This approach allowed us to analyze separately the different types of power exercised in society, pointing that, even when differentiated, powers are aimed at a common domain: the human body to be trained, making it useful to extract economic value. It is to the body that different regimes of power are directed, in their multiple strategies of production of the human adapted to the capitalist social order. Foucault also emphasizes the relationships that are established between knowledge and power, so that the target, the body of the living, becomes gradually the object of a scientific investigation that results in the accumulation of knowledge of it. From this emerges a power device in close connection with the knowledge on living bodies, called by him as biopolitics (1988), which involves a complex network constituted from the 19th century. This accumulates knowledge about the living bodies, starting to take place on them and considering them in their dual biological and collective condition, that is, population.

The concept of population inexorably demands the analysis of the bodies that the bourgeois family intended to keep veiled and imprisoned in the family domain. In this way, biopolitics confronts the claim of isolation of this institution. Or yet,

What is it about this new technology of power, this biopolitics, that biopower that is settling in? I was telling you in two words just now: it is a set of processes such as the proportion of births and deaths, the rate of reproduction, the fecundity of a population, etc. These processes of birth, death, and longevity that, in the second half of the 18th century, together with a number of economic and political problems (which do not return now), constituted, I think, the first objects of knowledge and the first control targets of this biopolitics (Foucault, 1999, pp. 289-290).

Therefore, when analyzing and intervening in fields such as mortality and longevity, biopolitics makes visible one of its most effective aspects: the domain of the so-called public health that, with the continued acquisition of technology, will experience considerable expansion throughout the 20th century (Nalli, 2013). On the other hand, when directing its intervention to the issues of birth and fertility, biopolitics signals that sexuality is also its domain and occupies a prominent position. This is due to the fact that: "Sexuality is at the very crossroads of the body and population. Therefore, it depends on discipline, but also depends on regulation" (Foucault, 1999, p. 300).

With the consolidation of the device of biopolitical power, the minimum conditions for the bourgeois family to lay claim to the maintenance of the issues of the body and of sexuality in the private space of the houses disappear. Living and sexed bodies, kept veiled by the morality prevailing in this institution, will be exposed, with the advent of biopolitics, to procedures that transit between the space that is under the control of the public power (for example, schools) and the privacy of the house. Obviously, the representatives and defenders of bourgeois morality could not tolerate this movement. In the words of Foucault,

It seems to me that one of the fundamental phenomena of the 19th century was, what could be called the assumption of life by power: if you prefer, a takeover of man as a living being, a type of nationalization of the biological, or, at less, a certain inclination leading to what could be called the nationalization of the biological (Foucault 1999, pp. 285-286).

Given the previous path, we can now incisively put the problem that justifies and supports this study: the beginning of the 20th century, in the so-called capitalist societies of the West, was marked by a decisive event. It is a confrontation between different segments of the social order: on the one side the institutions allied with the bourgeois nuclear family that defended their prerogative of exclusivity in dealing with the questions of the sexed body; and, on the other side, those segments that were positioned within the emerging biopolitical device, endowed with a scientific power/knowledge and whose effectuation was inclined towards a nationalization of the biological. It is a conflict that is little explored in its many implications, but whose outcome do all know: the bourgeois nuclear family, which is closed in principle (since its appearance) and on principle (thanks to its moral beliefs), will have to be opened and will be, through the Biopolitical device, in its multiple interventions (Cúnico & Arpini, 2013). An image may help us to outline the contours of this event: the bourgeois family, which was intended to be closed, is now besieged by the agents of biopower in its surroundings, wanting to know its practices and customs, to offer parameters of what can be considered normal or pathological within the family. It happens that, just as a besieged city does not have to be destroyed at the time of its conquest, the device of biopower also does not need to remove the powers that are exerted within the family. It is rather a question of connecting every functional hierarchy in the family with an external regulation. From now on, the legitimization of hierarchical positions in the family environment comes from outside. Foucault says:

I think of studies such as those of Jacques Donzelot on family (he shows how the absolutely specific forms of power exercised within families were penetrated by more general state-type mechanisms through schooling, but as state-type powers and family-type powers they retained their specificity and could not truly engage in or else to the extent that each of their mechanisms was respected). (Foucault, 2014, p. 40).

