Chapter 11

Strategy, Medicine and Habitat: Foucault in 1976

Stuart Elden

I study things like a psychiatric asylum, the forms of constraint, exclusion, elimination, disqualification, of which reason is always precisely incarnate, in the body of the doctor, in medical knowledge, medical institutions, etc., exercised over madness, illness, unreason, etc. What I study, is an architecture, a spatial organisation; disciplinary techniques, modalities of dressage, forms of surveillance; actually what I study is what I have called governmentality (a word which is undoubtedly much too grand): what are the practices which are put to work to govern men, that is to enable a certain manner of conducting them, government as the conduct of conduct, how to conduct the conduct of men. (Foucault 1978: 9)


And yet this is merely the visible tip of his research. As in most years, he lectured widely across the world. These lectures included a largely unpublished one on alternatives to the prison in Montreal (1976b), and a very important study given in Brazil in November which has been available in French only since 1994 and is translated for the first time in this volume: ‘The Meshes of Power’ (1994, IV: 182–201; 2007a). In addition, as is well known, the first volume of the History of Sexuality, The Will to Knowledge, was only intended to serve as an introduction to a six volume series.

1. La volonté de savoir [The Will to Knowledge]
2. La chair et le corps [The Flesh and the Body]
3. La croisade des enfants [The Children’s Crusade]
The logic of these volumes is that Foucault sees Christian practices of confession as central to understanding the birth of psychoanalysis and the discourse of sexuality; and that the four constituent subjects of sexuality were the masturbating child, the hysterical woman, the perverse adult and the Malthusian couple.

The projected volumes traded upon themes rehearsed in the Collège de France lectures of the previous few years. These courses provide valuable insight into these concerns: confession, perverts and childhood masturbation receive treatment in the The Abnormals course; hysteric is treated briefly in Le pouvoir psychiatrique; and the volume on Populations and Races would undoubtedly have traded upon the research presented in Society Must be Defended. But Foucault did not merely outline these ideas in lectures. At least two of the volumes were actually drafted: Les pervers and Le chair et le corps.

Foucault’s research in his first five courses at the Collège had therefore contained some remarkable analyses. Early concerns with systems of knowledge had been partnered by some important studies of questions of power, initially in relation to punishment and the penal society in Théories et institutions pénales and La société punitive, and then in Le pouvoir psychiatrique through a rereading of the last parts of Histoire de la folie in the light of the new conceptual tools of power and genealogy.

The course immediately preceding Society Must be Defended, The Abnormals, had broadened the institutional analysis of prisons and asylums to concentrate on themes already in Foucault’s work, but now brought to the fore. Society as a whole becomes an issue, with the techniques of normalization, categorization and control broadening beyond the institutions; mechanisms of confession in the production of truth are brought to bear on the individual and collective subject; and truth is conceptualized as a political force, opening to a later concern with modalities of government (see 1999, 45). Despite his very critical self-assessment in Society Must be Defended, about how little he felt he had achieved (1997, 5–6/3–4) Foucault had, in nascent form, outlined many of the concerns that would occupy him for the next few years.

The year 1976 was, then, a hinge point for Foucault. On the one hand it marks the culmination of several years of research, finding outlet in the programmatic first volume of the History of Sexuality; on the other it opens up many of the themes he would treat from 1977 until the end of his life. But few could have predicted how the next eight years would have turned out. Instead of the projected volumes at the proposed rate of one a year, he published the second and third volumes, on entirely different subject matter, in 1984.

Foucault delivered Society Must be Defended in the first three months of 1976. He completed The Will to Knowledge in August. Given his seeming discontent with what he had done, as evidenced by remarks in the course, it is perhaps surprising

---

4. *La femme, la mère et l’hystérique* [Woman, Mother, and Hysteric]
5. *Les pervers* [The Perverse]

