ANTHROPOS TODAY

Reflections on Modern Equipment

Paul Rabinow

Anthropos Today

IN **FOR**MATION *Series*

Anthropos Today

Reflections on Modern Equipment

Paul Rabinow

In memory of Pierre Bourdieu
for lessons, taught and not taught

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Acknowledgments

This page intentionally left blank

Anthropos Today

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction
Modern Equipment

> *Paraskeuē* [equipment], [. . .] is the medium
> through which logos is transformed into ethos.
> —Michel Foucault

This book is proposed as a meditation on Michel Foucault's claim that "equipment is the medium of transformation of logos into ethos." A good deal of work is required, however, to grasp what such a claim might mean. The difficulty in part lies in the fact that the terms "equipment" and "meditation" are used in a distinctive technical sense. Furthermore, why one would want to transform "logos" into "ethos" equally requires explanation. Hence the reader is alerted that reading this book will require a certain patience. Additionally, and unexpectedly, the book addresses the reader as a friend. Initially this appellation too is opaque. However, using as a guide Jean Paul's wonderful claim that "Philosophy is the ability to make friends through the medium of a written text," we at least have some sense of the terri-

Michel Foucault, "Hautes Etudes," in *L'Herméneutique du sujet: Cours au Collège de France, 1981–82*, ed. Frédéric Gros (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Editions Gallimard, Editions du Seuil, 2001), p. 312.

tory to be visited in the following chapters, as well as the manner in which that territory is to be traversed.[1]

A central purpose of the book is to assemble a toolkit of concepts. The goal of such a toolkit is to advance inquiry. The currently reigning modes of research in the human sciences are, it seems to me, deficient in vital respects. Those deficiencies are especially marked in the strained relations between an ever-accumulating body of information, the ways that information is given narrative and conceptual form, and how this knowledge fits into a conduct of life. No doubt all of this demands further elaboration, and this book attempts to respond to that demand.

The term "interpretive analytics" was coined by Hubert Dreyfus and myself and put to use in our book *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*.[2] Although the term cannot be said to have gained any special currency in the human sciences, I still find it useful. We arrived at the term while attempting to make Foucault's method more precise and explicit. Our claim was that Foucault was trying to move beyond the two methodological poles then dominant in the human sciences: a version of structuralism in which human signifying practice is seen as generating object-like, rule-governed semiotic systems that produce subjects as a function of discourse; and various versions of hermeneutics that found subjects and cultures infused with deep meaning they themselves had spun, webs of signification requiring interpretation. Foucault, we wrote,

> sought to avoid the structuralist analysis which eliminates notions of meaning altogether and substitutes a formal model of human behavior as rule-governed transformations of meaningless elements; to avoid the phenomenological project of tracing all elements back to the meaning-giving activity of an autonomous, transcendental subject; and finally, to avoid the attempt of commentary to read off the implicit meanings of social practices as well as the hermeneutic unearthing of a different and deeper meaning of which social actors are only dimly aware.[3]

Foucault had pieced together an innovative method through his tacking between so-called archaeological and genealogical emphases. Foucault, we argued, had gotten beyond structuralism and hermeneutics by showing how the historical relations of knowledge and power had produced an object of knowledge that was also the subject of knowledge: Man. Further, we concluded that the strengths and weaknesses of Foucault's writings could not be evaluated or appreciated adequately in terms of a correspondence theory of truth any more than through a deconstructive dissipation of the real. Rather, it seemed clear that the power of his work rested on its heuristic value.

There is a lineage of major work in the twentieth-century human sciences that has succeeded in bringing philosophical learning, diagnostic rigor, and a practice of inquiry that operates in proximity to concrete situations into a productive relationship. Such inquiry proceeds through mediated experience. It contributes to what used to be called a *Bildung*, a process of self-formation, that today might be called an attitude or an ethos. The proximity to concreteness is both the goal and the means through which inquiry operates when it works well. Understanding is a conceptual, political, and ethical practice. It is conceptual because without concepts one would not know what to think about or where to look in the world. It is political because reflection is made possible by the social conditions that enable this practice (thought may be singular, but it is not individual). It is ethical because the question of why and how to think are questions of what is good in life. Finally, all action is stylized; hence it is aesthetic, insofar as it is shaped and presented to others.

The goal of the meditations that follow is neither to systematically survey any specific domain of knowledge nor to solve any particular contemporary dispute. Rather, this book seeks to bring together a set of conceptual tools and to use them as a starting point to advance an experimental mode for the human sciences in which concepts and techniques could be made to function differently. By differently, I mean better. By better, I mean in a more

sagacious manner. By a more sagacious manner, I mean a wiser one: logos serving phronesis, phronesis under the sign of philosophy, philosophy under the sign of ethos. By ethos I refer to that space of practice at the interface of ethics and culture. It is a premise of this work that both of the latter terms are very much in question today.

Hetero-Logoi

How to think about things human is a problem. Most attempts to solve this problem deploy one or another answer that claims to offer generality and stability. These attempts have produced incompatible answers. The fact that there is a problem in thinking about human things, and that part of that problem lies in the inability to provide a stable solution, is coexistent and cotemporal with the practice itself. This state of affairs has existed from the beginnings of Western philosophy, continued through the disputatious elaboration of theology, through the proliferation of what came to be known as the natural and social sciences, and through the strife of critical theory in the twentieth century, and again today is blazing afresh among, amidst, and between different sciences. However, the form of the problem—and therefore the practices that produce it and that it produces—has not always been the same. We can conclude with some confidence, in a pragmatic spirit, that future attempts to define what the "thinking," or the "problem," "really is" are themselves fated to fail, by which I mean they will not establish themselves as enduring solutions. They will join the cacophony of dispute that is such a vexing aspect of the subject matter itself.

No consensus has ever been reached about principles, methods, and modes of problem specification, or about modes, methods, and principles of verification, or about forms of narration in the human sciences. The hope for a positive science, or the end of metaphysics, or hermeneutical closure on the Bible or other authoritative texts, is like a cargo cult, which persists in the face of constant disappointment. How can thinkers fail to notice that

almost no one outside their own immediate circle is paying attention to their proofs, their prophecies, their purges? When attempts have been made to recognize and acknowledge the reality of heterogeneity — and there have been a multitude of such attempts, especially in the last two centuries (ranging from Hegel's to Bourdieu's) — they have almost exclusively been aimed at showing the underlying unity of what merely appeared to be diverse. Yet no consensus has been reached on what that unity might be.

An examination of "interpretive communities," whether of the American pragmatist persuasion or the more recent post-Heideggerian stylizations, shows us that such communities pay no serious attention to one another. For communities of discourse, mutual engagement is fundamentally an internal matter (and a highly fractured one at that). Thus, for example, while there is an ongoing effort to disprove Freudian theory, most of those who use it don't care; they continue to analyze patients, movies, etcetera in Freudian terms. And the overwhelming majority of literate, or semiliterate, knowledge producers, who have never read a word of Freud, don't care either. As there are no sanctions except mutual contempt and the nasty book or grant review, this situation is unlikely to change. Different interpretive "federations," or simply clusters, coalesce around different questions, different methods, different standards of evidence, different types of argumentation, different career patterns, different sources of symbolic capital, differential placements within the cultural, economic, political, and social fields. Then such clusters themselves produce other subclusters, and discursive battles ensue.

This state of things is partially the result of the fact that within the human sciences no stable mechanism has been invented to centralize policing, to enforce "order and progress," to cite the old positivist motto. To make a long argument short, in the natural sciences the academies and granting agencies function as gatekeepers; without money and facilities there is no natural science. In the human sciences, no such mechanisms exist, or none, at least, approaching the same effectiveness. As salaries continue to be paid, discourses continue to augment. Only in authoritarian

systems has a degree of consensus been reached and sustained. This claim extends from the hard authoritarianisms like communism or National Socialism to softer ones in which elites rule by habitus and class affiliation and thereby control boundaries through appointments and commissions alone.

So what is one to make of this dissonance? One way out is to adopt a metaposition that begins with a principled affirmation of the inevitable plurality of positions. An inevitable plurality of logoi and perhaps of ethē as well. Philosophers in the American pragmatist tradition made a number of attempts to think this state of pluralism through as a positive condition of thought and value. From John Dewey through Richard McKeon, they have provided significant reflections on maximizing the utility and public good attained through an acknowledgment and affirmation of pluralism. Their positions, however, have tended to constitute themselves as schools and have encountered eventually the same types of divisions and disputes as other schools of philosophy.

Equipment

Why, when it comes to thinking, is there this vexation? This irritation, this distress, this tossing about? Although logos, reasoned discourse, must be a part of the solution, as what we are doing is thinking, it seems also to constitute an essential dimension of the problem. This insight might lead one to conclude that logos is expendable. Nothing could be farther from my project. Rather, it seems to me that the starting point of inquiry and reflection, the anthropological problem, lies in the apparently unavoidable fact that anthropos is that being who suffers from too many logoi.

To say that relating logos to ethos is problematic is to rephrase what has just been said. Attempts to establish a relationship between these two terms have produced different affects. Among these affects is pathos.[4] Remembering that pathos is both a medical and a theatrical term, its presence can be taken up as both diagnostic and representative. Its presence is diagnostic in the sense that something seems wrong: a form of care is called for. The presence of pathos is representative in that all staging of an-

swers themselves eventually pose the problem of how something can be represented. It follows that an attention to form is inescapable.

When Foucault undertook his famous detour into ethics during the 1980s, the topics of care and form became central. He turned to the genealogy of a type of relation between thinking and acting to which he had not given prominence, a relation that was pragmatic but not immediately political. He entitled his course at the Collège de France during the academic year 1981–82 "L'Herméneutique du sujet." The course was devoted to exploring the techniques, practices, and reflections related to "care of the self" in the late antique world. The guiding hypothesis of Foucault's rich and far-reaching lectures was that for almost two millennia the imperative to take "care of the self" had been linked to, and in fact primed, the imperative to "know thyself." Knowledge was not an end in itself; it was an essential element of a life well led. Its function was to contribute to such a life.

In the early 1980s, Foucault devoted himself to archaeological explorations of the sundering of the imperative to "know thyself" from that of its lost partner, the "care of the self." The genealogical dimension of Foucault's work explored the possibility of recreating this alliance as a problem of actuality—not, of course, to return to the older solutions but to find among those solutions a way of formulating a contemporary problem with more clarity. Frédéric Gros, the scholarly editor of the 1981–82 course, in his excellent "Afterword," succinctly sums up the core of Foucault's concerns as follows:

> (1) Can one have access to truth without putting into question the very being of the subject who achieves that access? Can one have access to truth without paying the price of a sacrifice, of an asceticism, of a transformation, of a purification, that touches the very being of the subject?
> (2) Can self knowledge, understood as part of knowledge in general, take account of the care of the self?"[5]

There existed in late antiquity a corpus of arts and techniques considered by all to be essential to the care of the self. Much of Foucault's inquiry in the 1981–82 lectures focused on this corpus,

these practices, these exercises, constituent of, and essential to, self-formation and care. His preliminary working hypothesis was that in the Western philosophical tradition there had been three major forms of reflexivity. By reflexivity Foucault means exercises of thought in which the act of thinking is itself made an object of thought. The three forms were memory, meditation, and method. In this instance, as elsewhere, Foucault is using terms such as "memory" or "method" as topics to begin an inquiry. He starts by taking one of these terms — for example, "memory" — focusing on one exemplary use of it in the writings of Plato. He then analyzes the constituent elements of the exemplary case. The recombination of these elements, as well as the addition of new ones, provides the material means to articulate a space of variation and development. This space is not the historian's space. Rather, it is a logical space, composed of historically defined and situated elements, close to that of Max Weber's "ideal types" (as we shall see later).

It was with the emergence of program of method as certitude that the concerns with the ethical conduct of a life were sundered from the search for truth. Method was conceived as operating as a form of objectivity and autonomy. Method was *amoral* in the sense that the subject of knowledge no longer needed to be in a privileged ethical state to receive the truth.[6] And the reception of objective truth had no necessary consequences for the ethical state of the subject who received it. The search for a method is a search for a "form of reflexivity that seeks a certitude that can serve as a criterion for all possible truths, and which, from that fixed point, can lead truth to a systematic organization of an objective knowledge."[7] Both of these forms, memory and method, are well known, even if their histories and fates have been complex. Neither memory nor method, however, is at the heart of Foucault's analysis. Rather, they are topics that enable him to better define the space of "meditation."

What is meditation? In the late antique world, meditation differed profoundly in its goals, practices, and forms, from meditation today. Today "meditation" carries the connotation of either an attention to inward states or of attempts to empty the mind.

The gulf that separates the older uses of this term from the current ones stands out in the definition Foucault provides. "The test of one self as a thinking subject, who acts and thinks accordingly, who has as his goal a certain transformation of the subject such that there is a self-constitution as an ethical subject of truth."[8] Meditation, then, was an exercise, an exercise of thought directed to thinking, an exercise whose goal was to connect thought to ethos.

One of the characteristic ways of describing the care of the self was as a set of exercises that prepared one for a lifelong battle against external events. Sometimes this preparation, and its associated exercises, was described as an athletic contest, sometimes as a battle. In either case, one needed a supply of proverbial weapons in order to endure and to triumph in the conflict. Foucault captures this dimension in one of those invigorating turns of phrase at which he was so gifted: "The Stoic athlete [. . .] had to be prepared for a battle, a battle in which his adversary was anything that might come at him from the outside world: the event. The antique athlete is an athlete of the event. As for the Christian, he is an athlete who confronts himself."[9] One needed a training in vigilance and agonism, because these tests were challenges at which one sought to excel, not merely to triumph or survive.

Further inquiry would reveal that historically these types would have been broken down into elements and these elements recombined in various manners. They would have been rethought and put to different uses in different contexts. Thus, for example, centuries later, work on the self, even the interior self, would come to be understood as coping with the inner significance of events. Such work, of course, would have its own distinctive practice of memory and method.

The care of the self, then, was not just a state of consciousness; it was an activity. Furthermore it was not an activity appropriate just for this or that occasion; rather, it was an essential dimension of a whole way of life. It was a constitutive element of a form of life. Thus, in one sense it was part of a broader pedagogy, in the ancient sense of paideia, or in the more modern sense of Bildung.

However, the care of the self was more than that; it was more than a stage (or set of stages) one passed through. The care of the self was also a form of critique, a critique of the self that entailed perpetual self-examination, an unlearning of bad habits as well as the forming of good ones. In sum, meditation, *meletē*, was an exercise in the practical appropriation of thinking about and toward the self. It was an appropriation aimed at literally forming the subject. It was not aimed at merely enriching his knowledge, building his reputation, or polishing his style for its own sake. The care of the self was an essential aspect of how a moral existence had to be lived. Although this preparation and this exercise focused on the care of the self, it was far from being a solitary affair. In fact, the practice of the care of the self passed through an elaborate network of relationships with others. The care of the self was highly social, and it was oriented from the self outward to others, to things, to events, and then back to the self.

How was this work, how were these exercises, to be accomplished? In the late antique world there existed a whole range of "equipment" to aid those engaged in these exercises. The key "equipment" that was required to take care of the self, to aid it in its confrontations with the proverbial slings and arrows of the external world, or more generally to accomplish the complex task of facing the future, was an arsenal, if you will, of logoi.[10] This inventory of logoi formed a kind of tool chest. The Greek word for this toolkit is *paraskeuē*, or "equipment." As the name suggests, this equipment was designed to achieve a practical end. These "true discourses," these "logoi," were neither abstractions nor, as we say today, "merely discursive." They had their own materiality, their own concreteness, their own consistency.

What was at stake in the use of this equipment was not primarily a quest for truth about the world or the self. Rather, it was a question of assimilating these true discourses, in an almost physiological sense, as aids in confronting and coping with external events and internal passions. The challenge was not just to learn these maxims, often banal in themselves, but to make them an embodied dimension of one's existence. To have them ready at hand when needed: "to make of a taught, learned, repeated, and

assimilated logos the spontaneous form of the acting subject."[11] True discourses were equipment to the extent that they had been assimilated thoroughly, made to function as rational principles of action. Learning these maxims was not hard; accomplishing the goal of making these logoi a principle of action was a lifelong process.

Throughout late antiquity, Epicureans, Stoics, and Cynics ardently debated the best use of this arsenal of logoi within the problematic of the care of the self. But all the schools of thought agreed on two things: (1) that care of the self and knowledge of the self went together, with the former priming the latter; and (2) that the deployment of true discourses was absolutely not a question of deciphering the hidden meaning of our thoughts and desires.[12] Thought was inseparable from the world, from the self, from others, from events. Thought was a practice. In sum, "*paraskeuē*, [. . .] is the medium through which logos is transformed into ethos."[13] The challenge of bringing logos and ethos into the right relationship was, and is, the challenge confronting anthropos.

Modern Equipment

In *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*, I traced some of the dimensions of how modern urban planning had gradually developed over the course of the nineteenth century. Urban planning had started with the rational reform of physical space but had gradually included more and more elements in its purview. By the time such planning had become a socialist project during the 1930s, it was proud of having expanded its scope from city planning, *un plan de ville*, to planning that included all those elements (spatial, social, psychological, architectural, hygienic, etc.) that contributed to shaping an individual life, *un plan de vie*. The goal of planning was social and individual health, a well-policed order. By 1942, the French "Plan d'Equipement National," defined *équipement* as everything that was not a "free gift of the soil, subsoil or climate. It is the work of each day and the country as a whole." One could say "equip-

ment" had become the subject matter of method. In a parallel fashion, one could say that the subject had equally become an object of method.

Thus, viewed from our current perspective, we could say that a tool chest of logoi had been gradually assembled, and partially put into practice by the state. Further, new social technologies had been invented to oblige individuals to have these rational aids ready at hand on all occasions; or, failing that, at least to have social specialists nearby who could bring the corrective benefits of these technologies to bear with the shortest possible delay. The political rationality consisted in recuperating and subsuming, through method, the traditional functions of meditation.

The task of this book is neither to rehearse the archaeology of these changes nor to evaluate them. Rather, what I am attempting to do is to reflect on how it might be possible to transfigure elements of the equipment of modern method into a form of modern meditation, and to bring the benefits and effects of that transformation to bear on inquiry. The challenge is threefold: (1) to provide a toolkit of concepts for conducting inquiries into the contemporary world in its actuality; (2) to conduct those inquiries in a manner that makes the relations, connections, and disjunctions between logos and ethos apparent and available to oneself and to others, that is to say, to make those relations part of the inquiry itself as well as part of a life; (3) to take into account the pathos encountered and engendered by such an undertaking, and to find a place for it within the form under construction.