In fact, the work that most incisively analyzes the encounter of biopolitics with the bourgeois family constitution is *The Family Police*, written by Jacques Donzelot (1986). The author refers repeatedly to the field of powers that targets the family sphere and, within it, the issues concerning living and sexed bodies. He makes considerations precisely on the connections that are established between powers inside and outside the family. Donzelot (1986, pp.179-180) questions: *"how to remove the family from a part of its former powers, especially on the social destiny of the children, without annulling it to the point of not being able to attribute new educational and sanitary tasks to it?"*. It is interesting to note that the questioning proposed by the author implies a strategic approach in which the bourgeois family will be regulated without losing its condition of institution that organizes daily life. The regulation is offered by the biopolitical device that transits through social fabric.

The effects of the presence of the biopolitical device in capitalist societies began to be felt in the first decades of the 20th century by the populations it administered. The rise of the educational institution as an instrument of an ever-increasing professionalization and the compulsory teaching indicate that, more and more, the training time for young people will be occupied outside and not in the home. This fact could only suggest that the family becomes less important in the educational process, if it were not for a fact: within the school institutions, a family-oriented attention regime takes shape. Donzelot (1986) points out that the school is increasingly disseminating knowledge about health, also conducting a "colonization of families through the dissemination of public and private hygiene standards: conferences held by teachers for parents" (p. 181). It is evident here that the questions of the living and sexed body, the focus of biopower, kept in the sphere of private life, become the object of intervention, under the focus of public or collective health, bringing the parents to the discussion of something which is nothing more than their private life. The attention regime that makes the family an object of investigation of the school gains continuity with the creation of parent-teacher associations in which the discussion about student achievement creates the necessary conditions to speak of the

family daily life in an institution of public domain. The opening of the family is thus deepened (Lima & Chapadeiro, 2015).

What most directly inscribes school participation in the device of biopower, however, is the adoption of sex education programs, which in some countries become compulsory in the first half of the 20th century. It is a profound change in the sharing of what is public and what is private, which brings sexuality out of the houses by confronting the morality in force in the period. It is such a decisive moment that people are entering the debate. Donzelot highlights the controversial nature of the ongoing changes:

In addition to being threatened by a common regime of schooling, 'family' children, through a collective teaching of sexuality, would be exposed and even incited to temptations that could make explicit, in terms of sex, the dangers of social promiscuity that school imposes (Donzelot, 1986, p. 182).

The reasons that populations resisted sex education programs are evident. These struck the family in what it had as most intimate, hidden, veiled: the sexed bodies of its members. The concealment of sexuality in the bourgeois family can be considered, as we have seen, a constituent element of it. It should be remembered that it was motivated by the imperative to exclude the family from promiscuity, in which the bourgeois family closed itself off in the houses and withdrew from public space. Therefore, it is not gratuitous that the reluctance with sex education programs was due to the claim that they would facilitate promiscuity. Once excluded from private life, it will be in the public space, which accommodates prolongations of state power, that the discussion about sexuality will occur. Thus, in a same process, the loss of the family's prerogatives regarding sex and what Foucault (1999) called the "nationalization of the biological" (p. 286) was constituted. A change of such magnitude inevitably causes effects that will be felt later. In this case, the effects continue to this day.

Another procedure that attests the entry of sexuality into the public sphere and its consequent withdrawal from the family sphere is the adoption by public institutions of family planning programs. Related topics, such as contraception and early pregnancy, start to be addressed in the public meetings of these programs, so that the open debate on sex begins to gain visibility and begins to be naturalized, even starting to be inscribed in the everyday life, outside specialized contexts. Donzelot observes, curiously, that the family, as it witnesses the systematic exposition of all that was its original secret, the reason for its closure, is mischaracterized, ceasing to be familiar in the sense hitherto adopted. Or yet:

Family Planning, also, has nothing more as familiar than the name. Since 1973, his motto is the "revaluation of the person, his integral psychosomatic development outside the traditional roles", the "reintegration of sexuality at all levels of daily life", the "sexualization of the Society" (Donzelot, 1986, p. 196).