---

1 For more detailed discussions, see Elden 2001; 2002; 2005; 2006b.
that he spent the next five months perfecting the plan of a project he had already
decided was flawed. As his partner Daniel Defert suggests in his chronology that
accompanies the French collection of his shorter works, even at this point he did
not intend to write them (Foucault 1994, I, 49). Instead, he worked on a related
yet different set of concerns. In a letter he wrote in August 1974, at the time of
completing Discipline and Punish, cited by Defert in his chronology, he confessed
he was bored with the subjects he had been working on and that ‘political economy,
strategy, politics’ would be his new concerns (1994, I, 45). We get an initial glimpse
of this in Society Must be Defended, when he suggests that if the previous five years
had been given over to the disciplines, in ‘the next five years, it will be war, struggle,
the army’ (1997, 21/23). Had this been followed through, Foucault would have been
treating these subjects until 1981, but of course we know that this was not the case.
Equally in April 1976 he notes that ‘his next book will treat military institutions’

Sécurité, Territoire, Population was the first course Foucault gave after he
returned from his 1977 sabbatical year. In this course, given in early 1978, Foucault
begin with three important case studies of town planning, famines and smallpox, in
order to illustrate the themes of the spaces of security, the aleatory, normalization
and the birth of the modern conception of population, before giving the famous
‘Governmentality’ lecture. It is clear now how this lecture, for so long seen out of
context, is the opening up of a problematic that Foucault then treats in sustained detail
for the rest of that year’s course and the next, Naissance de la biopolitique (2004b).
Foucault is concerned with rereading the history of the state from the perspective of
practices of government, and he suggests three key models for the West. These are
the Christian pastoral, with its themes of the flock, confession and the government
of souls; the diplomatic-military technology that emerges following the Peace of
Westphalia; and the notion of the police. Population, police and governance: all
themes that had been in his work before, but now given new pre-eminence and a
much more explicitly political twist.

The 1980 course was entitled Du gouvernement des vivants, and returned
explicitly to Christian practices, and offers what is effectively a draft of sections of
the unpublished fourth volume of the History of Sexuality series, Les aveux de la
chair. As Naissance de la biopolitique (2004b, 3) makes clear, government can be
understood in a range of ways, as government over children, families, a household,
of the soul, of communities. Such issues re-emerge in Foucault’s final two courses,
both under the title of Le gouvernement de soi et des autres – but in Naissance de la
biopolitique it is exercised in political sovereignty. Tracing the theme of government,
which emerges out of the ashes of the abandoned original plan of the History of
Sexuality, and then leads into the version of the History of Sexuality that Foucault
left incomplete at his death is a long and complicated story, of which I have offered
a fuller account elsewhere (Elden 2005; 2007a). These few points of indication are,

---

2 On this theme see also Vol. III, 123—4, 268, 515.
3 The best analysis of these lectures to date, making use of the tapes, is Lemke 1997.
I hope, useful and important. They are not merely important because they show that the lecture courses provide many of the clues necessary for the reconstruction of these paths, but because they help to illuminate the questions Foucault asked the geographers in 1976.

Some broad themes thus emerge as contexts for these questions: notably strategy and war, and medicine and habitat. These will be the topics of this chapter, which then re-examines the questions in their light, and in so doing raises issues concerning the question of science and knowledge. It concludes by raising some general issues around Foucault’s work and how it might be appropriated in the future.

**Strategy and War**

For a perspective on Foucault’s view of strategy in 1976 the obvious place to turn is *Society Must be Defended*. This course, as is becoming well known, was not entirely accurately portrayed in the summary Foucault published at the time. Rather than a study of war in itself, the course is directed at the war of races that constituted modern states, something that is only briefly mentioned in the summary (1997, 244/271–2). Issues of security, violence, revolution, class struggle and the themes of the final chapter of *The Will to Knowledge* all make an appearance.\(^4\) Coming out of the researches of both the *History of Sexuality* and *Discipline and Punish* this was Foucault concentrating on the most spectacularly brutal, on power in its naked, violent, repressive form. Despite his later analyses to the contrary, such as the empowering passages of *The Will to Knowledge*, the initial formulations and analyses of power in Foucault are almost invariably overwhelming and encompassing.