Chapter 1
Midst Anthropology's Problems

> A term is an object so far as that object is
> undergoing shaping in a directed act of inquiry.
> — John Dewey

Michel Foucault, in *The Order of Things* (1966), identified three arenas of discourse that in their unstable and incomplete coalescence at the end of the classical age constituted the *object* called "Man," *l'homme*. This figure emerges at the intersection of three domains — life, labor, and language — unstably unified around, and constituting, a would-be sovereign *subject*. The doubling of a transcendental subject and an empirical object and their dynamic and unstable relations defined the form of this being. In 1966, Foucault held an epochal view of Man and of modernity. In his

John Dewey, "Logic of Judgments of Practice," in *Essays in Experimental Logic* (New York: Dover, 1916), p. 435. In the introduction to that volume, he states, "A term is not of course a mere word; a mere word is non-sense, for a sound by itself is not a word at all. Nor is it a mere meaning, which is not even natural non-sense, being (if it be at all) super-natural or transcendental non-sense. 'Terms' signify that certain absent existences are indicated by certain given existences, in the respect that they are abstracted and fixed for intellectual use by some physically convenient means, such as a sound or a muscular contraction of the vocal organs" (p. 51).

conclusion, Foucault intimated the imminent coming of a new configuration of language about to sweep the figure of Man away like "a face drawn in the sand at the edge of the sea."[1] It now appears that he was wrong: in the ensuing decades language, in its modality as *poiesis*, has not turned out to be the site of radical formal transformations through which this being, Man, would either disappear entirely, as Foucault intimated, or would transmute into a new type of being, as predicted by Gilles Deleuze.[2]

Although Foucault did not directly return to his diagnosis of the "end of Man," he did modify his understanding of modernity as an epoch. In his essay "What Is Enlightenment?" Foucault posed the challenge of inventing a new philosophic relationship to the present, one in which modernity was taken up not through the analytic frame of the epoch but instead through a practice of inquiry grounded in an ethos of being oriented toward the present, of contingency, of form-giving. Perhaps today one, but only one, significant challenge of forging a modern ethos lies in thinking about how to relate to the issue of anthropos. Such a task presents different types of challenges to philosophical thinkers such as Foucault than to the anthropologist. But regardless of how one approaches those questions, what if we took up recent changes in the logoi of life, labor, and language not as indicating an epochal shift with a totalizing coherence but rather as fragmented and sectorial changes that pose problems, both in and of themselves and for attempts to make sense of what form(s) anthropos is currently being given?

Labor, Life, Language

In 1966, capitalism was strong in its enclaves but not completely unchallenged: it faced neither what now appears to have been a hopeless socialism nor various failed schemes for the political or economic development of the Third World. In 2003, no one can doubt that capitalism is more expansive, destructive, and productive than ever before. No one can doubt the growing scope and scale of market relations and the concomitant commodification of an ever greater range of things previously held to be external

to the realm of monetary value. However, today there exists nei-
ther a logos adequate to understanding this globalizing oikeu-
mene nor a means of regulating its volatility. In 1966 the me-
chanics of the genetic code and its extraordinary universality was
just being discovered. The ensuing decades have seen the most
dramatic and significant changes in the life sciences since Darwin.
Yet no molecular Darwin has yet appeared to provide a unifying
logos. Where and when and whether the technology-driven ad-
vances of genomics and biotechnology will transform into an
understanding of living beings more adequate to their evident
complexity remains to be seen. Although in 1966 semiotics, cy-
bernetics, and cognitive science competed to unify all language,
and although today we are in the midst of a revolution brought
about by the invention and spread of technologies of communica-
tion and information, there still exists no unifying logos of
discourse.

At the very least, then, we can say that we are currently under-
going and participating in a distinctive set of inflections of labor,
life, and language.[3] Perhaps, after all, the project of seeking
Man—life, labor, language—as the logos of modernity has been
dissolved. Or it may be that seeking such a logos actually was the
wrong approach. Perhaps the multiplication and heterogeneity of
recent logoi has put anthropos once again into question. We can
see more clearly today that Foucault's Man was only one instan-
tiation of the *figure* of anthropos. However, the one thing we
should not be doing is attempting to find a new, hidden, deeper,
unifying rationality or ontology. The alternative is not chaos.
Rather, using the concept of problematization, and the topic of
anthropos, we can direct our efforts toward inventing means of
observing and analyzing how the various logoi are currently be-
ing assembled into contingent forms.

Inquiry: From Reconstruction to Problematization

This surfeit of forms of knowledge is problematic, and is chal-
lenging to find ways to deal with it. To do so, we pursue our
convocation of Dewey and Foucault, two thinkers who made the

issues of encumbrances, discordances, and problems into topics of inquiry.

John Dewey opened his long introduction to *Essays in Experimental Logic* (1916) by advising his readers that "the key" to his essays was to be found in his emphasis on "the temporal development of experience." Thinking was itself a temporal experience, or, to be more precise, thinking was a temporal experiment. Terms such as "thinking," "reflection," or "judgment," Dewey asserted, are not faculties; rather, they "denote inquiries or the results of inquiries, and that inquiry occupies an intermediate and mediating place in the development of an experience."[4] Dewey's summation of the logic of experiment and experience places reason squarely in an intermediate position and assigns it a mediating function. Thinking takes place in a milieu. Playing on the original sense of the term—*mi-lieu*, between places—one can say that thinking takes place between places but not just anywhere, or anytime. Dewey explains:

> From the standpoint of temporal order, we find reflection, or thought, occupying an intermediate and reconstructive position. It comes between a temporally prior situation, an organized interaction of factors, of active and appreciative experience, wherein some of the factors have become discordant and incompatible, and a later situation, which has been constituted out of the first situation by means of acting on the findings of reflective inquiry. The final solution thus has a richness of meaning, as well as a controlled character lacking in the original.[5]

For Dewey, then, thinking is not only a practice set in a dynamic milieu, it is an action called forth and set into motion by a discordancy. The function of thinking is to rectify—in the sense of "realign"—the factors that have produced, and/or been altered by, a disruption. In order to fulfill its function, thinking must take up an active relationship to the milieu in which it finds itself; and so must, presumably, the thinker. Further, Dewey assigns thinking the task of providing a reconstructive "richness of meaning," although exactly what he means by "richness" remains vague. Think-

ing, then, is a situated practice of active inquiry whose role and goal is to initiate a movement from a discordant situation to a more harmonious one. Thinking is nothing more nor less than this practice.

The value terms by which the norms of that movement, and the practice that initiates it, are guided and judged are control and meaning. Control and meaning are not subjective terms. Neither the primary locus nor the yardstick of this practice are to be found in the subject. Dewey makes this point through a striking, if ambiguous, formulation, "it is the needs of a *situation* which are determinative."[6] We can gloss his claim by saying that thinking is a temporally unfolding, situated practice, the function of which is to clarify and to realign a problematic situation. The site of the trouble and of its resolution is the problematic situation. Intervention is judged successful when it yields a reconstructive change through meeting the needs of the situation. Intervention and inquiry are thus essentially practical—Dewey, after all, was a pragmatist, an optimist, and an American. Thinking operated with no fixed universal principles, no innate and unalterable faculties. Dewey's claims are both persuasive and contestable. Are there situations that cannot be repaired? This is not a question that can be answered in the abstract, but one can ask whether Dewey allows sufficient space either for critical limits or a sense of pathos or tragedy. If not, is this lack a major limitation of his work? The answer is complicated, as Dewey was made aware of these issues through repeated attacks by the left and right (both theological and secular) in America over more than a half-century.[7]

A core ambiguity of Dewey's position can be located in his noteworthy metaphoric frame. For a metaphoric frame it is: how, we wonder, do situations have *needs*? Without entering into the vast literature of debate about functionalism, organicism, and anthropocentrism that characterized so much of twentieth-century social thought, not to mention the equally vast scholarly production around metaphor to which the cultural sciences for the last half-century have devoted so much effort, let us simply suggest, following Georges Canguilhem, that it is epistemologically and

historically preferable to say that modern situations are *normed*. Or that, to be more precise, norms function actively so as to ceaselessly spread a grid of normativity into an expanding range of situations. Looking at the question from this angle, we can move from Dewey's approach to situations in general to a historically more specific subset of discordant dynamism.

One can find a partial but pronounced resonance, a purely coincidental one in terms of direct influence, in Michel Foucault's concept of "problematization." A "problematization," Foucault writes, "does not mean the representation of a preexistent object nor the creation through discourse of an object that did not exist. It is the ensemble of discursive and nondiscursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc.)."[8] The reason that problematizations are problematic, not surprisingly, is that, something prior "must have happened to introduce uncertainty, a loss of familiarity; that loss, that uncertainty, is the result of difficulties in our previous way of understanding, acting, relating."[9] For Foucault there are always several possible ways of responding to "the same ensemble of difficulties." Consequently, the primary task of the analyst is not to proceed directly toward intervention and repair of the situation's discordancy but rather to understand and to put forth a diagnosis of "what makes these responses simultaneously possible." In contrast to Dewey, Foucault stops short, in a rigorously self-limiting manner, of proposing means of rectification. The extent to which Foucault's practice could be assimilated to a reconstruction (in Dewey's sense) is therefore complicated. He would seem to be constructing something like an ideal type, but since Weber's concept of the ideal type has been massively misinterpreted, this comparison has limited utility.

For Foucault the specific diacritic of thought is found not only in this act of diagnosis but additionally in the attempt to achieve a modal change from seeing a situation not only as "a given" but as "a question." Such a modal shift seeks to accomplish a num-

ber of things. It asserts that in any historically troubled situation, not only are there multiple constraints at work but multiple responses as well. Foucault underscores this condition of heterogeneous, if constrained, contingency — "this transformation of an ensemble of difficulties into problems to which diverse solutions are proposed" — in order to propose a particular style of inquiry. Foucault saw his calling as a contribution to the "freeing up" of possibilities. The act of thinking is an act of modal transformation from the constative to the subjunctive. From the singular to the multiple. From the necessary to the contingent.

A problematization, then, is both a kind of general historical and social situation — saturated with power relations, as are all situations, and imbued with the relational "play of truth and falsehood," a diacritic marking a subclass of situations — as well as a nexus of responses to that situation. Those diverse but not entirely disparate responses, it follows, themselves form part of the problematization as it develops or unfolds (although both words are too Hegelian) over time. What Foucault is attempting to conceptualize is a situation that is neither simply the product of a process of social and historical construction nor the target of a deconstruction. Rather, he is indicating a historical space of conditioned contingency that emerges in relation to (and then forms a feedback situation with) a more general situation, one that is real enough in standard terms but not fixed or static. Thus the domain of problematization is constituted by and through economic conditions, scientific knowledges, political actors, and other related vectors. What is distinctive is Foucault's identification of the problematic situation, the situation of the process of a specific type of problem making, as simultaneously the object, the site, and ultimately the substance of thinking.

It is important to notice that Foucault differs from Dewey on this point: Dewey identified discordant forces and a breakdown of meaning as the locus of experience and the target of action. From the very start of his methodological work, Foucault sought to bracket meaning as well as the standard form of truth claims. What was substituted, if that is not too mechanical a word, was a series of forms of nominalist seriousness, of which problematiza-

tion was the last. Foucault's concept of problematization is broad but not unlimited in scope. It is surely not as general as Dewey's "discordance." Rather, Foucault requires that the situation in question contain institutionally legitimated claims to truth or one or another type of sanctioned seriousness; Dreyfus and I called them "serious speech acts." Without the presence of serious speech acts, there is no problematization in the strict sense of the term, although obviously there could be problems.

In contrast to earlier positions he held, Foucault's thinker is, by definition, neither entirely outside of the situation in question nor entirely enmeshed within it, without recourse or options. The defining trait of problematization does not turn on the couplings of opposites (outside or inside, free or constrained), but rather on the type of relationship forged between observer and problematized situation. The specificity of that relationship entails taking up the situation simultaneously as problematic and as something about which one is required to think.[10]

Cultural Goods

The emergence of the complex of discourses, practices, and strategies lumped under the term "ethics," or "bioethics," or "medical ethics," indicates the presence of a problematized domain. One might well wonder, How did "ethical relations" become a zone of such charged importance? Upon reflection, however, we must pose the prior question: When and under what circumstances did "ethical relations" become an object domain at all? How did they become a problem — and a solution — and thereby a new problem domain?

One can say that two of the most distinctive innovations of the 1990s inflecting anthropos were the visionary projects, technological developments, and institutional stabilizations of (1) genome mapping and (2) bioethics. Although bioethics is perhaps a decade older than genome mapping, their trajectories have been in part entwined in recent years. Both genome mapping and bioethics are increasingly transnational, although both were power-

fully spearheaded in the United States. Latterly, European com-
missions and numerous authorized spokespeople have elaborated
and disseminated the associated doctrines and practices around
the world. Thus, for example, following in the wake of the ven-
ture capitalists, biotech start-ups, and multinational pharmaceuti-
cal companies, more and more people around the world are grow-
ing accustomed to thinking of themselves, and their pets and plants
and food, as having genomes. These genomes, it is believed, con-
tain precious information that tells the truth about who they, and
their pets and plants and food, really are and provides clues to
what their future holds. Influenced by the aforementioned pur-
veyors of biopolitical futures, more and more people are also
coming to believe that their genomes contain information that is
rightfully their property. If someone else uses it, their individual
and collective identity has been not only violated but pirated.
Both multinational corporations *and* NGOs frequently work —
however unequal they may be in their political power — to rein-
force this view of the body, the self, ownership, and truth. Power
and resistance, it has been claimed, can act mutually, if unwit-
tingly, to reinforce a type of rationality and the forms it takes.

HUMAN RIGHTS: HUMAN GOOD?

Historian and journalist Michael Ignatieff makes a claim that is
striking and, upon reflection, perplexing: "There has been a revo-
lution in the moral imagination in the last fifty years. [. . .] and
its most distinctive feature is the emergence and triumph of hu-
man rights discourse as the language of human good."[11] Is this
true? If so, what brought about this change? What was the domi-
nant figure of moral imagination in Europe before World War II?
Is there, in fact, a dominant figure of morality? Other related
questions come to mind. For example, How does human rights
discourse relate to issues of health? How do both rights and
health relate to biopolitics?

  The contemporary self-evidence of the legitimacy of human
rights discourse is even more striking when one realizes that be-
fore 1945 there existed no international legal framework for the

protection of individual human rights. As Hannah Arendt made clear in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, those without passports ran the greatest of risks, for only states (and their citizens) had rights.[12] To be stripped of an official attachment to a nation left one in the most precarious and vulnerable state. This fact underscores the historical originality of the new formation of human rights to which Ignatieff refers, but also the rather curious condition instantiated by it. After all, rights discourses have been around for centuries, but the rights discoursed of were not defended in an extra-discursive institutional location. If human rights are natural, or God-given, or merely self-evident, then how is it that protection at the scale of "humanity" has not been previously invented? What has made the political and cultural shift toward such protection possible? Where has the urgency come from? To see that these are real questions, we must first acknowledge that the claim to self-evidence is itself problematic.

Although the Enlightenment idea of a common human history with cosmopolitan intent and reflections on the conditions that would produce "perpetual peace" had been a topic in a longstanding problematization, most famously in the writings of Immanuel Kant, yet it was only after the fall of the Soviet empire that the conditions have come about, Ignatieff argues, for the appearance of "an at least virtual global civil society." Ignatieff underscores that the Holocaust is not the main motive force in putting human rights on the world agenda. The special consciousness of the Holocaust as an utterly singular event only became widespread in the 1960s and 1970s when the first postwar generation came to political consciousness. A similar argument is spelled out in detail for the United States by Peter Novick in his book *The Holocaust in American Life*.[13]

Ignatieff specifies his claim when he asserts that with the fall of the Soviet empire there is now a "single human rights culture in the world." This claim is difficult to evaluate; after all, it is generally recognized within anthropology that the culture concept today raises more questions than it solves.[14] Whatever one wishes to make of, say, pre-contact "Hawaiian culture" after the lengthy, sophisticated, and acrimonious debate between Marshall Sahlins

and Gananath Obeyesekere concerning its status and meaning, "rights culture" would certainly have to have a different status. Whatever kind of culture "rights culture" is, it certainly must exist and shape people's lives in a manner different from "Hawaiian culture."

Nor is it as self-evident as Ignatieff claims that rights discourse actually does dominate the moral landscape of the human good. Market cultures and religious cultures — to use shorthand and to trouble the conceit of culture even more — remain potent contenders for the privilege of defining *who* speaks morally, *how* to speak morally, and *what* moral speaking is about. Secular rights cultures, cultures of consumption, and a wide range of religious and neotraditionalist moral discourses, and the symbols deployed by all three, function at times and in specific settings as competitors, or rank enemies, at times and for certain issues as complexly complementary, and at times and for specific issues as simply copresent, or cordoned off one from the other. Claims to hegemony are typical of this moral landscape, but practices of coexistence are equally representative.

Ignatieff points in the direction of this elusiveness and substantive contradiction, or pragmatic flexibility, when he writes that "The legitimacy of human rights is not so much its authoritative universalism, so much as its capacity to become a moral vernacular for the demand for freedom within local cultures."[15] A moral vernacular? Perhaps, albeit one that derives in part from a highly articulated transnational form that is anything but vernacular. It is obvious that market cultures and religious cultures often are also the vehicle for such moral vernaculars, just as they are themselves transnationally located, a fact that cannot be readily accommodated into a narrative of hope and progress set within the essentially nineteenth-century trope of modernization and tradition.

Ignatieff, remains, as he himself says, a Victorian, whatever such a claim could actually mean.[16] The nineteenth century, of course, was the time of a triumphant ascendancy of normalization, a time of World Expositions and international competitions over capital, science, and sovereignty. As if surprised at himself, Ignatieff immediately draws back from his self-characterization

as a Victorian when he writes: "Human rights is misconceived if it is understood as a breviary of values: rights talk can do no more than formalize the terms in which conflicts of values are made precise and therefore rendered amenable to compromise and solution. This is their dynamic: they do not, in themselves, resolve arguments; they create the steadily burgeoning case law, which in turn expands the ambit of human rights claims."[17] Rights language is dynamic, destabilizing; it is, in the sense Canguilhem and then Foucault used the term, normalizing. "Once rights language exists in public consciousness, it sets up a dynamic directed at the inevitable gap between what a society practices and what it preaches." That gap is its engine, its steam, its normativity. Of course, just as "culture" is rather in disrepute as a concept today, so, too, is "society." Societies don't practice anything anymore than they preach. Spokesmen for regimes, ideologues, missionaries, and pastors preach — not society.