This mischaracterization of the family, due to its opening, launches the institution in a condition where there are more risks than support or sustainment. In other words: "From a pillar of society, the family becomes, in these discourses, the place where it runs the risk of being undone" (Donzelot, 1986, p. 196).

At the end of this process, the family, taken to the limit of its mischaracterization, emerges as modern, which was only possible by a complete surrender of this institution to the intervening regulations of biopower. This is what we call family's opening. Around the second half of the 20th century, we witnessed the emergence of a family nucleus that, instead of resisting, continually calls for external orientations, the family standardization parameters offered by biopower. Thus, from "a place of resistance to medical standards that threatened its integrity and the game of its privileges, the bourgeois family became its best receiving surface" (Donzelot, 1986, p. 198).

The surrender of the family to the regime of biopower is a significant event that has historical implications, although it has not been sufficiently analyzed. It should be remembered that the trajectory of closure of the family space in the context of bourgeois morality was justified as a way of avoiding, to its members, all types of experience related to sexuality. Due to the intervention of biopower, the family becomes a consumer of medical, sanitary standards and, increasingly, of the services of relationship

technicians. It also becomes permeable, speaking of itself at the same time as it is attentive to what happens with other families (Franca & Souza, 2016).

Donzelot (1986) adds a contribution to the historical analysis of the family by pointing out that the different technical services provided to the family introduce it to confession practices (Foucault, 2008). In the sense proposed by the author, the confession consists of talking about private and family life, its secrets, sufferings and prohibitions. The issue of sexuality will occupy a prominent place in this process. To enunciate the lived in the family interior becomes, then, a procedure in which the individuals are initiated in the office, but that they start to execute this procedure also outside the office. The persons, as they incorporate the confession, consent to give visibility to their private life, even outside the office. It is possible to consider that the generalized adoption of psychotherapy and sex education services, when opening the family, results in a process of "pedagogy of confession" with psychosocial and collective effects. In the social sphere, it is then "natural" to expose one's own private life.

Societies exposed to the normalizing intervention of biopower gain the prerogative to speak openly about sex, and Psychology played a decisive role in this process. The opening and normalization of the family had the participation of different agents. There are multiple instances of power/knowledge that when connected to the biopolitical device, began to act in order to watch the family interior. They are public and private schools, medical and psychological clinics, hospitals and social assistance institutions, all of them interrogating family everyday life and offering prescriptions. In this way, we can measure the amplitude of the "social machine" that was triggered in the opening operation of the family. It is important to note that this process took place over several decades, the last decades of the 20th century, and its effects extend during the 21st century.

Because of the biopolitical device, we live today a transformed reality in what concerns the family space. They are families whose members speak of their affective and sexual experiences with some naturalness and who seek, in the practices adopted by other families (also open), subsidies to continue the sexual normalization coming from outside. Other critical issues, such as vocational choice and training, are also supervised by experts to minimize the future impact of a decision. The vectors of biopolitical normalization examine the position of each member of the family group, offering parameters for each of the social roles experienced there. The study of Almeida, Ferrarotto and Malavas (2017) show how families and schools interrelate, operating normalizations in an increasingly extended circuit.