Strategy had been a concern of Foucault’s for some time, and had been proposed explicitly as a mode of analysis in *Le pouvoir psychiatrique*. Foucault notes that he is attempting to avoid psycho-sociological vocabulary, and rather decides on ‘a pseudo-military vocabulary’ (2003, 18). The manuscript of the course notes that examples of the exercise of power should be understood not as stories or ‘theatrical episodes’ but as ‘a ritual, a strategy, a battle’ (cited in Lagrange 2001, 139).

Foucault’s fascination with the military was equally not new, indeed it had been a major topic in *Le pouvoir psychiatrique*, and *Discipline and Punish*, even before the extended treatment of war in *Society Must be Defended*. Indeed, in the interview with the geographers at the *Hérodote* journal, Foucault notes that in terms of spatial analyses Marx’s work on ‘the army and its role in the development of political power’ had been unjustly neglected (1994, III, 39; this volume, 182). It is also notable that Foucault is interested in the second volume of *Capital*, both because of its analysis of the genealogy of capital (1978, 1), but also because of the material on circulation (see 2004a). Excepting Marx himself, Foucault had equally long claimed that struggle was a neglected issue in political theory, and that even Marxists had largely ignored it in their analysis of class struggle (1994, III, 206, 268, 310–11). In the *Hérodote*

\(^4\) For fuller accounts, see Stoler 1995; Zarka (Ed.) 2000; Zancarini (Ed.) 2001; Elden 2002; Dillon and Neal (Eds) 2007.
interview he suggests that the metaphors they claim are geographical are actually political, juridical, administrative and military. His interlocutors respond that some of these terms are both geographical and strategic, which is not surprising, given that geography ‘grew up in the shadow of the military’ (1994, III, 32–4; this volume, 176–7). This interest can be seen as continuing in the discussions of the Peace of Westphalia and the invention of standing armies in the late 17th century. Later, in Sécurité, Territoire, Population, Foucault discusses the permanent military apparatus, the advent of professional soldiers, the infrastructure of fortresses and transport, and the sustained tactical reflection that dates from this time (2004a, 308–13).

Strategy and war were thus at the heart of Foucault’s concerns when he addressed his questions to Hérodote. Strategy was, he contended, essential to understanding the relation of power and knowledge, but the relation of strategy to domination and war was more complicated. How, he asks, do we need to rethink strategy? A similar set of questions are asked in the course summary to Society Must be Defended, written at the conclusion of the course and thus at the same time as the questions to Hérodote. They are worth reproducing at length:

Must war be regarded as a primal and basic state of affairs, and must all phenomena of social domination, differentiation, and hierarchization be regarded as its derivatives?
Do processes of antagonism, confrontations, and struggles among individuals, groups, or classes derive in the last instance from general processes of war?
Can a set of notions derived from strategy and tactics constitute a valid and adequate instrument for the analysis of power relations? (1997, 239–40/266)

We can see, in these questions, not what is perhaps most obvious. Rather than Foucault suggesting that these are programmes for future work, the way that he turns seems to indicate that his answers would largely have been in the negative. Indeed a sense that is tangible from the lectures is that of Foucault running ideas to ground, working them through to their logical conclusions and exhausting their possibilities before turning to other avenues. These are lectures after all, not polished works. Instead, as I have argued elsewhere, Foucault is more concerned with strategies for waging peace, how mechanisms employed in what he calls governmentality are only indirectly from mechanisms of war (2005; 2007a).

Medicine and Habitat

One of the best instances of seeing how Foucault was more concerned with peacetime strategies and tactics comes in his work on medicine and habitat. Traditionally for a reading of Foucault’s work on these topics, the sources had been Birth of the Clinic and the essay ‘The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century’ (1963; 1994, 273–89). The former is a remarkable book, but largely concentrates on the form of medicine that emerges in the clinical hospital itself, in other words clinical medicine. There Foucault discusses three forms of spatialization: the location of a disease in a family, the taxonomies of disease; the location of disease in the body; and the
way diseases are located in society as a whole, in political struggles, economic constraints, and social confrontations. Foucault claims that it is in the last of these that the changes that led to a reformulation of medical knowledge occurred (1963, 14–15). This is the space of imaginary classifications, space of corporal reality, and space of social order.