In any event, there is much about this talk of rights that is new; it is generally not autochthonous, at least not in the specific forms in which it is being disseminated around the world through a variety of practices — especially by international bodies linked to the United Nations and a multitude of NGOs; it is not rooted in the long-standing beliefs, practices, and representations of a defined community. Rather, it would seem to be partly a doctrine, partly a module in what Robert Bellah has called a "life style enclave," as a not entirely positive term for a trend to self-conscious and delocalized practices stitched together in a form of life that Bellah characterizes as "thin." But newness and "thinness" are derogatory only if one thinks that thick and old are better. If one sees the rise, spread, and triumph of "rights talk" as a good thing, then its newness, and perhaps the ready comprehensibility of its core message, would carry with them a positive valence. This positive valuation is one Ignatieff shares.

Regardless of one's individual judgment of these matters, as human scientists we want to observe how this talk — in fact, a set of discursive and nondiscursive practices — is taking shape. Our imperative is to learn more about the variety and practices of human rights groups as well as the (now visible) preexisting

moral landscapes to which the carriers of rights culture bring their message of change and improvement. Although there are governments who contest and combat "rights talk," and the groups who articulate it, on a variety of grounds, including national sovereignty and traditional culture, it is plausible to argue that currently no secular counterdiscourse exists that has anything like the legitimacy, power, and potential for successful expansion that the human rights discourse does.

A significant move toward specifying how one might approach these developments sociologically is made by Yves Dezalay and Bryant Garth, in an article in Pierre Bourdieu's journal, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, entitled "Droits de l'homme et philanthropie hégémonique." They provide a penetrating analysis of recent, seemingly contradictory developments in the field of human rights. "The movement for human rights is often presented as an exemplary illustration of those new transnational practices that escape from state order. However, by a sort of paradox, it is the national state's recognition of this 'soft law' that represents the fulfillment of the militants' efforts, leading to a growing professionalization and competition within the market of political activism."[18] There are several claims embedded here. First, the perfectly straightforward and not especially controversial point that within a transnational field, national interests, institutions, and players remain significant actors; sovereignty in most domains remains national. Even when it is not absolute, national states and institutions remain funnels, as it were, through which things must pass on the way in or the way out. Although, as many authors have argued, we are witnessing new relationships between the national and the transnational, this transformation cannot be equated with the definitive eclipse of national sovereignty.

More original is the second claim, that there is a *market for humanitarianism*. In *Dealing in Virtue*, Garth and Dezalay provide a detailed account of one example of how a sector of this

market—international legal arbitration—came into existence, changed, and currently operates. Strikingly, success within the humanitarian market depends on many of the same strategies employed in the world of venture capital. These include capturing the attention of various traditional media as well as innovating in the use of new media (NGOs pioneered the use of the fax machine and then the Internet for political mobilization and the articulation of virtual communities), securing funding from "donor" institutions, translating into position for international conferences and agencies, high mobility of personnel, et cetera. One sees a marketing of symbolic capital resources "whose investments and counseling strategy must prepare its clients to overcome the very intense competition that reigns in the market of civic virtue."[19] Following Bourdieu, our authors do not assert that the market in humanitarianism and the capital markets are the same, only that there are parallel principles and forces at work. The analysts' task is to identify those principles and forces as well as to investigate how "capital" from one market is converted into "capital" (or advantage) in another. Garth and Dezalay analyze in some detail the changing players and goals involved in the "diffusion of this new symbolic imperialism." They speak of an "elitist democratic" project, conceived and carried by a small group of "learned men" (English in the text) "desirous of social progress and civic morality, but very respectful of the interests of big capital, whose inheritors, collaborators and beneficiaries they are."[20] The field of these civic engagements and disagreements is a microcosm of the fractures within the ruling class. To invest in civic virtue is also to construct the state and to assure oneself of a position of legitimacy on the international market of *savoirs d'état*, "state knowledges."[21]

In *Empire*, Tony Negri and Michael Hardt make a similar point. They argue that military intervention is only one form of imperial intervention. (By imperial they do not mean imperialist but the regime of sovereignty that comes after imperialism.) Judicial and moral forms provide potent vectors as well. In fact, Negri and Hardt argue that the softer, "moral" forms are frequently deployed first. Following Weber, we might say that such moral intervention is less costly in both economic and political terms.

The most original new form of such intervention is the so-called nongovernmental organization, which, not being state-based, is especially well suited to make moral claims. Such humanitarian NGOs as Amnesty International, Oxfam, and Médecins sans Frontières, often despite the conscious intentions of their participants, are

> some of the most powerful pacific weapons of the new world order. These NGOs conduct "just wars" without arms, without violence, without borders. Like the Dominicans in the late medieval period and the Jesuits at the dawn of modernity, these groups strive to identify universal needs and defend human rights. Their modern universalism operates both at the level of rights and at the level of the most basic needs of life. It is the key symbol of a growing market of increasing sophistication for protectors of living beings and vital things. Its space is the space of the bio-political.[22]

For those in the human sciences who prefer to trace these grand themes back to historically specific cases and locations, David Rothman in his book *Strangers at the Bedside* provides helpful argument and chronology. Rothman shows that the rise of medical ethics boards was not the consequence of the Nuremberg trials. Rather, both in the United States and Europe, the trials were understood as revealing the sharp line cordoning off the pathological from the normal. Nuremberg did not put into question the normal practices or the authority of paternalistic science and medicine. Bioethics in the United States arose rather from the scandals of Willow Brook, Tuskegee, and other experimental venues. The change in American medicine—the awareness that its paternalistic authority needed regulation—took place between 1966 and 1976. In 1966 Henry Beecher, a Harvard Medical School professor, exposed abuses in human experimentation, and in 1974 a national commission on medical ethics was established by the U.S. Congress. A new formality was introduced that ushered in collective decision making and what might be called a new publicity. "This formality transformed the medical chart from an essentially private means of communication among doctors to a public piece of evidence that documented what the doc-

tor had told, and heard from, the patient."[23] Tacit practices be-
came objects of analysis, scrutiny, and regulation. As Rothman
observes, wrongs abounded: "A series of exposés of practices in
human experimentation revealed a stark conflict of interest be-
tween clinical investigations and human subjects, between re-
searchers' ambitions and patients' well-being." These linkages
were made readily in the light of the civil rights movements gain-
ing strength in the 1960s, for "the great majority of research
subjects were minorities, drawn from the ranks of the poor, the
mentally disabled, and the incarcerated." Victims filed suits; phi-
losophers wrote treatises on "bioethics" (a strange new word),
Congress and state legislatures passed laws to prohibit the exploi-
tation of experimental subjects. But there is more. Rothman ob-
serves that "some regulatory measures were bound to be imposed
on medicine when the bill for national health care skyrocketed
from $19 billion in 1960 to $275 billion by 1980 and $365 bil-
lion by 1985."[24] Indeed, new experiences, new experiments, new
markets, new actors, new rules mean a new game in which medi-
cal research, health care delivery, and capital, as well as the asso-
ciated lawyers, advocates, ethicists, and others, were coupled in
multiple positions in many sites beyond the bedside.

The developments Rothman describes are part of a larger space
in which an ethics of life and death, of the normal and the patho-
logical, of well-being and deprivation, of degeneration and growth,
is articulated and problematized. This fluid space is one traversed
by layered economies and multiple new logoi. Contrary to Negri,
I do not think we should approach it as a space of epochal
change driven and shaped by a ghostly transhistorical force —
sovereignty — but rather as a space of concrete problems, dan-
gers, and hopes that is actual, emergent, and virtual.

Restraint

Hans Blumenberg proposes an original solution to the question
of why the practitioners of modern reason have proliferated to-
talizing systems, especially philosophies of history, and why these

systems have all failed. In *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, Blumenberg provides a lengthy account of the background to these perpetually futile and ever-renewed efforts. In seeking to diagnose the root causes of the incessant overreaching that has characterized modern thought, Blumenberg rejects the notion that reason itself or the "will to knowledge," is essentially demonic; such a position, he underscores, is itself symptomatic of excessive hopes for reason that were then disappointed. Rather, he locates the problem in a historical fact: "Modern reason, in the form of philosophy, accepted the challenge of the questions, both the great and the all too great, that were bequeathed to it."[25] Bequeathed, that is, by the great systems of Christian theology. Although Blumenberg devotes hundreds of erudite pages to demonstrating that the great theological systems were themselves unstable, he nonetheless argues that there had been a proportionality of scale between the type of questions posed and the type of answers provided. That proportionality between problem and response broke down in the seventeenth century. Yet the former questions (about the nature of being, of logic, of general principles of the cosmos) continued to be posed and, more importantly, accepted as legitimate, that is, as requiring answers. Blumenberg's diagnosis is that modern thinkers "found it impossible to decline to answer questions about the totality of history. To that extent the philosophy of history is an attempt to answer a medieval question with the means available to a post medieval age."[26] The wrong tools for the wrong job.

These broad historical problem formations and the sequential answers provided constitute Blumenberg's subject matter. "The continuity of history [. . .] lies not in the permanence of ideal substances but rather in the inheritance of problems." Blumenberg paints a massively detailed portrait of successive articulations of problems, their philosophical/theological answers, and their failure, displacement, and rearticulation — in his vocabulary, a history of reoccupations. However, Blumenberg's thesis is not itself a philosophy of history, at least in the traditional sense. He does not see the developments he chronicles as either unalterable or inevitable, that is, as fatal, for such an attitude would place

him squarely in a reoccupation zone, which Blumenberg stead-fastly refuses to enter. Rather, it is only in later modernity that the long-term pattern of problem-failure-shift and a new articulation of the problem has itself become the topic of theoretical curiosity. This new perspective has opened up because, as Blumenberg explains in the section entitled "The Trial of Theoretical Curiosity," theoretical curiosity, under constant attack from many quarters, has been obliged to question its own legitimacy. As Blumenberg's translator puts it in his introductory remarks, "By questioning the nature of our own questioning, we alter the dynamic of our curiosity not by fiat, by proscribing questions, but by extending it to and satisfying it on another level."[27] In sum, Blumenberg aims at a critical, curative, and affirmative diagnosis. His position is critical in that it seeks to establish through inquiry the contemporary limits of reason; it is curative because, if his critical inquiry were to be sustained, a situation would arise in which certain of the current maladies afflicting the practice of reason would disappear; and it is affirmative in that it seeks not to denounce or proscribe reason but to articulate the conditions under which reason can (currently) operate with legitimacy.

Observing, naming, and analyzing the forms of anthropos is the logos of one type of anthropology. How best to think about the arbitrariness, contingency, and powerful effects of those forms constitutes the challenge of that type of anthropology, understood as *Wissenschaft* or *science*. To place oneself amidst the relationships of the contending logoi (embedded as they are within problematizations, apparatuses, and assemblages) is to find oneself among anthropology's problems.

Chapter 2
Method

> It is not the "actual" interconnections of "things" but the *conceptual* interconnections of *problems* which define the scope of the various sciences. A new "science" emerges where new problems are pursued by new methods and truths are thereby discovered which open up significant new points of view.
> —Max Weber

Max Weber's classic essay "Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy" has received much critical attention in the Weber literature, as it is one of his few sustained statements about conceptual and methodological issues. It was drafted as Weber was writing the first version of *The Protestant Ethic*, after recovering, in the winter of 1902, from one of his severe breakdowns, which had lasted four years. The critical literature generally ignores the fact that the essay was in part collectively written and was intended as a broad policy statement. In the summer of 1903, Werner Sombart, Edgar Jaffé, and Max Weber assumed joint editorship of the

Max Weber, "Objectivity in the Social Sciences," in *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, trans. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch (New York: Free Press, 1949), p. 68.

prestigious journal *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozial-politik* (with its ties to the academic socialists).[1] Published in 1904, the essay was a manifesto.

An intriguing sidelight, to which I wish to draw the reader's attention, is that although the adjective "social" appears twice in the journal's title, Weber and his colleagues dismissed the concept of "society" as utterly devoid of intellectual substance. "It is now no accident that the term: social which seems to have a quite general meaning, turns out to have, as soon as one carefully examines its application, a particular specifically colored though often indefinite meaning. Its 'generality' rests on nothing but its ambiguity. It provides, when taken in its 'general' meaning, no specific *point of view*, from which the *significance* of given elements of culture can be analyzed."[2] The center around which Weber's remarks turn in this essay is *Kultur*, a concept saturated with significance and point of view, although hardly exempt from ambiguity.

Cultural Singularity

The "Objectivity" essay opens by claiming that "every science treating the institutions and events of human culture, [. . .] first arose in connection with *practical* considerations."[3] Like clinical medicine, "sociology" was a technique developed within a setting of problem solving. Social science techniques arose as procedures directed at improving state policy. Hence they originally contained no fundamental split between "is" and "ought." It was only as social analysis gained autonomy, and became embedded in a larger metaphysics, that it began to be haunted by the problem of values.

The emergence of a distinctive and problematic form of establishing the limits of cultural understanding was rooted in a specific historical ethos during the nineteenth century: "With the awakening of the historical sense, a combination of ethical evolutionism and historical relativism became the predominant attitude in our science."[4] This cultural development led to a belief

among economists that their task was to combine science and ethics, or, more precisely, that science and ethics formed a bound pair within a cultural totality unfolding through time. Weber and his colleagues thundered their disapproval of this stance, not because it combined values and facts but because it did so uncritically. They saw neither the possibility nor the desirability of totally disconnecting value judgments and scientific analysis. Rather, they wanted the problem of analysis and value to be taken up with more clarity as to its cultural significance. There is no doubt, our authors held, that scientific analysis can help to clarify the appropriateness of specific actions in specific situations. Scientific analysis can provide a dispassionate evaluation of the objective possibilities. Such technical criticism was not the same as the justification of political or social action. Science can only help to clarify the advantages and disadvantages of alternative means.

Ends, too, can be clarified—but not by science. Ends can be objectified: they can be historically contextualized and reflected on. They can also be evaluated as to their internal consistency. The sedimented assumptions and historical circumstances involved in concrete value judgments can be brought to light and made available for further discussion. Beyond that logico-historical clarification lies only "will" and "conscience" as bases for action. "It must [be] recognize[d] that general views of life and the universe can never be the products of increasing empirical knowledge, and that the highest ideals, which move us most forcefully, are always formed only in the struggle with other ideals, which are just as sacred to others as ours are to us."[5] By 1917, when Weber reformulated many of the same ideas in his equally classic manifestos "Politics as a Vocation" and "Science as a Vocation," the confidence and hope of the prewar years had given way to an austere neutrality, a waiting in the night.

For Weber and his colleagues, the problem is, How does one take up this situation? After recognizing its historical formation, one must also recognize its critical contours. "There is and always will be," they assert, "an unbridgeable distinction among (1) those arguments which appeal to our capacity to become en-

thusiastic about and our feeling for concrete practical aims or cultural forms and values, (2) those arguments in which, once it is a question of the validity of ethical norms, the appeal is directed to our conscience, and finally (3) those arguments which appeal to our capacity and need for *analytically ordering* empirical reality in a manner which lays claim to *validity* as empirical truth."[6] Phrased another way, one could ask, How is one to separate, and then bring into a relationship, arguments aiming at affect, those aiming at conscience, and those aiming at validity? When one poses the question in these terms, answering it becomes simultaneously a matter of rhetoric (in the classical sense of using appropriate figures and tropes to achieve stipulated ends within specific genres) and of one's attitude toward modernity (which has rent asunder the assumption that there can be a unified organon of arts and sciences). Clearly, the latter is at issue for our turn-of-the-last-century Germans.

What kind of social science would result from this diagnosis of the social differentiation of modernity? If we approached Weber through the secondary literature, the answer would be far from clear. On the one hand, there is extended commentary and endless debate in that literature concerning what really constitutes the central theme of Weber's work: we would find rationalization, comparative sociology, differentiation of value spheres, the fate of the life orders in modernity. On the other hand, we would also find an extensive commentary on how to characterize Weber's methodology. Although this is a complicated topic, Weber and his colleagues actually do provide a rather succinct and clear statement of their position in the "Objectivity" essay. The goal of their journal, they state, is to address: "*the general cultural significance of the social-economic structure of the human community and its historical forms of organization.*"[7]

That unexceptional generality, however, is immediately qualified. "The type of social science in which we are interested is an *empirical science* of concrete *reality* [*Wirklichkeitswissenschaft*]. Our aim is the understanding of the characteristic uniqueness of the reality in which we move." The goal of advancing an empiri-

cal science still seems to be a straightforward, if somewhat vague, objective. Presumably the science is empirical because it is addressed to concrete reality, that which is "really there," as the German says. Such claims on occasion earned Weber the epithet of "positivist." In the following sentence, however, the limits are again narrowed and made strikingly more distinctive. What exactly is meant by "characteristic uniqueness" in this context? Weber's answer is "the relationships and cultural significance of individual events in their contemporary manifestations and [. . .] the causes of their being historically *so* and not *otherwise*."[8] Consequently, "cultural significance" here cannot mean something "cultural" in the sense the term has come to have in American anthropology. Weber's view is not one that claims to grasp total patterns of life understood as organized wholes. Weber and his colleagues are not Clifford Geertz reading the text of Balinese culture leaning over the shoulders of the Balinese, who are, as Geertz believed, enacting it for him and for themselves. Rather, the Weberian position is historical through and through. Above all, Weber's position is attentive not to generalities but to singularities.

Weber provides an extensive, and sarcastic, analysis of the utter futility of seeking a total description of reality. Even the smallest detail of daily life presents an "infinite multiplicity" of possible things to know. Weber's description of the infinite, buzzing confusion of cultural life resonates with that of William James. His description of the eerie ridiculousness of attempting either to lead a life or to describe life from no point of view is reminiscent of Robert Musil's *The Man without Qualities*. The object itself will never provide the basis for empirical science. So how is the analyst to define that which is worth being known? One must, Weber underscores, have a point of view: "In *which* sense and in *which* situations this [significance] is the case is not revealed to us by any law; it is decided according to the *value-ideas* in the light of which we view 'culture' in each individual case."[9] Consequently, the methodology is circular, as is entirely appropriate for an interpretive undertaking. Thus, "culture" is a finite segment of the meaningless infinity of the world process, a segment on which

human beings confer meaning and significance." However, "All knowledge of cultural reality [. . .] is always knowledge *from particular points of view*."[10] Thus the methodology is hermeneutic, but it is neither totalizing nor transhistorical. Weber is neither Burckhardt nor Dilthey, neither Geertz nor Sahlins. For Weber, both the object of understanding and the subject of understanding are historically situated and "in question." Understanding and meaning are a task and a quest; understanding and meaning are a duty and a vocation.

