

Foucault Studies

© John Protevi 2008

ISSN: 1832-5203

Foucault Studies, No 5, pp. 145-147, January 2008

REVIEW

Martin Fuglsang and Bent Meier Sørensen (eds.), *Deleuze and the Social* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006). ISBN: 9780748620920.

As would be expected in an essay collection entitled *Deleuze and the Social*, Michel Foucault functions therein as a reference, interlocutor and, perhaps, rival. The volume is couched, however, in a Deleuzian idiom, and so requires a close familiarity with the technical terms introduced in the works of Deleuze, both his single-authored works, and the collaborative works produced with Guattari.

For those readers with the appropriate theoretical background, one of the volume's most interesting features is the introduction to an Anglophone audience of several thinkers from Scandinavia who specialize in "organizational studies," a field which is a sort of hybrid of sociology, management, and cultural studies. Pieces by these thinkers appear in four of the volume's five sections: "Order and Organisation," "Subjectivity and Transformation," "Capitalism and Resistance," and "Social Constitution and Ontology." The exception is "Art and the Outside," which includes pieces by thinkers well-known to Anglophone Deleuze studies, Ian Buchanan and Eric Alliez.

For readers interested in the Deleuze / Foucault connection, there are several major themes of interest in the collection, among them (1) the distinction between disciplinary societies and "societies of control;" (2) biopolitics; and (3) subjectification. As with all such images, it would be an exaggeration to say that Foucault begins on the inside (of discursive practices, of institutions) and seeks freedom, the outside (of thought), whereas Deleuze begins with the outside, with lines of flight, and seeks to show how insides are formed (as strata or residues). Nonetheless, there is something to this formula, as we see in Paul Patton's essay, "Order, Exteriority and Flat Multiplicities in the Social." Perhaps a more profound point of comparison is Deleuze's affinity for working in the traditional philosophical area of ontology. While Deleuze does not hesitate to write about reality – all reality, natural and social – Foucault famously hesitates, especially about "nature." While one could attempt to construct a Foucaultian

ontology of the social – the categories by which human reality is constructed – we also need to acknowledge Foucault’s hesitancy to use philosophical terms in the straightforward way in which Deleuze uses them.

Thus while it is perfectly appropriate for several of the authors – Thanem and Linstead, Albertsen and Diken, and DeLanda in particular – to deal straightaway with Deleuze’s ontology, the reader interested in Foucault will have to do the work to see the connection with the latter’s work. Similar caveats apply to most of the other essays, which treat various aspects of social life, at either a micro-scale of daily life both inside and outside organizations (Kornberger, Rhodes and ten Bos; Lohmann and Steyaert; Bay) or the macro-scale of “capitalism” (Buchanan; Holland; Vähämäki and Virtanen) and the “posthuman” (Land). This is not to say that Foucault’s name or concepts do not appear from time to time, just that the Deleuze / Foucault connection is not a major focus of the essays, with one exception, on which I will concentrate for the remainder of this review.

Maurizio Lazzarato’s essay is entitled “The Concepts of Life and the Living in the Societies of Control.” The “society of control” is Deleuze’s term for the contemporary world in which disciplinary institutions are in crisis (see Deleuze, *Negotiations* [Columbia University Press, 1995], 177-182). Deleuze is of course aware that Foucault was perfectly cognizant of such a crisis, and had in fact posited it as the condition of his writing his genealogies of disciplinary institutions, the various “births” he described: of the hospital, the prison, and so on. In his essay, Deleuze proposes a series of oppositions. The factory has been supplemented by the corporation; the perpetual re-beginning of discipline (“you’re not at school anymore, you’re in the army now!”) has been supplemented by the never-having-finished of perpetual re-training; the centralized dossier has been supplemented by dispersed files in multiple databases (which form a “virtual” dossier that can be assembled when needed); the individual viewed from a central panoptic eye has been supplemented by the “dividual,” the dispersion of profiles in multiple aspects; the enclosures of disciplinary institutions have been supplemented by an open space of multiple formation (people are today students, workers, and military trainees all at the same time). The basic difference, Deleuze proposes, is that disciplinary institutions are “molds” in which a human matter receives a definite form (children become students; rabble become workers; recruits become soldiers), while control societies are “modulators” in which a continuously changing training regime molds itself in conjunction with its target’s potentials as they appear in the process of training (“we see from your performance in yesterday’s session that you would benefit from a shift to another field of study”).

Lazzarato takes this basic perspective and feeds it into a discussion of biopower. While biopower aimed at the reproduction of a population, the society of control aims at “noo-politics” (the politics of *nous* rather than *bios*) or what Foucault would call

subjectification: public opinion, shared emotions and tastes, etc. (186). The interest in Lazzarato's piece comes from his use of the Deleuzian logic of multiplicity, what Deleuze called the "philosophy of difference." Here, individuation comes from the integration of differential relations. Deleuze often adopted the image of crystallization from Gilbert Simondon to express this process: from a metastable field, the supersaturated solution, which contains only elements in differential, rather than individuated relations, crystals form as individuals. Lazzarato shows how a similar individuation process is at work in Foucault's analysis of discipline and biopower: from the differential multiplicity of the small group (disciplinary institutions) or the mass of *le peuple* (biopower), individuals are formed with definite, malleable characteristics: the team or the population. The real benefit of his essay comes from his extending this analysis to control societies. Using Gabriel Tarde and Bergson, Lazzarato posits a virtual biological memory as the target of control, allowing the modulation of habits in a "noo-politics." From the virtual multiplicity of our social being-together (what Tarde called invention and imitation at the level of "brains"), the society of control captures and renders malleable individuated forms of social life: the pre-formed and "commodified" fads, habits, tastes, opinions, and "life styles" that are packaged and offered to us in what others have called "the postmodern condition."

While the other essays offer here and there a confrontation with or at least a reference to Foucault, Lazzarato has provided a sustained meditation on three crucial elements of the Deleuze / Foucault connection: discipline vs. "control," biopower, and subjectification. In other circumstances I would hesitate to recommend a volume to Foucault scholars based on only one essay, but the quality of Lazzarato's work, combined with the more muted encounters with Foucault in the other essays, make *Deleuze and the Social* a worthwhile purchase for readers of *Foucault Studies*.

John Protevi, Louisiana State University.