_Histoire de la folie_ and other writings on madness and mental illness broaden this work, but it is really in the 1970s that Foucault returned to these earlier themes with a more explicitly political and social twist. Central sources include his lecture courses _The Abnormals_ and the recently published _Le pouvoir psychiatrique_ (1999; 2003; see Elden 2001; 2006). In the former course he notes that eighteenth and nineteenth century psychiatry was a branch of public hygiene rather than of general medicine (1999, 109). A series of important lectures in Rio in 1974 (1994, III, 40–58, 207–28, 508–21; 2000, 134–56; 2004c; 2007b; see Elden 2003) and seminar research on ‘the history of the hospital institution and hospital architecture in the eighteenth century’ (Foucault 2003, 352) developed these themes.

Foucault’s work in this seminar opens up an important and neglected area of study. As well as the books and occasional pieces, which give the impression of a lone scholar, Foucault also collaborated on a number of projects. From the early 1970s he worked with Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and François Fourquet on the issue of urban infrastructure. This led to the book _Les équipements du pouvoir_ by François Fourquet and Lion Murard (1976), which included contributions in discussion by Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari. This was funded by the Ministere de l’aménagement du territoire, de l’équipement, du logement et du tourisme, and undertaken under the auspices of the Centre d’Études, de Recherche et de Formation Institutionnelle (CERFI), a group founded in 1967 by Guattari. Work undertaken in these projects and others led to the collective work _Les machines à guérir (aux origines de l’hôpital moderne)_ , and eventually to the book Foucault edited _Politiqes de l’habitat (1800–1850)_ . Foucault’s project on ‘equipments of normalization’, one of the parts of the CERFI research, had looked beyond the institutions of hospitals and schools to wider concerns with sanitary norms and ‘the power of the state in the determination of sanitary mechanisms’.

The collaborative work raises an important issue. Despite the title of this collection, Foucault should not be treated as a privileged subject, but as part of a network of researchers and relations. The Collège de France had acted as an inspiration to this work. Before 1976 the seminars accompanying his lecture courses had led to the publication of the texts around the case of Pierre Rivière (1973), and in various ways contributed to the ‘Dangerous Individual’ project (1994, III, 443–64), the publication of the Herculine Barbin memoir and dossier (1980), and _Le désordre des familles_ , a collection of ‘lettres de cachet’ with commentary by Arlette Farge and Foucault (1982). The archives of the Institut Mémoires de l’Édition Contemporaine

---

5 The papers for this and other projects are archived at the Institut Mémoires d’Édition Contemporaine, now based in Caen, Normandy. Subsequent codes refer to their cataloguing system. See [http://www.imec-archives.com/](http://www.imec-archives.com/). This quote is from D.2.3/FCL2.A04-04.
in Paris carry details of a range of other projects, mostly abortive, but fascinating in terms of an understanding of Foucault’s concerns.⁶

Foucault’s claim in the interview that preceded the re-edition of Bentham’s Panopticon text is that the organization of space, especially architecture in the eighteenth century, became explicitly tied to the ‘problems of population, health and the town planning … it became a question of using the management of space for economic-political ends’ (1994, III, 192). In an oft-quoted phrase from the same interview, Foucault declares that:

… a whole history of spaces – which would be at the same time a history of powers – remains to be written, from the grand strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat, institutional architecture from the classroom to the design of hospitals, passing via economic and political institutions … anchorage in space is an economic-political form which needs to be studied in detail. (Foucault 1994, III, 192–3)

If the danger here is that Foucault is still privileging time over space – it is a history of space that is to be written – there is certainly a recognition of the need to transform the doing of history through attention to its spatial context.

A further indication of the direction Foucault is taking at this time is another piece from 1976, entitled ‘Bio-histoire et bio-politique’. This is Foucault’s brief review of Jacques Ruffié’s De la biologie à la culture (Ruffié 1976). Ruffié is, for Foucault, ‘one of the most eminent representatives of the new physical anthropology’ (1994, III, 96). One of the conclusions that Foucault draws from the research here is that ‘although the species cannot be defined by a prototype but by a collection of variations, race, for the biologist, is statistical notion – a “population”’ (1994, III, 96). Overall, as well as contributing to the bio-politics that Foucault has been advancing since 1974, Ruffié also helps with a project of bio-history, ‘that would no longer be the unitary and mythological history of the human species through time’ (1994, III, 97). Several of these themes are explored in the lectures on the history of governmentality (2004a; 2004b).