Stratifications by age group describe in detail what is expected of a child, teenager, adult or elderly. Studies on gender, combined with age stratification, examine the various coercions, submissions and violence to which their members are subjected. In short, it is a scanned family, which is known in detail, evaluated in its deviations and, by choice, standardized. Foucault, at different times (1996, 2014), pointed out that power works producing effects of desire, rather than repression and coercion. It was no different from when the opening of the family happened: this institution, seeking to maintain a role in the architecture of powers of the capitalist social formation, accepted to modernize and thus to adapt to a socioeconomic system that deeply transformed the man and the world in the 20th century. The opening of the family met a need of the social order and the living subjects at the period. Could we then characterize what happened as a victorious operation of this social order? Yes, but only in part. Donzelot (1986) noted sharply that the opening of the family was a historical event, which "from the political view was not innocent at all" (p. 197). From it derives "both the emergence of the modern family and the expansion of 'psi' organisms" (p. 197). It follows from this observation that psychology played a fundamental role in the biopolitical operation of opening the family.

### **The contemporary effects of the opening of the family**

The current family will henceforth be at issue. This family, reformulated in the context of a biopolitical intervention, is what the living subjects have in the course of their existences today. The effects already considered of opening, scanning and normalization attest that the operation was successful. It turns out that they were not the only ones to be produced on this course. It is necessary

to consider the existence of effects of this same biopolitical intervention that were not foreseen or aimed.

The first effect to be considered is the destruction, which is still happening, of a whole mode of subjectivation that has different components and what we call intimacy. Its composition is complex: they are behaviors, practices adopted in daily life, rules to be followed and prohibitions to be respected to maintain intimacy. Intimacy, which has already been defined as experience derived from the bourgeois nuclear family (Ariès, 1981), also incorporates subjective components such as shame, shyness, and modesty, always directed towards the veiling of the sexed body. In case of non-observance of the rules of maintaining intimacy, the feeling of guilt was inevitable.

Vigarelo's (2008) work on the increasing visibility of the body throughout the 20th century shows that the demonstrations of intimacy were verifiable. A bourgeois young woman, when exposed to any situation involving sexuality, inevitably blushed. After a few decades, the feeling of intimacy enters into accelerated decline as the effect of the family's opening, allowing a naturalization of sexuality and increasing exposure of the body.

Another unexpected effect of the opening of the family can be identified in the work of Donzelot: what has been called the family crisis now emerges as an unexpected result, an uncalculated effect of the changes that the biopolitical device has imprinted on the daily lives of the populations. The generalized diffuse feeling that the family institution is in crisis has become recurrent in the social environment and the subjects already admit to inscribe the narrative of their trajectories in this new moment of family life. Donzelot exposes such narratives by recording the different forms of suffering experienced by the rapid transformation of the family. Significantly, Psychology becomes increasingly present as a result of the crisis collectively experienced.

The only thing that tries to respond to this perplexity is the multiplication of counselors and psychologists, always in insufficient number to meet the demand of disarmed parents, deviant children, unhappy couples, misunderstood ones, those seeking a meaning in life, those who was not taught to live. This is where it is necessary to intervene, to find solutions (Donzelot 1986, p. 196).

As for the participation of Psychology in this process, it is evident that the same crisis provoked by the opening of the family, of which Psychology was a decisive protagonist, consolidates its position, now permanent, as a normalizing agent of the domestic space. In other words, as far as the family is concerned, Psychology has come to stay. It should be noted that the psychologist does not come alone. This is demonstrated by the research of Cronemberger and Teixeira (2015) that gives visibility to this opening, in which a series of professionals of the social area focuses its interventions in the family nucleus, acting in a way to articulate power and knowledge on this institution. What power effects can be expected from this process? Says Donzelot:

It is forbidden to disturb the child, psychologists say. Do not let him stay doing nothing, the teachers replied. He is anxious, so he studies poorly, the pediatrician observed. The parents bowed to this: if the child became anxious, it was their fault. He is not motivated, the sociologists found. Unmotivated... Parents were worried: they had failed (Donzelot, 1986, pp. 201-202).