While we are now clear that Weber disdained resorting to cultural wholes for significance and looked instead to historical objects, we are still not clear what type of thing these historical objects are. The answer is that they are *individual events*. This answer raises the question, What are "events," and how does one know (or decide) what "individual events" to focus on? Weber provides an indication of how to answer this query. He writes: "It is not the 'actual' interconnections of 'things' but the conceptual interconnections of problems which define the scope of the various sciences. A new 'science' emerges where new problems are pursued by new methods and truths are thereby discovered which open up significant new points of view."[11] The act of identifying the "conceptual interconnections of problems" (rather than those interconnections themselves) is the subject and object, as well as the site of the logic, ethics, and politics of cultural understanding and the science appropriate to it. It follows that such a science would be perpetually changing.

Ideal Types

The methodological question then becomes, How is one to identify and analyze new problems? The Weberian answer is a hybrid of Diltheian *verstehen*, Nietzschean genealogy, and an objective procedure that serves as a counterbalance to Dilthey and Nietzsche. That device is the ideal type. It is designed to curb the excesses and blindness of subjectivity as well as those of objectivity. "The ideal typical concept will help to develop our skill in

imputation in *research*: it is no 'hypothesis' but it offers guidance to the construction of hypotheses. It is not a description of reality but it aims to give unambiguous means of expression to such a description."[12] It is precisely in the space between lived experience and the thing-like mechanisms and constraints of social facts that the ideal type is valuable.

The ideal type provides him with a means of combining the strengths (while counterbalancing the weaknesses) of multiple perspectives. "An ideal type," he writes, "is formed by the one-sided *accentuation* of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent *concrete individual* phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified *analytical* construct [*Gedankenbild*]."[13] If there ever was a heterogeneous assemblage brought into a form and made available for thought, it is the *Gedankenbild*. Although Weber does not say so (nor, to my knowledge, do his commentators), the ideal type seems to be the use to which the analyst puts the *Gedankenbild*.

Intelligibility

It is illuminating to explore an interview Foucault had with a group of French historians in 1977. In the third section of the interview, "The Problem of Rationalities," Foucault is asked about Weber. The reception of Weber in France was significantly different from his reception in Germany or the English-speaking world. Translations of his work into French were few and late, and although Foucault was fluent in German and could have read Weber in the original, he apparently had not been tempted to do so. In France Weber appeared in the polarized intellectual debates of the postwar period mainly as a minor figure, invoked as a counterweight to Marx, and a "French" Marx at that. Foucault initially shared this perspective, and he only began to take Weber more seriously during his visits to the United States in the late 1970s and early 1980s, where he encountered a radically differ-

ent Weber. The few references to Weber at the end of Foucault's
life are significantly richer than his earlier ones.

In response to a question about whether he shared Weber's in-
terpretation of the "meta-anthropological process of rationaliza-
tion" as increasingly dominant, Foucault replied, "If one calls
'Weberians' those who set out to take on board the Marxist an-
alyses of the contradictions of capital, treating these contradic-
tions as part and parcel of the irrational rationality of capitalist
society, then I don't think I am a Weberian, since my basic preoc-
cupation isn't rationality considered as an anthropological vari-
ant."[14] Of course, this "preoccupation" was not Weber's either.
Foucault went on to say that he preferred a view of rationality as
a practice understood in an "instrumental and relative" manner.
Further, he wanted to analyze how such a practice inflected forms
of governmentality. One would have no problem translating this
version of Foucault's analytic project into a Weberian framework.

Foucault's responses about Weber's ideal type, while themselves
debatable, reveal unexpected convergences between Weber and
Foucault. When asked whether his work was like Weber's in its
use of ideal types "which paralyzes and mutes analysis when one
tries to account for reality," not surprisingly Foucault responded
"no."[15] The French questioner was apparently not moved to
wonder why these Germans and Anglo-Saxons would ever em-
ploy a method that had been shown to be paralytic and muting?
Foucault then launched into a three-page discussion of how his
approach differed from Weber's. "Schematically," Foucault be-
gan, "one can say that the 'ideal type' is a category of historical
interpretation; it's a structure of understanding for the historian
who seeks to integrate, after the fact, a certain set of data; it
allows him to recapture the 'essence' (Calvinism, the state, the
capitalist enterprise), working from general principles which are
not at all present in the thought of the individuals whose concrete
behavior is nevertheless to be understood on their basis."[16] In one
sentence Foucault characterizes the ideal type first as a "cate-
gory," then as a "structure," and finally as a "general principle."
Although this list is confusing, Foucault is clear that all three are
deployed by the historian and not by those being analyzed. In

sum, for Foucault, Weber is a typical neo-Kantian. This inter-
pretation is wrong, or at the very least needs qualification. Weber,
in his section of the "Objectivity" essay, writes: "An ideal type of
certain situations, which can be abstracted from certain charac-
teristic social phenomena of an epoch, might, and this is indeed
quite often the case, have also been present in the minds of the
persons living in that epoch as an ideal to be striven for in practi-
cal life or as a maxim for the regulation of certain social relation-
ships."[17] Weber provides a number of examples and consistently
followed this line of reasoning in his work on the sociology of
religion and the sociology of capitalism. Weber was a neo-Kant-
ian of a complex sort, but then, again, some of the most fertile
thought of Foucault's later years arose from his own return to
Kant.

Following this dismissive distancing, Foucault shifted into an
affirmative, crisp, and confident elucidation of his own method.
He starts by stating that "the rational schemas of the prison, the
hospital, or the asylum are not 'general principles' which can be
rediscovered only through the historian's retrospective interpreta-
tion. They are explicit *programmes*: we are dealing with sets of
calculated, reasoned prescriptions in terms of which institutions
are meant to be reorganized, spaces arranged, behaviors regu-
lated. If they have an ideality, it is that of a programming left in
abeyance, not that of a general but hidden meaning."[18] The first
part of the statement seems disingenuous, as surely the method of
genealogy is retrospective as well as interpretive and Foucault
had been writing about it for years. Moreover, we have just seen
that Weber does include explicit maxims and overt normative be-
liefs in his ideal-typical analysis; after all, he began *The Protes-
tant Ethic* with just such a set of maxims from Benjamin Frank-
lin. Finally, Weber was not looking for "general but hidden
meaning" but rather for a singular cultural significance. Whether
cultural significance of such singularity must always be "left in
abeyance," in varying degrees, is a point worth pondering. And
ponder it both Foucault and Weber did.

The second criterion Foucault puts forth to distinguish himself
from Weber is formulated as follows: "Of course, this program-

ming depends on forms of rationality much more general than those they directly implement. 'Discipline' isn't the expression of an 'ideal type' (that of disciplined man); it is the generalization and interconnection of different techniques themselves designed in response to local requirements (schooling, etc.)." If one understands "discipline" to entail "generalization and interconnection of different techniques designed in response to local requirements," it is hard to see how this position differs from the genealogy of the social sciences presented by Weber, Sombart, and Jaffé, and why it should not be taken as a sort of construct serving to generalize and make connections. One would seem to be perfectly justified in calling "discipline" an ideal type. In any case, the identification of disciplinary technology as significant for the civilizing process or as a condition of liberalism is one of Michel Foucault's major achievements, just as Max Weber's legacy rightfully rests on the identification of the connection between the Protestant ethic, the spirit of capitalism, and a singular form of life.

Foucault makes a third point:

> These programs don't take effect in the institutions in an integral manner . . . they never work out as planned. This difference is not between the purity of the ideal and the disorderly impurity of the real but that in fact there are different strategies which are mutually opposed, composed, and superimposed so as to produce permanent and solid effects which can perfectly well be understood in terms of this rationality, even though they don't conform to the initial programming: this is what gives the resulting apparatus (*dispositif*) its solidity and suppleness.[19]

Weber certainly adopted a similar position on institutions and on the relation of the real to the ideal. It is only on the last point, the status and strategics of the "resulting apparatus," that there seems to be a difference. Foucault intends to convey that the apparatus has a different status than the ideal type in that it is a "thing of the world." However, just as Weber also intended his analyses to show us something significant about the world (its reality as well

as its ideality), Foucault never provided the sort of criteria that would satisfy a positivist social scientist or empiricist historian, or even that would enable others to judge unambiguously whether Foucault's apparatuses were discoveries or inventions. Clearly they were both.

Foucault says a number of times both in this interview and elsewhere that he is interested in the effects programs induce "in the real." However, in the interview he introduces an additional element into his definition of his object of analysis and provides a series of important metareflections thereon. He writes, "To grasp these effects as historical events—with what this implies for the question of truth (which is the question of philosophy itself)— this is more or less my theme." Leaving aside the problem of truth—in this context Foucault means those discourses taken to be true in a given society—and remembering that Weber asserted that ideal types could be of temporally unfolding processes as well as of historical configurations, let us turn to Foucault's thematization of historical events.

Foucault reminds his historian interlocutors that French historians for at least two generations have prided themselves on having left behind the old-fashioned political, military, and diplomatic history that addressed "events." The older narrative of great men and great deeds has been replaced by narratives of silent, gradual accumulation, punctuated by quasi-natural turning points, thresholds, and clines. The move away from events and toward *la longue durée* has produced a uniformity in conceptual apparatus and narrative form. By definition, however, the narrative forms invented by the *Annales* historians are useful only for certain types of historical objects. Others, by definition, escape from their purview. Foucault challenges his interlocutors to broaden their scope.

Like Weber, Foucault argued for renewed attention to the singularity of events. Such a move means "making visible a singularity at places where there is a temptation to invoke a historical constant, an immediate anthropological trait, or an obviousness which imposes itself uniformly on all." Events, after all, are themselves "a breach of self-evidence."[20] For example, there was

41

nothing "natural" about the fact that mad people came to be regarded as mentally ill, although it appeared that way to many at the time (and after that time). The establishment of this self-evidence was an event just as much as Napoleon's coronation or the upheavals of 1848. To understand this different kind of event, however, requires an increased attention to the multiple causes at play in its production. Having identified an event such as the birth of the modern prison, one must expand the number and diversity of elements brought into an analysis, and thus expand one's "domains of reference."

Foucault characterizes the resultant object of the historian attentive to singularities as a "a polyhedron of intelligibility." If a "polyhedron of intelligibility" is not an ideal type, it would seem to be something parallel to a "Gedankenbild." Weber's concepts are surely meant to make something real available, and Foucault's polyhedron of intelligibility could never have been arrived at without a process of building thoughts into a conceptual tool. The function of Foucault's polyhedron is parallel to the one Weber envisaged for his tools: an analytically reflective and reflexive prying-loose of sedimented self-evidences so as to reveal how things have come to be what they are and by so doing show how they could be different. Foucault puts it this way: "The history of the 'objectification' of those elements which historians consider as objectively given (the objectification of objectivities), this is the sort of circle I want to try to investigate. [. . .] It is a matter of the effect on historical knowledge of a nominalist critique itself arrived at by way of a historical analysis."[21] Weber puts it this way:

> Economics was originally [. . .] a "technique." [. . .] It was on the other hand, from the very beginning, more than a "technique" since it was integrated into the great scheme of natural law and rationalistic *Weltanschauung* of the eighteenth century. The nature of that *Weltanschauung*, with its optimistic faith in the theoretical and practical rationalizability of reality, had an important consequence insofar as it *obstructed* the discovery of the *problematic* character of that standpoint which had been assumed as self-evident.[22]

Weber probably would not have liked to be called a "nominal-ist," nor Foucault a "neo-Kantian," and it is true that the thought of neither one can be reduced to such a label. Perhaps one could say, though, that one trajectory of neo-Kantianism could lead to a kind of nominalism after a century of empiricism and ever more fatal philosophies of history, just as a certain neo-Kantianism was a way of adjudicating, at the beginning of the twentieth century, between the excesses of a century of positivism and romanticism as well as this century's philosophies of history. Upon reflection, Weber's insistence that singularities, not totalities, are what is most real actually does make him a kind of nominalist, while Foucault's insistence that his works are "fictions" with truth-effects would hardly be standard positivist fare. Most impor-tantly, method is only one part of the story, especially when it comes to thinkers who were notoriously inconsistent in their methodology.

Chapter 3
Object

> My books are not treatises in philosophy or studies
> of history: at most, they are philosophical
> fragments put to work in a historical field of
> problems.
> —Michel Foucault

Problematization

All of the explicit uses of the concept of *problématisation* are
found late in Foucault's work. It first appears in *Discipline and
Punish*, and this appearance is, as the saying goes, no accident.[1] It
is integrally related to Foucault's changing understanding of
thinking. In 1969 he was nominated for appointment to the Col-
lège de France and as part of the standard selection process was
obliged to present a research project and to propose a name for
the chair he would occupy. Foucault named his chair "History of
Systems of Thought."[2] By the mid-1970s, at the latest, Foucault
had abandoned the idea of "systems" and was giving more and

Dits et écrits: 1954–1988 (Paris: Editions Galimard, 1994), 4:21. Orig. from
"Table Ronde du 20 mai 1978," in Michelle Perot, ed., *L'Impossible Prison:
Recherches sur le système pénitentiaire au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions du Seuil,
1980).

more attention to "thinking" as a practice rather than a system. The object of his work shifted from an anonymous, discursive thing, the *epistēmē*, to a more dynamic and heterogeneous process of subjectifying objectivity and objectifying subjectivity.[3] Foucault began to take up and question thinking as an activity, one involving a degree of constraint as well as a degree of freedom. This simple but momentous shift has been lost on many Anglo-American commentators, both favorably and unfavorably disposed to Foucault, who have resisted the implications of Foucault's insight that power was not external to freedom.

During the mid-1970s, Foucault was rethinking the Nietzschean grid of warfare as the metaphorics of life, knowledge, and power. The route leading away from this core metaphor was genealogical. Foucault explored the place of the discourse of war in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as part of his nascent research on biotechnical power. He was concurrently developing the concept of "governmentality," as well as sketching the concepts with which to analyze an ethics of freedom. This space of enabling capacities and constraining powers, of the obligation to limit power but also of modes of inflecting it, gained a saliency not only as an analytics but also as a practical (political and ethical) problem. It is within this setting that Foucault first began to use the concept of problematization.

The most direct and explicit presentation of problematization took place in a discussion in Berkeley in 1983. Drawing on the few dense pages that Foucault provided during this working session (and their distillation in the second preface to *The Uses of Pleasure*), it is possible to set out the elements of the concept. Foucault began by characterizing his approach as distinct from other, apparently similar enterprises. "I have been searching," he wrote, "for a long time to understand if it would be possible to distinguish the history of thought as opposed to a history of ideas—that is to say, the analysis of systems of representations—as well as from the history of mentalities (cultures)—that is to say, the analysis of attitudes and cultural codes (*schémas de comportement*)." There is a threefold distinction at play here. (1) Foucault was not doing the history of ideas in its traditional sense of the

history of philosophic doctrines, as, for example, his mentor Jean Hyppolite had practiced it in his work on Hegel; but Foucault was also not analyzing representations as semiotic systems, as Anglo-American cultural studies later would. (2) He was not doing what many French historians and anthropologists were doing at the time, and continue to do, that is, the analysis of the underlying system of codes that shapes a culture's thought and behavior. He was neither analyzing culture as a total system (whether of signs or exchanges) nor exploring how such a system impacted lived experience. Foucault's phrase "schémas de comportement" carries with it echoes of, but insists on a respectful difference from, Merleau-Ponty's project of laying out the "structure de comportement." Hence, Foucault was not attempting to cover the ground of cultural analysis in either the French or the American anthropological use of the term, any more than he was dealing with *Kultur*, in the German sense of ideas and arts. But furthermore, although he does not explicitly say it, he was (3) not analyzing *systems of thought*, as he had done during the late 1960s, with its privileging of epistemēs as autonomous discursive objects. But neither was he addressing the "unthought" in Heidegger's sense of the tacit but omnipresent background of metaphysics that organized an age. The unthought, understood in this manner, was articulated in the French intellectual field by Louis Althusser. For Althusser, it was the "problematic" that precisely structured all that could not be seen, said, thought in an epoch.[4] In that dimension it was close to Foucault's concept of the episteme.

Having cleared his ground—it is not this and not that—what then was Foucault seeking to analyze? The distinctive mark of the history of thought could be named problematizations.

> That which distinguishes thought is something entirely different from the organized system of representations which support action or that domain of attitude that might determine it. Thought is not what "inhabits" an action and gives it meaning; rather, thought is that which permits a certain distance from a manner of acting or reacting, that which makes it possible to

make that manner of acting into an object of reflection and to make it available for analysis of its meanings, its conditions and its goals. Thinking is the freedom one has in relation to what one does, the movement through which one detaches oneself, constitutes oneself as an object and reflects on all of this motion as a problem.[5]

Although the Althusserian sense of the problematic leads one to a science that frees one to understand objectively the structure of an epoch—a notion that Foucault was close to holding during the time his archaeological work predominated—in the above passage it is precisely the implication of the thinker and thought as contingent that forms the problem.[6]

It is not thinking per se that makes an object available for thought. "In effect, in order for a domain of action to enter into the field of thought, it is necessary that a certain number of factors have made it uncertain, have made it lose its familiarity, or have produced around it a certain number of difficulties." Historical conjunctures (especially those produced by the introduction of technological interventions and their countereffects) can be turned into conceptual and practical problems. "Thought is an original response, or at least a specific response, one that may well be multiple, at times contradictory within its different aspects, in so far as it is responding to multiple difficulties or incitations that have gone into making a situation or context appear as a possible question." Thought arises out of an encounter with a complex conjuncture. "To the same set [*ensemble*] of difficulties several responses can be given. And most times, diverse responses are proposed. That which one needs to understand is that which makes these diverse responses simultaneously possible. [. . .] This elaboration of a given situation into a question, this transformation of a set of difficulties and troubles into problems to which diverse solutions are proposed as responses, is the point of problematization, the specific work of thought."[7] Thus, thought is not autonomous in any of the strong senses that it has been given in Western philosophy. Thought is not transparent, nor is it constitutive, nor is it a passive waiting or an intentional act of con-

47

sciousness. Thought is not necessarily coherent, if by that one means it has a univocal meaning that is amenable to internal logical clarification. Nor is it an external evaluation of a situation.