**Green Spaces**

Before I move to looking at the questions Foucault asked, I want here to provide a brief reading of another collaborative project, which was unpublished and from the extant records, appears to have only got to proposal stage, which aimed to analyze the ‘green spaces’, les espaces verts, of Paris.⁷ This project was intended to provide a mapping [un repérage] and analysis of the material and cultural underpinnings of ‘green spaces’. The attempt was to trace the relation between administrative strategies

---

⁶ For a fuller discussion of these see Elden 2007b. A project on the green spaces of Paris is discussed below.
⁷ See D.2.1/FCL2.A04-05.
concerning public hygiene more generally with the development of green spaces. The budget for the 18 month project was over a quarter of a million francs, and as well as the core team of Foucault, Blandine Barret-Kriegel, Jean-Marie Alliaumé and Anne Thalamy, who had been involved in other collaborative work, others, including the architect Henri Bonemazon and the geographer Alain Demangeon were included. Demangeon would later collaborate with another colleague of Foucault’s, Bruno Fortier, on the book *Les vaisseaux et les villes*, on the arsenal at Cherbourg, which appeared in the same series as *Les machines à guérir* (Demangeon and Fortier 1978).

One of the issues that seems remarkable to the team is the increasing scarcity of green spaces in Paris, but also in other major towns, and the way in which the discourse of salubrity ‘seems to have systematically excluded green space from its preoccupations’. Why this should have come to pass is a crucial issue, and needs to be situated in relation to the control of dangerous populations. The fairly detailed proposal notes the Ministry of Construction’s realization in 1958 that Paris was very lacking in both parks and gardens, and that the key was to preserve what did exist from development and autoroutes. While distancing themselves from the *paysagistes* or *Robinsonnades* with their wish for a return to nature, the research recognized their importance, and particularly their use by the old, women, and children.

The key green spaces – the Bois de Vincennes and the Bois de Boulogne to the east and west – need to be related to the planning of Baron Haussmann in the Third Republic, and the establishment of the Parc de Buttes Chaumont and Parc Montsourris can also be traced to this time. This is all related to the transition from Royal gardens to public parks and squares, but questions need to be asked about the ‘amputation’ of parks such as the Luxembourg gardens just south of the Latin Quarter, and the Parc Monceau, and why public places such as the Champs Elysées and Les Invalides did not become parks. These are perhaps the most crucial issues, but what is also notable is the lack of individual or communal private gardens on the English model. While the research looked to this specific example, it is clear that it is an opportunity to approach familiar questions from a new angle. The stated aims of the research to be undertaken in this project cover the recurrent themes of public hygiene; urban surveillance; and industrialization and the urban. In sum though, this projected research was concerned with the problem of ‘verdure’, of ‘greenery’, what they state to be ‘a recent problem, more exactly environmental’ of green belts, barriers. Of marginal interest perhaps, but notable for the geographical

---

8 D.2.1/FCL2.A04-05, 1.
13 D.2.1/FCL2.A04-05, 16–17
and environmental angle on a continuing set of concerns, and for the interest in this shown by Foucault, not noted for his love of the non-built environment.