The above fragment denounces another unexpected effect of the transformation suffered by the family when it was opened. Coming, most often, from the human sciences, the knowledge of the specialists contributed decisively to its mischaracterization. As they occupy the family with their prescriptions of what is right, healthy or appropriate, they disallow the parents, who recognize loss of legitimacy as a figure of authority. In practice, these parents are lost, which helps them to seek professional help from the same agents of power/knowledge. Thus, the process of family's opening is fed back. However, family life is not yet satisfactory, since, as is evident, these professionals differ significantly in their normalizing interventions. The end result of this process is the consolidation of parental helplessness accompanied by a disallowance in the use of the powers that the institution conferred on them in the past. In fact, in this case, the result makes sense: the arrival of agents of biopower delegitimizes and make parents powerless. Children educated in this new context recognize their multiple authority figures early on and use the arguments of teachers and psychologists to confront the authority of their parents.



Since Freud (1905/1996) the question of family love has been considered in the context of a love by authority. Therefore, it is an affective bond that accompanies the institutional hierarchy. When this hierarchy breaks down, there are reports of affective emptying of the family nucleus, such as those described above by Donzelot. If the affections experienced in the family context are in crisis, this is due to the new powers. This does not mean, however, that the agents of biopower meet the conditions to offer any type of solution to the malaise that permeates the contemporary bourgeois family. Donzelot then questions such agents:

Do you have any schedule, plan, experimental project, some small formula of self-management, a vision of the family of tomorrow, anyway, something to propose? Do not hesitate, the State accepts and the right-minded are interested. Do not you have anything? Do community formulas seem to you illusory, a mere transposition, on a larger scale, of family egocentrism? Do you denounce the loneliness in which the individuals are, the misery of their affective lives, the insipidity of their existences? (Donzelot, 1986, pp. 196-197).

Every course of family history in the 20th century can now be evaluated by the effects that become more evident in the contemporary world. In fact, what happened was the encounter of the bourgeois family with the agents of biopower. Foucault explains the effects of this encounter with the power writing on the violence that it implies:

A relationship of violence acts on a body, on things: it forces, it bends, it breaks, it destroys: it closes all possibilities; It does not have, next to it, another pole if not of passivity; and if it finds resistance, it has no choice but to reduce it (Foucault, 2014, p. 132).

This is effectively what happened to the family during the 20th century. If it was not totally destroyed, it was broken in its claim for self-sufficiency, in its practice of isolation, as well as in its determination to veil bodies and sexes. At last, it was forced to open up. What remains of it remains only in function of the affective value that still covers the family. But for how long? As we have seen, the affective bond follows the relations of authority and these relations were completely mischaracterized.

There is a disturbing finding here: contemporary capitalism no longer depends on family institutions as it has depended in the past decades. The functions, considered strategic for the formation of the workforce in the contemporary, transit through other institutions, with the rise of the school and the omnipresence of the means of communication. In the new architecture of power relations, within the framework of an emerging control society (Tarres, Martínez, & Mansano, 2016), power calls directly on the subjects of all age groups, for media intervention. This situation leads to a questioning about the functionality of the current family. Is it still the basic cell of society? As a result of the opening of the family institution, new forms of sociability are also constituted in a process of gradual replacement of what was lived in the family interior. This is demonstrated by the study of Uber and Boeckel (2014) on the articulation of the family with an extensive social network in which sexuality will appear.

As we have seen with Donzelot, it is a society in the process of sexualization. In it, sexuality appears publicly and in a recurring way, which, in turn, shows the assertion of Foucault of the nationalization of living and sexed bodies. More questions can be asked: How are living beings constituted in this context? What do they do with their lives and their sexuality radically transformed? What do they do with the frightening confirmation that society, traditionally repressive of sexuality, "in the era of biopower becomes a society of sex"? (Pelbart, 2003, p.58).

We are faced with our problem in the most complete sense. We arrive at the present, whose decipherment calls for and justifies all historical analyses, since, as Foucault (2014, p. 128) considers, "the critical analysis of the world in which we live is increasingly the great philosophical task. Undoubtedly, the most infallible philosophical problem is that of the present time".