Up to this point, Foucault's specification of what he means by problematization sounds unexpectedly quite similar to John Dewey's definition of thinking as problem solving. Obviously the two thinkers arrived at their respective positions by radically different routes. Foucault was working his way out of the apparatus of "structuralism" as it functioned in the French intellectual field. Dewey, in his *Essays in Experimental Logic*, was writing against diverse formal logicians, various neo-Kantians, and assorted transcendentalists. For Dewey thought takes place as an action in the practical world of daily affairs. Knowledge is a secondary phenomenon, in that it arises out of encounters of a practical kind, even if eventually it can remove itself from these encounters and acquire a more formal shape and more controlled means of experimentation. Thinking begins when things break down; when the common-sense world ceases to function, reflection begins. "Reflection," Dewey wrote, "appears as the dominant trait of a situation when there is something seriously the matter, some trouble, due to active discordance, dissentiency, conflict among the factors of a prior non-intellectual experience."[8] Dewey is proposing a general description of human action; otherwise his analysis of thinking is startlingly close to Foucault's.

I am not arguing that Dewey and Foucault have the same position, although I find the convergence that exists illuminating. Their tools are designed for somewhat different uses. First, Dewey is a philosopher who is laying out a general explanation of human experience. He is concerned with improving philosophy (as well as everything else) by reorienting it toward a richer and more accurate analytic vocabulary that, he is convinced, will make it function better. Dewey's goal is enriching an understanding of ordinary life and the ways in which it can be repaired. Foucault took as his primary data "serious speech acts." Even when Foucault moved toward an aesthetics of existence in which subjects would take up serious speech acts and refashion them, he was never talking about the taken-for-granted, ordinary life expe-

riences that formed the object for phenomenologists and pragmatists. Thus, while Dewey claims that "the subject-matter of knowledge is precisely that which we do *not* think of, or mentally refer to in any way, being that which is taken as a matter of course, but is nevertheless knowledge in virtue of the inquiry which has led up to it."[9] Foucault focused precisely on "the ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc)." That reflected play of true and false was always the level that concerned Foucault.

Dispositif: Apparatus

Foucault's first use of the term *dispositif* was in an interview he gave to *Le Monde* in 1975 following the publication of *Surveiller et punir*.[10] In the interview, Foucault spoke authoritatively about his methodological guidelines and overall analytic strategy, projecting serenity and clarity, as he often did after the fact. After many years working through the voluminous documentary archives around prisons, hospitals, schools, and the like, he had learned, he told his interviewer, that it was not necessary to search for anything hidden when it came to the intentions and projects of the nineteenth century bourgeoisie. In its classical manifestations, the bourgeoisie was lucid and cynical; they knew what they wanted to accomplish and wrote about their plans with great explicitness. All that was required for an analyst to come face to face with this social reality was to shift attention from the canonical texts of philosophy (say, Hegel or Marx) to the supposedly minor texts of those who actually made policy and wielded power; there one would discover what this class was in fact attempting to do.

In these remarks on method, Foucault marked the distance between himself and his Lacanian and Althusserian colleagues. For Foucault, the level of reality that counted was on the surface, and it was directly accessible. There was no need to contrive sophisti-

cated "symptomatic readings" of *Das Kapital*. "Substitute the logic of strategies," Foucault calmly advised, as if his approach was uncontroversial, "for the logic of the unconscious; replace the privileged place accorded to the signifier and its semiotic connections with an attention to tactics and their apparatuses."[11] Although this message is an analytic adieu to Althusser, it actually remains less than clear what Foucault means here by "apparatus" (*dispositif*). He appears to be using the term as it is ordinarily used in French, to denote tools and devices. Shortly thereafter in the interview, Foucault supports this interpretation with one of his famous tropes: his books should be approached as "toolkits"; one should take from them whatever is useful, whatever is helpful in strengthening the attack on the reigning systems of power. Foucault's analytics of power is Nietzschean here: weapons against weapons, archives against archives, tactics against tactics, strategies against strategies.

In the 1976 introduction to a collective work, *Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century*, Foucault used the concept of "apparatus" as well as the term, although he does not elaborate either on its meaning or on the term's more general theoretical implications. Nonetheless, his articulation (as well as the research project on health that he had been leading during the year) is pregnant with the future. "The biological traits of a population became pertinent elements in its economic management, and it was necessary to organize them through an apparatus that not only assured the constant maximization of their utility but equally their subjection."[12] This statement is one of Foucault's earliest articulations of the theme of biotechnical politics. Finally, Foucault uses the word "apparatus" to mean a device whose purpose is control and management. In the collective report on the seminar's work, there is a sustained empirical demonstration of what a strategic assemblage looks like and how, and in what ways, an apparatus composed of a grouping of heterogeneous elements had been deployed for specific purposes at a particular historical conjuncture. The politics of health in the eighteenth century was a politics of apparatuses. It was a politics of strategically chosen targets. It was an articulation of technologies aimed at first spec-

ifying (and to that extent creating) those targets and then controlling (distributing and regulating) them.

The one and only time that Foucault was explicitly questioned about his use of the term *dispositif* and decided to take the occasion to respond at some length was in an interview in 1977 with a group of Parisian Lacanian friends, transcribed and published as *Le Jeu de Michel Foucault* (and later translated into English as *The Confessions of the Flesh*). Foucault was asked "What is the meaning and methodological function of the term apparatus?"[13] He responded by underscoring that the defining aspect of apparatuses was their grouping of heterogeneous elements into a common network. The apparatus was "a resolutely heterogeneous grouping comprising discourses, institutions, architectural arrangements, policy decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophic, moral and philanthropic propositions; in sum, the said and the not-said, these are the elements of the apparatus. The apparatus itself is the network that can be established between these elements."[14] This definition is again primarily a negative one. It is a marking of distance from the exclusive emphasis on discourse in the *Archaeology*. It is a claim for the utility of the shift of focus he had undertaken in *Discipline and Punish* and in his seminar work on the nascent topics of biopower.

Although the distancing from his previous work is emphatic, the analytic unpacking of the object remains minimal. The elements composing or taken up in a network apparently could be anything. This expansion beyond discourse consequently displaces the issue to what kind of relationships such diverse elements maintain one with the other. To characterize these ties, Foucault uses the metaphor of the "game." Although this figure is an unexceptional one in French, "les règles du jeu," it can seem frivolous in English: "politics is not a game," irritated Habermasians rebuked Foucault during the 1980s. As Dreyfus and I showed in *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, the imprecision was less a matter of "the game" than of its "rules." Foucault was fuzzy about his use of the term "rule." At the time of the *Archaeology*, he employed the term in a quasi-structuralist sense

that held that discourse arose out of an underlying formal systematicity that conditioned and limited its possibilities. This position was most explicit in the *Archaeology* but also in Foucault's inaugural address at the Collège, "L'Ordre du discours." During the mid-1970s, Foucault was still using this same language, but in his analytic practice he was moving away from taking rules to mean the underlying determination of the possibilities of discursive action. Rather, he was beginning to use the term in a more Wittgensteinian sense, without, however, thematizing it as such.

In sum, at this point in time, in light of *Discipline and Punish* and *The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century*, Foucault cast the elements in an apparatus as joined and disjoined by a strategic logic and a tactical economy of domination operating against a background of discursive formations. He identified the apparatus as characterized by changes in the position of its elements, the multiplying modifications of its functions, and an overall articulated strategic intent, albeit an appropriately flexible one. The apparatus embodied a kind of strategic bricolage, a bricolage articulated by an identifiable social collectivity. It functioned to define and to regulate targets constituted through a mixed economy of power and knowledge.

The controlling terms of Foucault's conceptual work during the mid-1970s were "strategy" and "power/knowledge." In his important article "The Subject and Power" (significant parts of which were drafted during the mid-1970s, although the article was published later), Foucault delineates three senses of the term "strategy" as it applies to "power relations."[15] The three senses are "(1) to designate the means employed to attain a certain end; [. . .] (2) to designate the manner in which a partner in a certain game acts with regard to what he thinks should be the action of the others and what he considers the others think to be his own; [. . .] (3) to designate the procedures used in a situation of confrontation to deprive the opponent of his means of combat and to reduce him to giving up the struggle." A tactic, apparently, is a subset of a strategy. Finally, in his 1976 *History of Sexuality*, Foucault announced that he was seeking to understand the operations of a "strategy without a strategist." Through this ad-

mittedly cryptic formulation, Foucault reaffirmed his conceptual distance from Althusser (and his/their mutual Marxist friends) as well as his continued reliance on a type of dynamic systems approach, self-regulating but non-homeostatic, for which he lacked an adequate analytic vocabulary. The named actors are now found at the level of tactics, and there is no overall articulator of the strategy. The bourgeoisie may well have been explicit about its political and social intentions, but, Foucault now saw, the bourgeoisie's local cynicism of power was not the whole story. Although people might well be explicit about what they are doing, they are not capable of grasping what they did, did. There were feedback loops and countereffects that escaped from all the planning, programs, and paranoia these rational actors had produced and so proudly deployed.

Just as "strategy" was a controlling term in Foucault's conceptual toolkit of the mid-1970s, one that was in the process of transfiguration, a parallel process was taking place with the other dominant term in Foucault's analytic arsenal at this period, "power/knowledge." Foucault was always crystal clear that "power" and "knowledge" were distinct terms — why else, he sarcastically observed on several occasions, would he have spent so much time trying to see how they shaped each other? The apparatus provided one key to approaching this issue. "The apparatus is fundamentally of a strategic nature. [. . .] It is always inscribed in a play of power, but it is always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in: strategies of relations of forces supporting, and supported by, types of knowledge."[16] And here Foucault looks back to correct himself. "The apparatus is a much more general case of the *epistēmē*; or, rather, the *epistēmē* is a specifically discursive apparatus, whereas the apparatus in its general form is both discursive and non-discursive."[17] The *epistēmē* is the "apparatus" that makes possible the separation, not of the true from the false, but of what may be characterized as scientific. Foucault is still operating within a frame of systematicity — a systematicity that is now even more complex than before in its composition and its function; a sys-

tematicity that is simultaneously utterly transparent to those in-
volved in its operations (as well as potentially to the analyst) and
opaque (to actor and analyst alike) in its effects and counter-
effects.

There is an important additional element at play here. As Fou-
cault had spelled out at some length in *Discipline and Punish*,
these strategic assemblages are initially formed as responses to
crises or problems. He does use the term "problem" but only in
the sense of a historical conjuncture that raises power/knowledge
challenges to those governing. The apparatus is a specific re-
sponse to a historical problem. It is, however, a dominating stra-
tegic response. That initial response to a pressing situation can
gradually be turned into a general technology of power applica-
ble to other situations. The apparatus is a kind of formation.
What may have begun, for example, as a pressing problem of
urban policing may turn into a set of diverse techniques applica-
ble to other populations, at other times and in other places: the
apparatus can be turned into a technology. Given a specific strate-
gic objective and the attempt to develop a successful response, as
one might expect, diverse and unplanned effects can and do re-
sult. These too can play a role in extending the network of the
apparatus. For example, the creation of a delinquent milieu in the
city was not planned by prison reformers but arose as an unan-
ticipated effect. It soon became part of the larger problem of ur-
ban policing and, as it turned out, did not destroy the strategic
intent of the apparatus but, to some degree, was used to extend
it. This claim, of course, does not mean the apparatus was an
improvement, if by that one means it achieved the explicit goals
laid out by the forces of order. It did, however, "work," if by that
one means that the rationality of order was cast even more sol-
idly within its terms, its rationality.

Foucault does not explicitly return to refashion the concept of
the "apparatus" again. However, precisely during these years of
the mid-1970s, he was in the process of questioning and recasting
his views on "power/knowledge." He was not only weakening
the scope given to a metaphorics of war but shifting his use of
"power/knowledge" from a quite general category into the more

historically specific concept of "governmentality," as the form of power relations characteristic of liberalism. As he turned to issues of "subjectivation," the issue of the apparatus faded from view. Had Foucault lived long enough to return to his work on bio-power and on historical forms of governmentality, he would no doubt have rethought and redeployed the concept of apparatus. Be that as it may, his work shifted to other issues during what turned out to be the last period of his life.

Anthropology of the Actual

I have characterized my inquiries as an anthropology of the con-temporary, or an anthropology of the actual, or an anthropology of the "near future and recent past." The core objects of analysis in such an inquiry (problematization, apparatus, assemblage) op-erate with distinct temporal scales. Problematization has the broadest scope (in terms of its multiple and diverse domains) and is the longest enduring. Problematizations emerge out of a caul-dron of convergent factors (economic, discursive, political, envi-ronmental, and the like). Such an emergence is an event. For ex-ample, the Greek problematization of pleasure and freedom or the modern problematization of life and governmentality lasted for centuries. Hence their emergence and articulation is an event of long duration, one that sets events of different scale in motion. Apparatuses are the forms composed of heterogeneous elements that have been stabilized and set to work in multiple domains. Apparatuses like "discipline" or "confession" or "insurance" are long-standing, long-enduring. They are specific responses to par-ticular dimensions of larger problematizations. Stabilized does not mean static: apparatuses are mobile. One goal of the history of the present is to identify apparatuses, to trace their genealogy, to show their emergence, and thereby to make them available for thought and change. To a significant degree the history of the present rests on a retrospective identification of those apparatuses that have already been stabilized. It follows that apparatuses typ-ically operate within a temporality of long duration, even though

their spread, through micropractices, creates incessant smaller-scale dynamics and turbulence.

My recent anthropological inquiries have taken as their primary object "assemblages."[18] Assemblages are secondary matrices from within which apparatuses emerge and become stabilized or transformed. Assemblages stand in a dependent but contingent and unpredictable relationship to the grander problematizations. In terms of scale they fall between problematizations and apparatuses and function differently from either one. They are a distinctive type of experimental matrix of heterogeneous elements, techniques, and concepts. They are not yet an experimental system in which controlled variation can be produced, measured, and observed. They are comparatively effervescent, disappearing in years or decades rather than centuries. Consequently, the temporality of assemblages is qualitatively different from that of either problematizations or apparatuses.

The emergence of an assemblage is certainly an event. However, it is an event on a different scale from that of the emergence of problematizations or apparatuses. One might say that an assemblage is not the kind of thing that is intended to endure; either a more structured apparatus emerges from it or it disaggregates. Although apparatuses and assemblages are heterogeneous in their temporalities, they may well be contemporary. The anthropologist of the actual (near future/recent past) seeks to identify emergent assemblages and to set them in an environment that is partially composed of apparatuses and partially of a variety of other elements (such as institutions, symbols, and the like). A central task of the anthropology of the actual is to identify conjunctures between and among these diverse objects, and between and among their temporalities and their functionalities.

Chapter 4
Mode

> For the artist, forms that are still do not represent
> the essence of the creative process in the world.
> "La nature naturante" counts more for him than
> "la nature naturée."
> —Paul Klee

How does the future appear today? What form does it take? And what attitude toward that form can and should one adopt? Reinhardt Koselleck's *Futures Past* is devoted to an inquiry into what clumsily could be called the European historical semantics of narratives of temporality.[1] The essays in the book provide essential background for situating a temporal mode of our modernity. Koselleck's erudition, like that of his contemporary, Hans Blumenberg, is focused on the history of discursive figures and concepts. Koselleck is the founder of a method and school devoted to the "history of concepts," *Begriffsgeschichte*. Hence we should not expect, nor are we given, a political or institutional history but rather an incisive cultural one. From that richly documented and

---

Paul Klee, "De l'art moderne," in *Théorie de l'art moderne* (Paris: Editions Denöel, 1985), p. 28.

argued history, three points about modern temporality are relevant here.

Modern Historicity

The essays open with a meditation on a Bavarian duke in 1529 contemplating a painting he had commissioned for his summer residence. The painting is a realistic depiction of the Battle of Issus in 333 B.C. between a Persian army and a Macedonian one led by Alexander. For such noble, Christian-humanist observers, paintings were didactic. In this instance, the painting's lessons turned on the eternal quandaries of war and strategy. To underline that such humanists did indeed take the quandaries to be eternal, Koselleck refers to Machiavelli, who had devoted an entire chapter of his *Discourses* to arguing that the invention of firearms had not fundamentally altered the nature of warfare. The painting had a contemporary referent, as the year 1529 was the year that the Turks had been defeated at the gates of Vienna (the Persians in the painting wore Turkish attire). The viewer's relationship to the painting was transparent and unproblematic. "Temporal difference," Koselleck writes, "was not more or less arbitrarily eliminated; it was not, as such, at all apparent."[2] The time of the painting, the time of its subject matter, and the time of the observer were contemporaneous. Image and narrative, history as temporality, and history as story were not differentiated.

Whereas Velasquez and the loss of transparency between representation and sovereignty were a century away (*Las Meninas*, 1656), in northern Europe, the Reformation was at hand. Koselleck argues that the fundamental reformulation of authority relations within Christendom produced comprehensive effects on the manner in which the past, present, and future came to be represented, experienced, and governed. "Stating my thesis simply," he writes, "there occurs a temporalization of history, at the end of which there is the peculiar form of acceleration which characterizes modernity."[3] Blumenberg joins Koselleck in identi-

fying "acceleration" as the key diacritic of contemporary modernity's mode of temporality.

Christian history, until the Reformation, is "a history of expectations, or more exactly, the constant anticipation of the End of the World on the one hand and the continual deferment of the End on the other."[4] The primacy given by the Church to eschatology was a question not only of doctrine but also and of the institutional power of the Roman Catholic Church. The Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17) formalized what had been tacitly accepted previously: claims about the future had to be authorized by the church. "The future of the world was made part of the history of the Church." During this period, Protestant, especially German ones, began writing histories of the papacy cast as accounts of error, deceit, and all too human frailty.[5]

A parallel process of linking accounts of the past and future with institutions of power and law is found elsewhere in Europe. Jean Bodin (1530–96), known for his influential treatises on the sovereignty of the absolutist state, drew a distinction between sacred, human, and natural history. Bodin opened his *Method for the Easy Understanding of History* with these words: "Of History, that is, the true narration of things, there are three kinds: Human, natural, and divine. The first concerns man; the second, nature; the third, the father of nature. One depicts the acts of man while leading his life in the midst of society. The second reveals causes hidden in nature and explains their development from their earliest beginnings. The last records the strength and power of Almighty God and of the immortal souls, set apart from all else."[6] The three types yielded knowledge of differing degrees of certainty: divine history was the surest and human history merely "probable," although useful in the conduct of human affairs. Human history was taken out of the eschatological context and transferred to the political domain. "The setting free of a *historia humana* which turned away from sacral history, and the legitimation of a modern state capable of subduing salvation-oriented religious factions, are for Bodin one and the same."[7] Predictions, whether political or religious, had become part of the business of the state.