Consequences for Questions

In the light of all this work, we can return to the four questions Foucault posed. As he says, ‘they are inquiries that I am asking myself’, rather than work to which he already feels he has the answers. We can clearly see how the first question relates to the work of Society Must be Defended, concerning questions of strategy, war and domination, and how this continues into his work on governmentality. As Arnold Davidson has noted, a ‘full study of the emergence of this strategic model in Foucault’s work would have to begin with texts written no later than 1971’ (2003, xviii–xix), namely the first lecture course at the Collège de France La volonté de savoir. As Davidson outlines, the model of strategy can be seen as the bridge between works such as The Order of Things and The Archaeology of Knowledge (1966; 1969), where he looks at how discourses are structured, to the later work where discourses are relations of force, of battle in, for example, both the lecture course and the book from 1976 (1976a; 1997).16

The second question is less obviously related to the work undertaken at this time, but returns to the questions posed in works such as The Order of Things and The Archaeology of Knowledge about taxonomies of scientific knowledge. One of the interesting issues that arises from reading the lecture courses is how frequently Foucault did refer back to those earlier works, to rework their analyses and engage in self-critique. For example, Le pouvoir psychiatrique returns to Histoire de la folie, and both Society Must be Defended and Sécurité, Territoire, Population explicitly politicize questions raised in The Order of Things about mathesis and the birth of man respectively, in the latter case seeing the development of biology, political economy and linguistics as the emergence of the ‘living being, the working individual, the speaking subject’, which ‘can be understood from the emergence of population as a correlative of power and as an object of knowledge [savoir]’. While this brings the application of the power-knowledge couplet to the analysis, Foucault also broadens and politicizes the notion of man itself: ‘man … is nothing other, in the last analysis, than the figure of population’ (2004a, 81).

Right at the beginning of Society Must be Defended Foucault does something similar, where he discusses what he calls ‘subjugated knowledges’ both as ‘historical contents that have been buried or masked in functional coherences or formal systemizations’, and ‘a whole series of knowledges that have been disqualified as nonconceptual knowledges, as insufficiently elaborated knowledges, as naïve knowledges, hierarchically inferior knowledges, knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificity’ (1997, 8–9/7). This is important because Foucault wants to see his own work of genealogies as ‘antisciences’:

They are about the insurrection of knowledges. Not so much against the contents, methods or concepts of a science; this is above all, primarily, an insurrection against the centralizing power-effects that are bound up with the institutionalization and workings of any scientific discourse organized in a society such as ours. That this institutionalization of scientific discourse is embodied in a university or, in general terms, a pedagogical apparatus, that this institutionalization of scientific discourse is embodied in a theorectico-commercial network such as psychoanalysis, or in a political apparatus – with everything that implies, such as in the case of Marxism – is largely irrelevant. It is thus against the power-effects characteristic of any discourse that is regarded as scientific that genealogy has to engage in combat. (Foucault 1997, 10/9)

The question that needs to be asked, Foucault suggests, is ‘what types of knowledge are you trying to disqualify when you say that you are a science? What speaking subject, what discursive subject, what subject of experience and knowledge are you trying to make minor [minoriser] when you begin to say: “I speak this discourse, I am speaking a scientific discourse, and I am a scientist”’ (1997, 11/10). These reflections, Foucault contends, allow us to understand the relationship between archaeology and genealogy:

Archaeology is the method specific to the analysis of local discursivities, and genealogy is the tactic which, once it has described these local discursivities, brings into play the desubjugated knowledges that have been released from them. That just about sums up the overall project. (Foucault 1997, 11–12/10–11)

The third question might be asked back to Foucault, and this is certainly one of the key things that he is known for today. Despite offering a clear analytic in The Will of Knowledge, especially in the chapter ‘Method’ (1976a, 121–35), Foucault often returned to this question with clarifications and fine-tunings. This is perhaps particularly the case in two important interviews: ‘The Subject and Power’ and ‘The Ethic of Care for Self as a Practice of Freedom’ (1994, 222–43; 708–29). Once again, Society Must be Defended offers an important perspective on this question:

What is power? Or rather – given that the question ‘What is power?’ is obviously a theoretical question that would provide an answer to everything, which is just what I don’t want to do – the issue is to determine what are, in their mechanisms, effects, their relations, the various power-apparatuses that operate at various levels of society, in such very different domains and with so many different extensions? (Foucault 1997, 13–14/13)

Question four seems to be a question directed at Foucault’s own ongoing work with the collaborative projects, and retrospectively to the Rio lectures and even back as far as Birth of the Clinic. While there is a developed spatial sense to these investigations, and though they undoubtedly provide rich insights and tools for geographers today, it is questionable if they would have been recognized as such in either the Anglophone

17 For a fuller discussion see Chris Philo’s chapter in this volume.
or Francophone academy at the time. Gerry Kearns’s chapter in this volume provides a number of helpful pointers.