Foucault's analyses of power have always been constituted from a strategic dynamics that involves action and reaction. In these, acts of resistance are opposed to the effects of power. Hence, the strategic sense of questioning, in the case of the family, what the subjects do with what has been inscribed in their lives by effectuation of power. Faced with power, Foucault points out; there remains the prerogative of resistance as a possibility in a dynamics of permanent struggle. With regard to the

sexed body, it must be considered that somehow a turnaround has occurred. It is what can be seen in the fragment below:

Mastery, the consciousness of their own body could only be acquired by the effect of the investment of the body by power: gymnastics, exercises, muscular development, nudity, exaltation of the beautiful body... All this leads to the desire of their own body through an insistent, obstinate, meticulous work that the power exerted on the body of the children, the soldiers, on the healthy body. But as soon as power has produced this effect, as a direct consequence of their achievements, inevitably emerges the claim of their own body against power, health against the economy, pleasure against moral rules (Foucault, 1996, p. 146).

In these observations, we find the subsidies for the complex task of deciphering the capitalist contemporaneity as to the value and meaning that both family and sexuality can still clothe. The turnaround, with value of resistance, consisted of welcoming our body and sexed condition, which occurred by the effect of power. But also, by resistance, this welcome re-signified and valued in a different way the body and the sex, as pointed out in the fragment quoted. This is another unexpected effect of biopolitical interventions within the family. What other turnarounds or actions of resistance and turns could be pointed out subsequently? The current, open and normalized bourgeois family, tolerant to sex by the effect of biopower, is involved with a diffuse movement, to some extent unconscious, of re-elaboration. We select here the importance attributed to the veiling of the body, as a condition for the existence of intimacy. When the family environment opens, an unveiling of that same body begins, which gains visibility through denudation. Intimacy then suffers a blow. Showing the body today is a hallmark of contemporary culture and the generations that were born and raised in the late 20th century are opposed to what is the imperative of that period, that is, the naked body as a health condition. The confrontation, as the most recent turnaround, now implies a new change of direction: this body made visible will be subject to excessive exposure in different contexts, especially those related to sexual pleasure. The confrontation, as the most recent turnaround, now implies a new change of direction: this body made visible will be object of excessive exposure in different contexts, especially those related to sexual pleasure.

Historically speaking, within a century, approximately, in capitalist societies the house was opened, its secrets and prohibitions made public and standardized. It also happens that sexuality, present in this process, has been transformed into an issue of public domain. How did the populations react to the sex addressed in the schools, the sex exposed in the media and a sexualization that inscribes to the everyday in a recurrent and trivial way? These populations reacted, starting with the younger segments and less committed to the morale of the first half of the 20th century, refusing the former intimacy and making the body's exposure an element of confrontation.

In this second decade of the 21st century, we see a multiplication of situations in which the naked and sexed body is at issue. Every day the media display episodes of public denudation under the most different claims. They are protests and demonstrations, where the naked body is exhibited in collective or individual act. The social movements organized by the questions of the sexed body are also multiplied. Such movements have in the issues of gender, in the problematic of pleasure and in the re-appropriation of the body, their axes of politicization.

However, effectively, the practices of denudation show to be more forceful on the World Wide Web, on the internet. On it, lacking any modesty, young and adults expose themselves to the eyes of all and share the scenes once veiled by intimacy. It has become a frequent practice to produce images of their own sexual relationship, which are then posted and made public by their protagonists or by those who have access to these images. Facts of this type, which occur in different countries, challenge an understanding of the issue of sexuality in the contemporary world. What is the meaning of such a movement? How can we understand that pre-teens expose their naked bodies irreversibly, since the digital image of public domain has unlimited duration? It is not a question here to join with conservative morality, but an exercise of problematization: Where does such a drastic change in values, practices, feelings, and senses of the body and sexuality come from?