It is within this context that one of Koselleck's initially startling claims makes sense. "The course of the seventeenth century is characterized by the destruction of interpretations of the future, however they were motivated."[8] By this he means both that there were increasing efforts to control those making claims about the future and that a new type of temporal rationality was emerging. Two long-term developments unfolded sequentially: rational prognosis based on probability and statistics, and the philosophy of historical progress.

The art of rational forecast was developed in the political realm. Political theorists and court advisors pondered a famous quotation from Aristotle, "For future events the truth is indeterminate." By indeterminate, Aristotle, or his Renaissance and Reformation interpreters, did not mean unknowable, but indeterminate in its precise contours. The kind of event and its constituent components could be perfectly well known in advance, but the exact particulars of the outcome could not. Perfect knowledge would require correctly establishing every step in the logical chain of events, and it was a practical impossibility to perform such analysis. "Prognosis produces the time within which and out of which it weaves, whereas apocalyptic prophecy destroys time through its fixation on the End. From the point of view of prophecy, events are merely symbols of that which is already known."[9] The space of prognosis is a uniform space. Hence, the political future "became a domain of finite possibilities, arranged according to their greater or lesser probability."[10] God's will might well be unknowable, but the sphere of political action was being drawn into a "de-magification" process. If, as Blumenberg demonstrates, astrology, astronomy, and politics were linked for much of Western history, their disaggregation marks one threshold of a coming modernity.

Koselleck underscores two other dimensions of modern temporality. "First, the future of *progress* [my emphasis] is characterized by the increasing speed with which it approaches us and, second, its unknown quality. Unknown because this accelerated time, i.e., our history, abbreviated the space of experiences, robbed them of their constancy, and continually brought into

play new, unknown factors, so that even the actuality or complexity of these unknown quantities could not be ascertained."[11] This insight crystallized for Koselleck when he noticed a philological oddity. While philosophies of history from the eighteenth century forward increasingly used the term *neue Zeit*, it is only after 1870 that the composite concept *Neuzeit* is found. "New time" is a strange term, as it can only contrast with "old time." "Where once we had the triad Antiquity-Middle Ages-Modernity (or the older Ancients and Moderns)—now we have only a contrastive pair of an ever-appearing Newtime that incessantly distinguishes itself from an ever-disappearing Oldtime."[12] It is not clear why this temporality should be characterized as a space of progress, rather than mere motion.

Nominalism: Duchamp

In 1912, Marcel Duchamp left Paris for Munich. In Paris the art world was battling over Cézanne and cubism. In Munich, from a Parisian perspective, expressionism reigned. However, the art scene in Munich was organized in a significantly different way from its counterpart in Paris. For example, there was no official state academy; consequently, the reigning taste in Munich could not be directly imposed on Berlin, or, for that matter, on everyone in Munich. Thierry de Duve, in *Pictorial Nominalism: On Marcel Duchamp's Passage from Painting to the Ready-Made*, conjectures that Duchamp was creatively disoriented by his visit to Munich even though he was completely untouched by what is now called "expressionism" per se. Neither its stylistics nor the mode of subjectivation nor the discursive productions of its leading figures (Kandinsky and others) directly influenced Duchamp in the slightest. Duchamp was "not an artist of 'temperament'; he had no religious feeling, no taste for social revolt, no faith in the symbolism of nature, no identification with a Great Force, no sense of participation in the expression of a communal *Zeitgeist*."[13] However, clearly there can be experiences and effects other than those of influence or world vision that a different milieu may

catalyze for an artist (or other practitioner). Such a complacency-rattling reorientation may arise less from the exoticism of new surroundings than from the shock of seeing familiar elements organized in unfamiliar patterns.

In the Parisian art world Duchamp had left behind, there existed an authorized stylistic lineage whose temporal trajectory charted the progress of the avant-garde: realism-impressionism-Cézannism-cubism. In Munich, the constitution, the reception, and even the chronological ordering of these movements was dissimilar. "Impressionism was largely ignored, both by the Academy and the avant-garde. Cézanne, however, was not, although he was associated with Gauguin and Van Gogh"; and Munch, most bizarrely of all from a French painter's perspective, was identified with this trio.[14] In Germany, Cézanne was the link to expressionism, not cubism. In fact, there were basically no cubists in Germany, and painters taken to be cubists in France were in Germany assimilated with the expressionists. "The 1911 *Berlin Sezession* exhibited eleven French artists in a separate room with the title *Expressionisten*. Among them were the fauves (but not Matisse), but also Braque, Picasso." Thus, a distinct patterning of modern painting, one that did not have to ceaselessly struggle with Cézanne, was not only possible, but already existed just a few hundred kilometers from Paris. How one saw the epoch, one might say, depended on where one stood. The taken-for-granted certitude of one set of practices now interfered with and dispersed that of another.

Duchamp later called his time in Munich "the occasion of my complete liberation."[15] In Munich Duchamp encountered a different way of taking up painting, understood as the nature of the questions and artistic practices. One could say that Duchamp experienced a disconcerting — and liberating — response to the problematization of painting, one that differed from the response he was familiar with in Paris. Famously, upon his return to Paris, Duchamp abandoned painting as an "artisanal pleasure," to turn it into something else. He did not break with painting, but he took up the practice in a wholly new manner, one that was "util-

itarian as opposed to contemplative, and ready-made, as opposed to artisanal."[16] To subjectivize the reaction, one might say he abandoned traditional painting out of loyalty.

MODES AND MATERIALS: SECESSION

There are two aspects of this response that are immediately relevant to the understanding of the contemporary "conceptual interconnections of problems" in the sciences. The first concerns the existence of different modes of change within a field of practice. The second addresses the thorny question of how best to characterize the thicket of relationships that formed between artistic practice and modern industrialization.[17] Two aspects of those relationships are exemplary here: first, the impact of the changing mode of production and circulation of materials, paint in particular; second, the manner in which the modern artist related to these changes in materials (the mode of subjectivation).

In Munich, Duchamp encountered a vividly distinctive mode of performing stylistic and institutional change. It was orthogonal to the one he had been accustomed to in France. The art world in Paris functioned above all by means of a tightly coiled, ever-spiraling synergistic pair of vehement rejection and subsequent canonization. In Munich, Berlin, and Vienna, challenge worked by means of schism or secession. In Paris, the idea of the avant-garde was intimately associated with a marked rupture of tradition; this was the only possible strategy available to artists as "a proof of modernity, and as the basis of a tradition to come. In secession, in contrast, the avant-garde makes conflict [. . .] serve as a pretext in order to quit the official institution and declare that the pact drawn around the concept of art has become too rigid. It is thus the avant-garde that makes the first move and takes it upon itself to remodel the name of art by impoverishing the adversary's conception. [. . .] the avant-garde accuses academicism of being only a dead tradition, while it conserves the power of presenting itself as the authentic and energetic inheritor of this very tradition."[18] Secession works inside, or alongside,

reigning practices and values; consequently, relations between the academy and the avant-garde were not impossible — quite the contrary.

The sharp distinction between official and independent art that existed in Paris was absent in Munich. The secession mode allowed for a certain respect for tradition. If one held, even passionately, that traditional modes of making and seeing were no longer vital, such a judgment did not bring with it the categorical obligation to refuse the past. In the secession mode, "the other name of a dead tradition is 'museum art.' As such, it deserves [. . .] respect, does not arouse any anger, and remains open to new pictorial representations. For these avant-gardes of secession, the technical and the aesthetic rupture with tradition was not and did not appear as the motor-force of modernity."[19] Within a secessionist mode one could be a modernist without requiring a tabula rasa. One could be modernist while being neither utopian nor dystopian. One did not have to despise the past to create the present. One did not have to despise the present to creatively use the past.

The emergence of modernism in painting, understood as a pictorial practice, involving objects, materials, ways of making things, forms of subjectivity, can be seen as an on-going *mise-en-question* through successive and overlapping abandonments of each of these elements. A primary site of the problematization of pictorial practice characteristic of the avant-garde is found in the impact of industrialization: division of labor, new materials, new means of pictorial production and reproduction.

Duchamp picked out the paint tube as a paradigmatic locus of such elemental transformations. The first commercially produced tubes of paint appeared during the 1830s, along with another "penetration into the painter's practice," photography. Like photography," de Duve writes, "it was thus threatening painters most directly in their artisanal traditions; certainly the tube of paint freed them from a tedious and mechanical task, but it also introduced the division of labor into a professional activity that had always sought to maintain as much control as possible over the whole production process."[20] Uneasy negotiations and experi-

ments between art and industry ensued throughout the rest of the century, often leading to an unstable eclecticism, played out in a variety of ways.[21]

At the time of Duchamp's visit, there existed in Munich a Deutsche Gesellschaft zur Förderung rationneller Malverfahren (German Society for the Promotion of Rational Pictorial Procedures) devoted to the preservation of traditional crafts. Industrialization's perceived threat to the status of traditional crafts was articulated as the basic reason for the society's existence, and the specific threat at issue concerned the control of the manufacture of pigments. This control was passing from the artist to industry, from the studio to the factory, a shift that carried with it a number of unexpected challenges and consequences. Artists were losing out to chemists and engineers for the control of a technical knowledge they formerly had considered integral to their art. "The workshop recipes that painters, since the Van Eyck brothers, had protected jealously from the curiosity of their colleagues and passed on only to their best pupils were now on the public market, object of a competition that no longer involved artists on the aesthetic plane, but rather paint manufacturers on the economic plane. Pictorial technique [. . .] which had been itself a bearer of tradition, lost its esoteric character and became know-how that was part science, part merchandise, and whose success was connected to technological progress and profit."[22]

This transformation is fully in line with the more general process of "rationalization" identified by Max Weber, in Munich, during the same period. The banalization of the tube of paint was surely a moment of "de-magification." "De-magification" is a fundamental principle of modernity. Simply put, it means that there are no mysterious forces at play in the world, that—in principle—everything could be known and mastered by calculation. Paint was becoming controllable material. The efforts of Kandinsky and others to "spiritualize" pure color were, in this perspective, a swan song rather than a prelude.[23]

The commercialization of the tube of paint also brought with it what is taken to be another ineluctable aspect of modernity, standardization. The tube of paint had a price, it had a reliable con-

sistency, it could pass from place to place while remaining the same. Colors were becoming modern. Industry was now an obligatory site of production for the manufacture and distribution of the artist's primary materials. What artists did with those primary materials, of course, was not dictated by the materials. Nonetheless, as Duchamp grasped so strongly, the tube of paint was exemplary of the mode in which industrialization contributed to the suspension of what had been painting's "common sense" as well as its art. That contribution, however, should not be understood as a determining one or as a univocal force. The rupture occasioned by nineteenth-century industrialization in the field of artistic practice was a singular and nonrepeatable historical event, which not only survived the conjuncture in which it emerged but helped to provide the materials and practices used to retroactively reinterpret what that conjuncture had been.

The point of this visit to the prehistory of Marcel Duchamp's ready-mades is not to extract exact parallels between the practices of avant-garde painting in 1912 and that of certain sciences (anthropology, molecular biology) in the 1990s. These diverse arts and sciences are practices set in distinctive institutional fields at historical moments set quite far apart. The self-styled avant-garde postures aimed at disrupting representational practices, that is where Duchamp joins with others in a field of problems and fin-de-siècle sciences have different ends, and work on different entities; they produce contrastive subjectivities. Following Weber, we might ask, Can they be shown to be working on a part of the large domain in which the relationship of concepts was being put into question? That is to say, does the example of Duchamp serve to show us anything about a "modern" conceptual interconnection of problems that might still be actual?

MODE OF SUBJECTIVATION: A NOMINALIST SENSIBILITY

The assimilation of industrial partners and industrial materials into artistic practice was an historical event of extended duration. Rembrandt was engaged in commerce and in the division of labor in his studio; the impressionists included smokestacks in their

paintings; Andy Warhol called his studio "the factory." There is no single point that defines the moment of transmogrification of tradition into modernity. However, there certainly have been — and will be — moments punctuated by a heightened awareness of change and challenge. Industry did not destroy painting, or crafts, for that matter, only made them appear problematic in a new way for a certain time. Furthermore, industry itself is only a general name for a very diverse set of processes, entities, and practices. As Marx emphasized, modern industry is characterized above all by relentless change. One certainly can lump together German chemical factories on the eve of World War I and Genentech at the end of the twentieth century, but they can be distinguished with equal plausibility and conviction. It all depends on what you are seeking to elucidate.

Events problematize classifications, practices, things.[24] The problematization of classifications, practices, things is an event. A sensibility to constant change, and a certain pleasure in it and feeling of obligation to grasp and participate in the transformations, constitute one mode of modernism. This sensibility takes the mode of a keen awareness that the taken-for-granted can change, that new entities appear, that our practices of making are closely linked to those entities, that we name them, that we group them, that we experiment with them, that we discover different contours when deploying questions and techniques. When this mode becomes reflexive, it becomes an aesthetic "not of taste nor of beautiful appearance but of the invention of new sensibilities, new concepts, new techniques and ideas of technique in response to those incommensurabalities that question our practices and that eventalize our relation to them."[25] Duchamp called that sensibility "nominalist."

The term "nominalism" can also be used to characterize modes of metaphysics and ethics. It is helpful to distinguish between nominalism as a claim about the nature of things (there are only particular things in the world, not natural kinds) and a nominalist sensibility that seeks to shape itself in accordance with a world experienced as contingent, malleable, and open. Such an obligation, once it becomes reflexive, can become an ethic of experi-

mentation. Despite the antiquity of such terms as "aesthetics" (eighteenth century) or "epistemology" (seventeenth century), or for that matter "metaphysics" (third century?), if one is prudent, it is possible to link them to a genealogy of modernity, a genealogy of the conceptual interconnection of problems. Given this framework, it follows that, there have been, of course, a series of modernities.

One scholar traces the origin of our contemporary conception of subjects and objects, the *via moderna* contrasted to the *via antiqua*, to medieval nominalism. One of nominalism's epochal moments took place on December 20, 1340, when followers of William of Occam were expelled from the Sorbonne.[26] Nominalism had become persona non grata in Paris. Five hundred and seventy years later, Duchamp brought it back from Munich to the Parisian art world. His reception in Paris was little better than William of Ockham's had been, but later he found a happier venue for it in New York.

Today, it is helpful to distinguish nominalism from deconstruction, if by that one means an ethic of revealing the inherent instability of all knowledge. Nominalism certainly works against the grain of established classifications, given entities, and habitual procedures of knowing. However, it does this not as an end in itself but rather as a means of knowing more. Further, while a nominalist sensibility lays a certain emphasis on the subject, this mode of subjectivation should not be confused with individualism or interiority. Today, a nominalist subjectivity primes action, encourages making, and obliges experimentation, but again not just of "things" but of the "conceptual interconnections of problems."

Deductions: Klee

We now turn to another artistic site. The reason that reflections taken from artists are placed in this section and not in the "form" chapter (chapter 5) is simple. If one is engaged in writing and exploring in the human sciences, it makes no sense to "imitate"

the forms used by those engaged in other practices, that is, those using other media in the pursuit of other ends. How would a twelve-tone anthropology sound? What would a fauvist sociology look like? Still, one can learn many things from other practices and take pleasure in what others have done or are doing. In that light, Thierry de Duve's reconceptualization of Duchamp's nominalism is helpful in making visible one way in which aspects of events and subjectivity are mutually constituting. And in seeing that different forms of change and classification can be equally compelling.[27]

Pierre Boulez's collection of essays *Le Pays fertile: Paul Klee* provides an instance of a friendly exchange between artists.[28] At one level, this exchange is a retrospective one, an explicit gesture of gratitude and appreciation from Boulez to Klee, who was dead when Boulez wrote his essays. However, at another level Boulez's book is future-oriented, it opens a space for other such creative and amicable exchanges. Thus, as will be explained in the next chapter, its form is philosophical and pedagogical. Its mode is formative, of self and other. Boulez is concerned with distilling the conceptual principles from Klee's approach to composition, especially his use of form and motion. He had been acquainted with the work of Klee and engaged with it for three decades before publishing *Le Pays fertile*.[29] The pedagogical dimension treats exactly the same matter as the conceptual, only articulated in such a manner as to facilitate its use as an instrument of instruction to guide and stimulate future creators, whatever their medium. Of course, the fact that such a double-edged mode of presentation takes as its starting point and its subject matter the work of Paul Klee is no accident. The elective affinities between these two reflective artists (not all artists, or scientists, or anthropologists are, or need to be, self-reflective) turn on their fascination with composition. Their reflected curiosity (ex-stasis, reflection, inquiry) leads them to pose questions of mode when they step back from their primary creative practices. How should I approach what I am doing? How does what I am doing inflect how I approach it?

The title of Boulez's book is taken from a 1929 painting enti-

tled *Monument à la limite du pays fertile*, inspired by a trip to Egypt. In the book Boulez repeatedly thematizes the old commonplace of the tension between structure and poetry, by which he means a certain quality of freedom and sensibility. When structuration is too strong in a composition, the artist finds himself situated at the border of a fertile territory but still stuck in an unfertile zone. It is only when structure enters into motion and "forces the imagination to enter into a new poetics that, in effect, one has passed into the fertile land."[30] Boulez treats this tension between too much constraint and too little, between stasis and motion, pausing and proceeding, in various manners, returning to it repeatedly. Thus, he castigates as "unjustifiable clichés" the idea that theory and creativity are somehow irrevocably opposed and constitute inherent dangers one for the other.[31] Boulez is categorical: there is no invention without logic, a formal and studied degree of imposed coherence. "One must distinguish between discipline and rigor, and anarchy must always combat discipline. Poetry results from this struggle."[32] In a third variation, Boulez insists that composition and experimentation are inseparably linked, although they are not identical. They are joined through a motion of stopping and starting, of moving toward and standing back.

Boulez observes with evident admiration that Klee possessed "an extraordinary power of deduction."[33] Deduction and distillation are both signs and goals of mature art (and thinking). The experienced artist knows that creativity is more than creative impulses. Creative impulses may (should) abound in a young artist. Ideas or impulses, one discovers, and there is no other way to know it, may well be too rich. That richness can constitute an unexpected encumbrance to creation. Handling this energy may pose unsuspected problems. Through practice, at least for certain artists and certain thinkers, the challenge becomes one of how to divide things into smaller units—ones that can be better handled. As Boulez expresses it: "How to reduce things to the most neutral elements so that they can completely irrigate the text; how to make the original idea proliferate just as one is simultaneously reducing it"—that is, how to imagine their development into a larger structure, but equally to have sufficient imagination to

maintain "l'impulsion en mouvement."[34] Achieving this motion, for Boulez, is precisely the essence of composition. Finding the means to do this, the balance of structure and poetry — the issue of form — varies from practice to practice; fortunately, there seems to be a large, if indeterminable, number of possibilities within each practice. Approaching composition as motion is one mode of creation.