**Consequences for Foucault Studies**

It is also important to consider the more general context of 1976. The editors of the course note that the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia and France were hardly a distant memory, and that recent history included the transitions from dictatorship to democracy in Spain, Portugal and Greece; terrorism in Ireland, Italy and Germany; war in Indochina and the Middle East; and civil war in Africa and South America (Fontana and Bertrani 1997: 257). The first September 11th, in Chile when Salvador Allende was overthrown by a CIA-backed Augusto Pinochet, had taken place in 1973. Industrial unrest had recently led to the defeat of Ted Heath’s government in England. This led to his replacement as Conservative leader by Margaret Thatcher, and the beginning of the neo-liberal dominance. The French left was struggling with the ideas of Eurocommunism and the unrepentant Stalinism of Georges Marchais, and it took five more years before a semi-united left facilitated the election of François Mitterand.

In the academy, numerous changes were taking place, particularly in the wake of the 1968 protests and those against the Vietnam war. Anglophone political theory was reenergized by debates around John Rawl’s *A Theory of Justice* (1971), and in geography, David Harvey’s *Social Justice and the City* (1973) was having an important catalyzing effect, particularly in the light of its move from positivism through liberalism to an explicitly Marxist agenda. The journals *Antipode* and *Hérodote* can be seen as having a similar role in the Anglophone and Francophone geographical circles, both attempting to shake up established patterns in research. Matthew Hannah and Juliet J. Fall’s chapters in this volume provide much useful context and comparison here.

As Anglophone studies of Foucault’s works continue to develop, both within geography and in wider disciplinary contexts, a number of general points can be drawn. First, the material that is now available. The 1994 four volume *Dits et écrits* not only collected together texts published in a range of hard to find places – it was the first collection as such in French, despite several collections in, for example, English, German and Italian – but also made a number of shorter texts available in French for the first time. Disparate texts originally published in Japanese, Italian and Portuguese were resituated in Foucault’s work, often providing new insights and analyses. In terms of the themes explored here I would particularly highlight the lectures on medicine given in Rio in 1974. Much of this material is yet to appear in English, as the *Essential Works* collection is merely a selection from the much richer French edition. In addition to *Dits et écrits* the lecture courses also provide much new and contextual material. The impact that *Society Must be Defended* has had, in the short time since its publication, especially in the field of International Relations, is testament to what lies in store as further volumes are translated. In those volumes
already published in France there are rich pickings for geographers – the analysis of
the family and domestic space, asylum architecture, racial politics, colonial ordering
and Foucault’s relation to Marx, to name only some of the most obvious.

Second, Foucault as collaborator. The collaborative works were published during
his lifetime, but with the exception of *I, Pierre Rivière* have not appeared in English.
This is regrettable, because here the researches of Foucault and his colleagues
are often much more concrete. *The Foucault Effect* was of course a collaborative
work of sorts. It appeared after Foucault’s death, and included work by many of his
colleagues and friends, and has initiated a whole series of important studies utilizing
the notion of ‘governmentality’ (Burchell, Gordon and Miller (Eds) 1991). Perhaps
here we can see the model for the sort of work that Foucault hoped would follow
him, work that was going on in his lifetime but remains largely unknown even in
his native France. In this respect we should also look at some of the work done by
colleagues since that date, including studies by Jacques Donzelot (1979), François

Third, implicit in the above is the relation between this work and the later
Foucault, shaped by two complementary concerns into the conduct of conduct and
the question of the self. The question of the government of others depends centrally,
as Foucault recognized, on the question of the government of the self. This is a
theme that can be seen in the collaborative work mentioned, the detours through
liberal modes of governance, Christian practices of confession and pastoral power,
and the work of his last years on antiquity.

Finally, these questions demonstrate Foucault’s openness to debate and productive
dialogue. The rest of this book continues that discussion.
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