## Final considerations

At the end of this course we have a diagnostic hypothesis, built on the dynamics of social struggles, as analyzed by Foucault: the opening and normalization of the family space, which instituted confession, can be considered a modality of self-exposition. With the advent of image reproduction technology on a large-scale, verbal self-exposure (confession) has given way to self-exposure by images (social media). What was the reason for this to have happened? That was because of an operation of resistance that reversed the value still attributed to intimacy. The young contemporaries, if they do not already have that mode of subjectivation that was the same as their parents and grandparents, if they are not already constituted by an intimacy, then they confront what is left of the bourgeois morality exposing themselves as a way of denouncing the biopolitical operation that constituted their ways of life.

The new generations are being subjectivated amid the destruction of intimacy. How do they react, how do they resist to it? Exposing their naked bodies beyond the limits of “good sense” that the residues of the bourgeois morality insist on maintaining. They make their bodies the living spectacle of the effects of biopower in the family sphere. They make it possible to glimpse that the transformations that have taken place in contemporary subjectivity produced completely unscaled effects. Now it is too late. The irreversible history of the destruction of intimacy is inscribed in our history, in our life and in our bodies. What else can come of it?

## References

- Almeida, L. C., Ferrarotto, L., & Malavas, M. M. S. (2017). Escola Vista de Fora: o que dizem as famílias? *Educação Real*, 42 (2). Porto Alegre.
- Ariès, P. (1981). *História social da criança de da família*. Rio de Janeiro: LTD.
- Cronemberger, I. H. G. M. & Teixeira, S. M. (2015). O sistema de proteção social brasileiro, política de assistência social e a atenção à família. *Pensando famílias*, 19(2), 132-147.
- Cúnico, S. D. & Arpini, D. M. (2013). A família em mudanças: desafios para a paternidade contemporânea. *Pensando famílias*, 17(1), 28-40.
- Donzelot, J. (1986). *A Polícia das famílias*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *História da sexualidade I: A vontade de saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- Foucault, M. (1996). *Microfísica do poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.
- Foucault, M. (1999). *Em defesa da sociedade*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *Segurança, território, população*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2014). *Ditos e escritos IX: Genealogia da ética, subjetividade e sexualidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.
- Franca, V. V. & Souza, F. (2016). 'Troca de Família': espiando as famílias, enxergando a sociedade. *Intercom, Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, 39 (1), 177-192.
- Freud, S. (1905/1996). *Três ensaios sobre a teoria da sexualidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- Giddens, A. (1993). *A transformação da intimidade: amor & erotismo nas sociedades modernas*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.
- Lima, T. B. H. & Chapadeiro, C. A. (2015). Encontros e (des)encontros no sistema família-escola. *Revista Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 19 (3), 493-502.
- Tarres, J. P., Martínez, M., & Mansano, S. R. V. (2016). Corpos dóceis: novos contornos. In M. Nalli & S. R. V. Mansano (Orgs.), *Michel Foucault: desdobramentos*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- Mioto, R. C. T. (2015). Política social e trabalho familiar: questões emergentes no debate contemporâneo. *Revista Serviço Social e Sociedade*, 124, 699-720.
- Nalli, M. (2013). Communitas/Immunitas: a releitura de Roberto Esposito da biopolítica. *Revista de Filosofia Aurora*, 25 (37), 79-105.
- Pelbart, P. P. (2003). *Vida capital: ensaios de biopolítica*. São Paulo: Iluminuras.
- Sennett, R. (1999). *O declínio do homem público: as tiranias da intimidade*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Uber, M. L. R. & Boeckel, M. G. (2014). Terapia de família e as redes sociais pessoais. *Pensando Famílias*, 18(2), 108-123.
- Vigarello, G. (Org.). (2008). *História do Corpo: As mutações do olhar – século XX*. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Received: Jan. 10, 2017

Approved: May. 22, 2017

---

*Paulo Roberto de Carvalho*: Doctor in Clinical Psychology from PUC/SP. Professor at the Department of Social and Institutional Psychology at the State University of Londrina.

*Sonia Regina Vargas Mansano*: Doctor in Clinical Psychology from PUC/SP. Professor of the Postgraduate Program in Administration and at the Department of Social and Institutional Psychology of the State University of Londrina.