Klee's *Pedagogical Sketchbooks* are a gold mine of distilled insights and instructions about the orderly use of elements and composition in painting. They are a handbook of techniques of form. His *Journals* provide stylized autobiographical material useful for a biographical understanding of the artist's self-presentation. It seems to me that it is in Klee's lectures that we find the kind of concise statements concerning his approach to things that indicate most clearly what I am calling "mode." In his lectures, however, Klee articulates both his worldview and his mode of approach. Following the lead of Duchamp's nominalist and high modernist sensibility, I am inclined, temperamentally and methodologically, to pay scant attention to Klee's worldview (his conceptual and affective concern with genesis, creation, life, nature, etc.). Rather, it is the mode in which Klee takes up things that intrigues and concerns me.

This concern includes his mode of change and development. If the Munich milieu liberated Duchamp through a lightening bolt that re-gestalted his view of art and then of his practice, Klee's response unfolded through a creative delay. For some practitioners, change is not instantaneous, which does not mean that it is not profound or radical. Boulez takes up Klee's experience of delayed reaction and generalizes its import. "Years can flow by between reception and a productive restitution, diverse and fragmentary impressions can be given once again in a new combination, or old impressions can be reactivated after years of latency by more recent impressions."[35] Klee's mode of secession was less violent, and unfolded more slowly, than Duchamp's.

Almost all the commentators on Klee point to his trip to Tunisia in 1914 as the moment that his distinctive style coalesced — as if Klee woke up in the light of North Africa and saw things,

especially color, differently. Indeed, Klee himself has contributed to this understanding.[36] However, the French art historian Claude Frontisi makes a compelling case that the turning point was Klee's trip to Paris in April 1912. Despite the fact that his career and connections to the Munich art world were beginning to bring him recognition, Klee was in a melancholic mood. He harbored pervasive doubts about his vocation and still wondered about whether he should become a musician. He was having trouble painting.[37] In 1911, his first major show, a retrospective of his work, produced not joy but a kind of despair. Further, the Jewish [*hébreux*] art dealers were concerned only with the commercial aspects of his work, whose prospects they found wanting.[38] Hoping to meet Picasso and Braque (meetings that did not take place), Klee met instead with Robert Delaunay.[39] The meeting apparently proved to be as catalytic for Klee as Duchamp's trip to Munich. The reasons for this reaction in Klee's case are somewhat less clear. Frontisi believes that Delaunay provided Klee with a way to regain his spirits through painting. We know that the two painters exchanged views, and Klee returned to Munich with Delaunay's small prose poem "Color," which he translated. Regardless of the dynamics of the encounter, which remain obscure, what is clear is that Klee redoubled his efforts to reflect on color—and to practice it. This exchange might well be seen as the transit point from the painter to the artist with a style. Tunisia was a manifestation—the primitivist *point de passage* that seemed to have been required of artists at that moment—of a change of mode that had already taken place. Regardless, de Duve's Duchamp can encourage us to push Klee further than he himself went toward what might be called a more solicitous nominalism.

In his 1912 "Approches de l'art moderne," Klee juxtaposes "impressionism" and "expressionism." Impressionism, he writes, seeks to receive nature and its existing forms, to let those forms and the sensations of the world press themselves in upon us. This mode should be appreciated for what it provides, a specific "*matière à penser*." The danger and limit of such naturalism, however, is that it privileges observation of form, or sensation, as if they existed by themselves, something Klee does not contest per

se, and that the artist's challenge consisted in observing and al-
lowing the capture of that autosufficiency. It is the latter claim
that Klee completely disavows. Rather, he maintains that one
must approach form, and nature, in an active mode; art is insep-
arable from an interventionist relationship to the material, as is
science. Forms are not merely received, although they are indeed
received; they are also, and with equal importance, made. Con-
struction, Klee writes in one of those startling deductions that
awed Boulez, is expression's "*insistance opératoire*."[40] Klee for-
mulated this insight in a 1920 lecture as his "credo," a credo that
has become emblematic for Klee's interpreters: "Art does not re-
produce the visible; it renders visible."[41] It is this operational di-
mension, the rendering, this insistence, that matters.

In 1924, Klee delivered a lecture entitled "*De l'art moderne*,"
in which he was responding with a certain force, even anger, to
his critics' charges that his painting was infantile or delusional.
Lest there be any further misunderstanding about what he was
doing, Klee asserted that the artist does not accord to nature the
same constraining importance and self-evidence that self-pro-
claimed realists attribute to it. "*Les formes arrêtées*," Klee writes,
"For the artist, forms that are still do not represent the essence of
the creative process in the world. 'La nature naturante' counts for
more for him than 'la nature naturée.'"[42] The artist need not,
must not, feel subjected (*assujetti*) by what exists. It is the artist's
right and duty to exercise this freedom from the merely existent.
However, it is precisely this mode of relating that provides access
to forms. The reason for this unexpected bonus is that nature
itself is movement and change. The thoughtful artist neither takes
the present world to be the best of all possible worlds nor ap-
proaches the existing world as being so horrible that it cannot be
taken up with a certain serenity as a starting point. Rather, the
modern artist attempts to see what is, while knowing that it
could be otherwise.[43] He knows that he can approach nature in a
mode of transfiguration. Klee's mode of transfiguration, however,
is not that of Baudelaire.

Baudelaire's modern artist practiced a mode of ironic heroiza-
tion of the present world. He was not attempting to sacralize the

73

passing moment as a means of preserving it, nor collecting it in the mode of the *flâneur* as a means either of providing stimulation for a sagging spirit or of replenishing an avaricious memory with precious moments. Rather, Baudelaire's modern painter sought to "redeem from fashion what it contains of the poetic within the historical." And poetry, for Baudelaire, in Foucault's rendition, is a mode of transfiguration. It is a mode of transfiguration through an intensification of what is. Hence, through the work of the artist " 'natural things' become more than natural." They do so through an "exercise in which the extreme attention to the real is confronted with the practice of a liberty that at one and the same time respects this real and violates it."[44] Foucault accepted Baudelaire's mode of attention to the real and his violation of it, proposing only to transpose it from the realm of art and the imaginary into a constituent element of a modern philosophic ethos. It is this mode of violation that separates Baudelaire and his modernism from that of Klee.

Klee's "cool romanticism" practiced an equally extreme attention to things. However, and this is the point of divergence, the imperative and the challenge for Klee did not consist in transforming nature through art, because (as for Baudelaire) nature was never sufficient, never beautiful enough. Rather, Klee invented a mode of approaching things as if they were themselves always already in the process of transformation. The job of the artist, then, was not to violate the real, anymore than he needed to adopt an avant-gardist opposition of logic and poetry. Rather, as things themselves were in a process of transformation (*nature naturante*), it was perfectly consistent to find their poetry there where it lay. And to work with it.

In his Bauhaus lessons, Klee provides a highly distilled exposition and demonstration of the means for achieving motion in painting.[45] During his decade at the Bauhaus, a time and a place which began with high hopes for joining theory and life, Klee, through his teaching and interchanges with his colleagues and students, moved toward a kind of purification, one that led back to geometry and its abstractions. Working systematically on elaborating the multiple uses of the simplest elements—the square,

the circle, the straight line, et cetera, — Klee laid out all the logical variations, combinations, connections, mutual reciprocities. At the same time, if in a more limited and restrained manner, Klee introduced figurative elements. He enjoyed the confrontation of these two worlds. Boulez underscores, however, that Klee's geometry is precisely not an objective geometry, by which he seems to mean a Euclidean geometry. And this modulation is exactly what separates Klee from Kandinsky, for whom a right angle is always a right angle, and a circle is an absolute. "Klee," Boulez writes, preserves "*une zone d'insoumission.*"[46] While Boulez's claim is certainly true, one might add that Klee in his space of nonsubmission was closer to both the spirit and practice of modern geometry than was Kandinsky. Klee's "dissidence" — allowed him even greater access to nature, and to a new art.[47]

Chapter 5

Form

> There are two human discoveries that are rightly referred to as the most difficult of all: the art of governing men, and that of educating them; and meanwhile we are still debating their ideas
> —Immanuel Kant

The anthropology that concerns me is one that is practically and essentially mediated by a form of actual experience. There have been different names given to the practice that grounds anthropology in empirical work. The names from the past—fieldwork, participant observation—are no longer adequate to the practice I am seeking to conceptualize. Regardless of how one might best characterize this practice (a topic to which I return below), it eventually passes through one or another form of figuration, especially writing. The traditional name for that practice of figuration is ethnography, but that term is inadequate and misleading, at least as concerns my enterprise. The kind of anthropology I am undertaking does not make ethnic groups its primary objects of study. Rather, as we have seen, it concerns a different range of

---

Immanuel Kant, *Réflexions sur l'éducation*, trans. Alexis Philonenko (Paris: J. Vrin, 1993), p. 78.

objects (problematizations, apparatuses, assemblages) and entails a mode that puts the self, in its relationship to itself, to others, and to things, in motion as well as in question. The challenge of form, therefore, is how to bring these diverse aspects together. This challenge includes the practice of inquiry in its experiential dimension. It also includes the dimension of ethnography that I do want to retain: the writing dimension. The graphē of ethos, logos, and pathos constitutes a privileged site for inquiry and experimentation.

Contemporary Chronicles

Hayden White, in his influential 1987 book *The Content of the Form*: *Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, draws a distinction between the three modes of narration that have dominated Western writing about temporality: annals, chronicles, histories.[1] It has been assumed over the course of the last century and a half that these three forms represent a progression of increasing power and perfection. That power and that perfection were held to be simultaneously veridical, moral, aesthetic, and ultimately political. It is only with narrative history that an adequate representation of the "events" that constitute the subject matter of history is possible. However, since events themselves don't take the form of a story with a beginning, a middle, and an end, it is the task of those seeking to narrativize events to invent and impose adequate means of doing so. Historical writing is one of the main forms invented in modern times to perform this task. It has also been the site of periodic contestation, most famously Nietzsche's assertion that the obsession of Europeans with history and its supposedly privileged moral insights was one of the main signs and causes of the culture's degeneracy. Such attacks have, however, never carried the day.

Annals—a plural noun derived from the yearly record books kept for various purposes by monks in monasteries—seem utterly foreign to us. A mere lists of things does not form a narration for us; it seems rather to require a narration to explain its very exis-

tence. At a minimum the narrative must provide a context for understanding the list. Commenting on why moderns find the lists in medieval annals so unsatisfactory, White identifies the core reason as follows: "Everywhere it is the forces of disorder, natural and human, the forces of violence and destruction, that occupy the forefront of attention. The account deals in qualities rather than agents, figuring forth a world in which things happen to people rather than one in which people do things."[2] These things happening to people, of course, are set within a cosmos in which there is, by definition, order and meaning. That order and meaning was the background to the annals, and we no longer inhabit that cosmos, or any cosmos.[3]

For us moderns, the annals form lacks coherence and is boring because it does not provide a story line. Chronicles do represent historical events in a narrative form, but that appears to us as an unfinished story. It seems to us that the chronicle "aspires to narrativity," as White nicely puts it, but does not succeed in achieving it. Chronicles simply terminate, without providing a defined closure. The chronicler remains in his own present, leaving things unresolved, if by unresolved one means lacking a narrative resolution in a story form structured by a beginning, middle, and end. Hence, while both chronicles and annals do contain a type of chronology as their principle of organization, they lack closure. Each lacks that "summing up of the 'meaning' of the chain of events with which it deals that we normally expect from the well-made story. The chronicle typically promises closure but does not provide it."[4] For those acculturated to the historical mode of narration, the chronicle is epistemologically unsatisfying and morally insufficient; at best, it has come to be tolerated in modernist fiction but not in accounts claiming to be true narrations.

White concludes that historical narrative rests on the dilemma of demanding a narrativity comprising "coherence, integrity, fullness, and closure," a narrativity that "can only be imaginary."[5] Once one sees and appreciates that one is in a dilemmatic situation — the possibility presents itself that one or more of the defining propositions needs to be altered. White in his rich inquiries has attempted to perform this move of altering premises in a

number of different ways. He has sought to make the contours of the historical imaginary available to reflection and then to propose alternatives. At the end of his magisterial *Meta-History*, White suggested that the great modernist master trope of the nineteenth century—irony—was dispensable.[6] Other master tropes might well be used to replace it—although White still deployed a historical narrative of progression as if alternatives would become available only after ironic modes of presentation had run their course. Later, White turned to the work of Paul Ricoeur and Ricoeur's attempts to produce an ontology of human experience that privileged modes of narrative temporality. Although White's and Ricoeur's lines of inquiry suggest plausible alternate venues for exploration, I will pursue neither.

Given that what I am seeking to understand, and establish a specific kind of relationship to, are events, in a hypercomplex world, identified from a position that privileges problematizations, apparatuses, and assemblages, the question of narrative form requires its own specificity. In my monographs on contemporary science, I have chosen to experiment—although the word "choose" is too voluntarist, as the French say; it would indeed be better to say I have found myself experimenting—with different narrative forms. Building upon this experience, and incorporating the conceptual aid provided by White's discussions of the chronicle (and the annals), I conclude that the narrative forms appropriate for such inquiry would (1) remain within and be oriented toward the actual; and (2) experiment with structures that lack closure.

Philia: Writing Logos, Writing Ethos

The result is one instantiation of a form (there are myriad ways this could be done) that brings inquiry and equipment into a common discursive space. That discursive space, however, is not autonomous. It (or its predecessors) itself has been given different forms, and these forms have a history. Since, after the preceding discussion of historical forms, one hesitates to enter once again

into that domain, let us instead provide a few indications of a genealogy of that space and the forms that have taken shape within it. Since the function of genealogy is to elucidate the present and its problems, and since we are delineating an anthropology of the recent past and near future, we will need to wonder about what forms might emerge and be available in the near future. Before confronting that issue, however, as we are employing a nominalist mode, we should attempt to name that space. Although there are many ways one might do that, for the sake of simplicity, I will only introduce one here.

The German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk, in a lecture entitled "*Règles pour le parc humain*" ("Rules for the Human Theme Park"), provides a diagnosis of the current prospects for the human condition. The 1999 lecture occasioned a violent polemic, first in Germany and subsequently in France. The polemic turned on a future policy of genetic selection that Sloterdijk purportedly advocated. Like most polemic, the debate was only tangentially concerned with the truth of what had actually been claimed. As Sloterdijk points out in a "postface" to the French edition of his lecture, the distinction between description and prescription had escaped his critics. In fact, one would never have guessed from reading the accounts of the battle that the bulk of Sloterdijk's lecture was devoted to a kind of genealogy of humanism in Western culture.[7]

The lecture has three parts: an overview of humanism understood as rooted in written exchanges between friends; a reflection on Martin Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism"; and a diagnosis of a possible coming age in which genetic "selection" would replace other institutions as a basic form of domestication. I find the last two sections of minor interest and distance myself from Sloterdijk's formulation of the problem as well as his answers. In the first part of his lecture, Sloterdijk presents the thesis that for well over two millennia Western philosophy has taken a specific form. That form was an exchange of letters among friends. As Jean Paul wrote, books were essentially letters written to friends. This form established itself when philosophy as an oral exchange between citizens of the same polis came to an end, that is, when

Greek thought was transferred to Rome. With the change of site the privileged medium became writing. These facts are banal and can be found in any standard textbook.

Where Sloterdijk takes his tale into more fertile territory is with his claim that "Philosophy is the ability to make friends through the medium of a written text."[8] This friend-making was no longer the one Aristotle valued, the long-term relationships, tested and developed in the face-to-face space of the polis. The newer form bridged geographical separations and was conducted over the course of generations. Philosophy, friendship, and writing were elements of a form that required and made possible a series of deferred exchanges among the living and the dead. A central characteristic of this form of epistle devoted to reflection and addressed to another is that while the original letter might well be sent to a specific person, it could be read across time and space by many others. Writers lived with the knowledge that their work was capable of producing an "indeterminate quantity of possibilities to establish a link of friendship with readers who are unknown and often not even born."[9] One might say that the horizon of philosophy was without temporal or spatial borders. Rather, it was social status that separated and joined individuals; the price of entry into the game of philosophy was leisure and literacy, although obviously not all those who had the means to do so chose to play the game. The practice equally required a curiosity and a receptivity. Furthermore, it did not actually required the participants to "communicate" with each other in any direct sense.[10]

The second aspect of Sloterdijk's claim is that this form had served a specific function. The function was to "domesticate" [*apprivoisier*] humanity as instantiated in the self. Western humanism has always opposed itself to—and thereby connected with the possibility of itself transforming into—one or another form of barbarism. The role, the task, the challenge of humanism was to overcome, or at least to tame, the barbaric. Among the elite philosophers—the men of leisure and learning—the challenge was to live a cultured life, that is, a moral life, among a barbaric populace policed and entertained by an ultimately brutal

civilization. The challenge was to overcome that barbarity through work on the self and work on, and with, those others that counted for oneself.

What later humanists understood as *humanitas* obliged them to adopt a distance from the entertainment of the masses "in the theaters of cruelty. Thus even when the humanist wandered among the howling crowd, it was only to underscore that he too was a human being who could be infected by bestiality."[11] The path out of and away from that bestialization was through what Sloterdijk calls a choice and correct use of "media." By "media" he means the form given to the practices of work on the self and others. Those practices centrally included writing. Foucault has given us a rich account of some of those practices in volumes 2 and 3 of *The History of Sexuality*.

Leaping forward a millennium and a half, Sloterdijk lands in the project of nation building as the challenge of culture and civilization. He asserts—again a standard textbook claim—that with the generalization of literacy between 1789 and 1945, the function of literary form changed. In a wonderful turn of phrase, Sloterdijk writes, "Populations were organized as obligatory fellowships [*des amicales obligatoires*], thoroughly literate and civilized by an obligatory canon of readings within a national space."[12] One epic battle of the ancients and the moderns was over: one could now have both the classical canon and a new one at the same time. Nationalism could incorporate them both into one body of learning, one technology of civilization.

The decline of this second form of literacy and cultivation— this "obligatory fellowship"—has many causes, all stemming from the end of the absolute dominance of the nation-state as the form of sovereignty. Central among those causes, Sloterdijk underscores, is the rise of mass society and its integral connection to new media: with radio (1918), television (after 1945), and the Internet (1989), a new world of post-literary, post-epistolary, and post-humanistic culture has inexorably spread its web. Almost as if hearing himself read what he had just written—perhaps one can become a philosophic friend to oneself—Sloterdijk retreats just a little. The great modern societies, he observes, can now

only "marginally" produce their political and cultural syntheses through traditional forms of media.[13] Neither literature nor philosophy have disappeared, it is only that they have ceased to play the central civilizing role for the nation-state. These practices are still present, but they are now located at the margins of the civilizing process.

The second part of Sloterdijk's lecture is devoted to Heidegger and his "Letter on Humanism." The one aspect relevant to this discussion is Sloterdijk's rejection of Heidegger's absolute line of demarcation between humans [*Dasein*] and animals as the basis for any new humanism. Humans are the only beings who live in the clearing of language. This dwelling is their essence. It radically differentiates humans from other living beings. The cultural world is not the environment. Sloterdijk's diagnosis is that in the current clearing of being it will no longer be possible to skirt the question of the biological constituents of human life—and the role they should play in the civilizing or enculturation process. I agree that a form of this question is certainly confronting us. However, I see no compelling reason whatsoever to reintroduce all the complications and obscurity that Heidegger's concept of the "clearing" brings with it. Furthermore, Heidegger's "Letter" can hardly serve as an exemplar of philosophic exchange. Neither its tone, nor its mission, nor its contents lead in a desirable direction. Rather, Heidegger, and unfortunately Sloterdijk as well, write more in the tradition of prophecy.

Formative: *Wissensarbeitsforschung*

There are three types of "friends" with whom I conduct inquiries. One group consists of readers. As the preceding sections suggest, one writes as if the majority of one's readers are unknown and many may not yet have even been born. That being said, there are of course disciplinary and genre constraints that are influential in establishing a readership, present, or future.[14] A second group is the informants I have worked with in my ethnographic projects.[15] Finally, doctoral students have proven to be crucial and

invaluable to the practice of forming thoughts and writing about them.[16] The challenge in each of the three groups' is to invent a form that is formative. By formative I mean in motion, active, concerned with ethics, logos, and pathos.

In the United States throughout the twentieth century, the practice of the cultural anthropologist was called "fieldwork." There is a significant literature on this topic that demonstrates the historical connections between the idea of culture as cultivation and the practice of going to the field as the place where one finds a culture.[17] My own work does not focus on culture in any of the current senses of the term (meaningful totalities, ordered semiotic fields, multiplying habitus, contested identities, etc.). My research, furthermore, has not taken place in the kind of rural setting in which one expects to find those doing fieldwork, at least since my work in the Middle Atlas Mountains of Morocco. Therefore neither where nor how I conduct my investigations is captured by the term "fieldwork." We require another figuration more appropriate to the changing practice.

But there are few alternatives available. Perhaps the safest candidate would be "participant observation." This purposively oxymoronic term, however, has probably also served its time, done its historical duty in anthropology. For the practice I am seeking to characterize, the term "participant observation" is misleading, as the observation pole implies more distance than is appropriate, as well as an exterior spatial location; the participation pole misleadingly implies that one engages in some mimicry of the natives' practices. Today, perhaps, the term participant observation applies more to many other types of work, ranging from humanitarian work in NGOs to some types of sociology. In those practices one engages in projects and then seeks to characterize those efforts and the project results in a discourse that is quite distinct from traditional ethnographic accounts (dossiers, field reports, commission documents, etc.).

At first encounter, Pierre Bourdieu's term "fieldwork in philosophy" seems to constitute a significant advance over "participant observation." However, Bourdieu himself intended the term to be understood as "participant objectivation." Hence, as he used it,

the term in no way essentially inflected dependence of knowing on the establishment of a position of exteriority or on the construction of an objectifying science of social things. Furthermore, although Bourdieu sought to yoke traditional philosophic topics to his inquiries, as such work as *Méditations pascaliennes* demonstrates, the form and substance of philosophy was not significantly altered. Rather, Bourdieu focused his efforts on shifting the rank of sociology in the status hierarchy of knowledge. Nonetheless, one could give the phrase "fieldwork in philosophy" a different meaning than he himself did, and it remains the best of the currently available terms to describe my enterprise.

The process I am currently engaged in and seeking to name—it is worth *forcefully* repeating that there are a multitude of other practices anthropologists might pursue—concerns the emergence of form as a process, includes in an essential manner claims to say or see something true. The process that concerns me is the one in which such "knowledge-things" are being assembled. That process of assembling—on the part of those producing the authorized claims to knowledge and on the part of those seeking to find a form to re-present that process—lacks a name.

As all of the names for the practices associated with empirical anthropology have come from the English language, it may be fruitful to seek help elsewhere. In German the term *arbeiten*, "to work," is useful in that it captures an essential dimension of what we are seeking to describe on both the side of those who are constituting the object of the empirical anthropological inquiry as well as on the side of those conducting it. As we will see in the next chapter, *arbeiten* can be used to capture an important processual aspect that carries across domains of knowledge and care, of self and other, of figure and ground. So, while one variant of "work" can be better highlighted by the term *Arbeit*, the issue of where and why this particular work is carried out remains to be addressed.

No satisfactory term yet exists to name this work. Assemblage/work is one possibility, and form/work is another. Missing from both is the processual dimension of emergence as well the state that proceeds coalescence into a configuration or apparatus. The

term "figuration" is better but sounds too representational and achieved. If we could find a means of characterizing the knowledge specific aspects in play, then we would have succeeded. However, is it likely that a term like *Wissensarbeits/forschung* would become a part of university parlance in the English-speaking world?

Although this book is explicitly *not* about the empirical subject matter of my inquiries, suffice it to say here that when I was doing the history of the present (*French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*) and setting forth a genealogy of apparatuses (in their normativity, their standardization, their technicity, their function in a larger political rationality), my (textual) informants were "technicians of general ideas." The material for this work was mainly textual (published books and articles as well as archival documents). As the purpose of the work on this material was to produce a genealogy of the elements of an apparatus, the narrative was itself presented in parts and these parts were juxtaposed. The form of a genealogy of an apparatus is a tracing of lines. These lines go back in time to pinpoint the emergence of elements and their subsequent disposition.

When I was doing the anthropology of the contemporary and presenting a chronicle of emergent assemblages—*Making PCR: A Story of Biotechnology*, and *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory*—the appropriate form of writing was a variant of the chronicle. My informants were entrepreneurial managers of new sites of mapping and manipulation of genetic material. They were also researchers involved in a transformation of their previous scientific, or medical, selves into a new role that was often not yet fully defined. Broadly speaking, there were three types of positions or "figures" with whom I interacted in these settings of innovation. First were the entrepreneurial managers themselves. They were always busy and frequently traveling; hence time with them was precious and given to active questioning, listening, and observing. Each of these enterprises also employed large number of junior scientists and technicians, whose role was to put the projects into practice. These people could be counted on to demonstrate techniques, but they rarely had a reflective "take" on

their situation. They enjoyed the challenge of a nonroutine setting but were generally not inclined to formulate a discourse about it. Finally, central to my inquiries were those informants who were close enough to the decision-makers to participate in, and incessantly to be informed about, strategic directions but who were equally involved in deciding how to implement the strategic decisions that were made. By definition such persons needed to be reflective and pragmatically concerned about their changing situation. That organizational and human evaluation of self and others produced wonderful informants. One might call them "technicians of the tentative."

Finally, it follows that if one's object is an anthropological account of a problematization, then one's informants will differ from each other. The challenge lies in finding an experiential and experimental site that would provide for a contemporary instance, and consequently a significant transformation of the kind of work Hans Blumenberg carried out in his histories of reoccupations of problem spaces. This work has only just begun.

Somewhat unexpectedly, it strikes me that essential aspects of the genesis of my work in writing and thinking are eminently imaginable (to me) without direct contact with colleagues. Or to be more precise, while I continue to learn from the books, articles, and lectures of colleagues (close by and far away, living and dead), a sustained and sustainable process of thinking occurs only infrequently between me and them. To a degree this imbalance might well be an idiosyncratically temperamental one, although subsequent reflection indicates that the phenomenon is itself more general. Nor, upon reflection, is this fact completely arbitrary or accidental. Colleagues, broadly speaking, are already substantially formed in their habits, thoughts, and conceptual horizons. There can well be frequent exchange with them, and thereby, if one is fortunate, a kind of friendship, but the institutions of higher learning in the contemporary West are focused on the awarding of credentials, the transmission of information and knowledge through teaching, and the production and dissemination of knowledge and information through various genres of research reports.[18] As I have described elsewhere, academic con-

ferences are emphatically not organized in a form that would promote formation of self and others in an open-ended and sustained manner, although a certain amount of such work, and its associated pleasures, does take place in the interstitial spaces around these events.[19]

Where, then, does the time-consuming and stumbling process of exploration, take place? Some—a fortunate few—do find a site for such vulnerable and uncertain formulations in faculty working groups; apparently for many others the exchanges take place with their life partners; and still other venues must exist (they would be well worth naming). In the natural sciences there are spaces devoted to a kind of liminal, form-in-the-making state: they are called lab meetings. They constitute a regular part of the ongoing work of a laboratory and a discipline. Here criticism of both detail, technique, and conception is permitted, or better, required. Such authorized permissivity is vital for criticism to take a constructive form. This work of vulnerable formulation, as has been observed, is subsequently erased in the forms that the contemporary life sciences practice for the presentation of results.[20]

In my experience, the place where the process in question can be given an appropriate form has been in work with graduate students. In this regard, my good fortune at Berkeley has been on a colossal scale. The fate of a doctoral student is to live within a process of liminality and self-formation. No doubt, a significant majority of graduate students in the United States or France or Germany or England, to mention the countries I know something about, experience mainly the stresses and anxieties of such status liminality. Their ardent drive is to move on to a defined professional position. They will be the experts, technicians, authorities, and office holders of their generation. Some, however, to follow along with Weber and Foucault, take up this situation of professional training differently. They seek to turn it into a different form. That form, *Wissenschaft als Beruf*, simply does not interest most students or professors, nor are they troubled by its absence. In a society whose organization and economy is thoroughly dependent on the production and circulation of information and

knowledge, such indifference is thoroughly predictable sociologically.

For those students who are vocationally committed and consumed, there are two interrelated dimensions of their situation to be underlined. First, the relationship between graduate student and professor is an open but hierarchical one. Such hierarchies are explicit and unchallenged in the natural sciences; they are operative but not adequately thought through in the human sciences. This disjunction is especially acute in the United States, with its egalitarian ideology. Second, it is precisely this normed dimension—exploratory but directed—that is crucial to a sustainable process of formative work. If the danger of a false equality can be overcome through a mutual clarity, then the chief remaining danger involved with the direction of such structured flux is that of forming disciples. Although discipleship constitutes a danger for the young thinker, it is actually a much greater danger for the professor. It is salutary, after all, for a student to mimic ideas during a period of time as an inescapable element of a mode of apprenticeship. Thinking is a practice, and practices are learned gradually over time. The danger of the master/disciple relationship is greater for the professor, for if he or she develops such a habitus, it will diminish or block the critical response by which such vocational work is nourished. Because the practice of norms and forms of pedagogy within the human sciences is neglected, we lack a sense of how to improve it.

The two main forms of discipleship are those attached to a doctrine and those attached to the person of the professor. Although no infallible formula exists for avoiding either, within anthropology at least one norm demands that theory serve practice. The "fieldwork experience" provides a possible counterweight to dogmatization. This empirical, and independently carried out, inquiry also provides a possible counterweight to the lure of charismatic attachments to specific persons. These safeguards are not foolproof, and fools abound. The norm of ongoing self-formation and the norm of respecting "the native's point of view" provide parameters for achieved independence. A pedagogy of inquiry is

hierarchical and mutually formative. As it is hierarchical, it requires care; as it is a process, it requires time; and as it is practice of inquiry, it requires conceptual work. It might best be called *Wissensarbeitsforschung*, but as that will never work, let us just call it a form of thinking.

Chapter 6
Discontents and Consolations

> The rosy blush of [. . .] the Enlightenment, seems
> also to be irretrievably fading, and the idea of
> duty in one's calling prowls about in our lives
> like the ghost of dead religious beliefs.
> —Max Weber

During the course of his essay Sloterdijk asks what seem to me to
be two rather different questions, each addressed to a particular
kind of problem. At one point Sloterdijk asks whether there is
still a "dignity of the human being which merits expression in
philosophic reflection."[1] However, earlier in his text, Sloterdijk
had asked a rather different question, a question that does not,
it seems to me, presuppose the form of possible answers: What
form could be available through which humans could become
humans by overcoming their brutal and bestial impulses? That
question, Sloterdijk observes, "implies nothing less than an *an-
thropo-dike*—that is to say, a determination of the human being
as concerns its biological incompletion and its moral ambiva-
lence."[2] The following chapters approach this topic from differ-

Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York:
Scribner's, 1950), pp. 182–83.

ent angles. These orthogonal approaches do not seek to answer the question but to provide elements that could help to pose it better.

Discontents

In 1930, Sigmund Freud, already in a sombre, pessimistic mood about the state of the world (a mood reinforced shortly thereafter by the victories of the National Socialists), published *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Perhaps defiantly, Freud conspicuously continued the scientifically detached stance he had fashioned in *The Future of an Illusion*. This stance, with its resigned distance, and its self-control, was both the price to be paid and the constraint required, or so it seemed to Freud, to pursue successfully the project of demystifying humankind's deepest illusions. By means of this ascetic exercise, Freud believed he could achieve, or had already achieved essential insights that others, mired in illusion, lacked. That lack — Freud was lucid about this point — provided its own benefits in the world, benefits that those pursuing science would have to forgo as the price of insight. Basically, for Freud, what had to be abandoned was hope, or at least naïve hope.

It would seem to follow that abandoning childlike hope was a necessary, if not definitive, step toward maturity, or perhaps wisdom. But is there such a thing as scientific maturity or wisdom? Much turns on the term *Wissenschaft*, science, and what it offered, and to whom. I take Freud's claims and the position he claimed them from as a starting point for exploration, with the hope that such an effort might help us renew *Wissenschaft* through a commitment to making it a central component of a life.

One of Freud's central claims was that mankind for most of its history had unknowingly projected its ideals onto its gods. Recent advances in civilization, however, had complicated this age-old process; not only were some of these projective processes now understood (thanks to the scientific advances Freud himself was spearheading) but additionally, and this was more complicated

yet, mankind was close to making its ideals into realities. "Man has, as it were, become a kind of prosthetic God." This double turning of increased self-awareness and increased power constituted the diacritic of the present. What Freud held to be certain was, first, that the process would continue indefinitely into the future; and second, that "present-day man does not feel happy in his Godlike character."[3] And humans, according to Freud, believe that they desire to be happy. Consequently, discontent was another diacritic of the human plight, especially as science advanced and its achievements yielded instrumental capacities. Freud's prognosis, in 1930, was gloomy. While scientific and technical advances were unquestionably accumulating, the contemporary mix of scientifically achieved self-understanding (of the self and of civilization) and technical advance was not yet coordinated. Mankind was pursuing its illusions with more power than ever before. Freud's effort was to question the project of coordination or at least to temper the expectations it engendered. Of course, Freud himself was deeply committed to a scientific project of his own.

In 1916, a younger Sigmund Freud had written a small article for a Hungarian journal entitled *A Difficulty in the Path of Psycho-Analysis*. The piece, which appeared early in 1917, was intended for an "educated but uninstructed audience" (an interesting distinction when you think about it). Freud remained content with the article's basic points and repeated them, albeit phrased a little differently, in his subsequent *Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis*[4] The difficulty alluded to in the title of Freud's essay was not humanity itself but rather its pride. (The question of who exactly this humanity or mankind is, it is worth remarking, is not explored in the essay.) Freud's core argument is that throughout history scientific advance had run counter to humanity's megalomania, its self-importance. Consequently, it was consistent to assume that any truly significant scientific advance concerning man's relation to the cosmos, to nature, to other humans, or to himself would be resisted, for longer or shorter periods of time.[5] Freud's core position is that as science discovered and demonstrated what was true, mankind ultimately had no ra-

tional alternative but to adapt its own self-understanding to scientific discoveries. In these articles, as elsewhere, Freud presents himself as a scientist, even a great scientist; this self-presentation constitutes an audacious challenge to his readers to accept his theories and no doubt offers some comfort to himself. After all, the article was written to explain why his theories were not being generally accepted.

Furthermore, in his defiant faith in the inevitable triumph of science against the blind forces of irrational resistance to its discoveries, Freud can be seen as not merely a scientist but an *Aufklärer*, a man of the Enlightenment. The distinction rests on the observation that there is nothing within the disciplinary confines of this or that science to direct the historical fate of its discoveries. An *Aufklärer* is someone who undertakes to pursue increased understanding of a rational sort whereever it leads, believing that it will lead somewhere beneficial. Enlightenment affect (belief, hope, desire) is a surplus, a supplement, to scientific achievement. An *Aufklärer* follows Kant's dictum, *sapere audere!*—"Dare to know!"[6] As Kant argued, enlightenment is simultaneously a scientific, moral, and political undertaking. Such a project constitutes a commitment to a kind of truth and to a way of life linked to an understanding of the good. Enlightenment, one might say, is a culture, an ethos, or a form of life. It is a form of life that can never be complete. It is a form of life that is both arrogant and humble. It is arrogant insofar as it acts for humanity with a confidence that it is right; it is humble in that enlightenment is an infinite project whose achievement lies in the future.

Consequently, an ethos of enlightenment is a way of life that requires a certain understanding of maturity, that is to say, a view of the past, the future, and the present that links them together in a hopeful manner but the proof of which can only lie in the future of humanity, not in any individual life. The question is whether there is a corresponding ethos within a scientific attitude. I will recurrently raise the issue of maturity and its relation to science, enlightenment, and history. The reason for this repetition is that there are different and contrastive understandings of each

of the terms. Those differences depend in part on an evaluation of the history of science and enlightenment—and of the present moment.

Freud proposes "to describe how the universal narcissism of men, their self-love, has up to the present suffered three severe blows from the researches of science."

1. The *cosmological* blow. Man believed that his abode, the earth, was the stationary center of the universe. This perception fit well with man's "inclination to regard himself as lord of the world." The first blow to mankind's lordly status was dealt when it learned that the earth was not the center of the universe but only a tiny fragment of a cosmic system of scarcely imaginable vastness. The destruction of this narcissistic illusion came to general acceptance in the sixteenth century with Copernicus, although Freud is at pains to underscore that the discovery had been made millennia before.

2. The *biological* blow. In the course of the development of civilization man acquired a dominating position over his fellow-creatures in the animal kingdom. Not content with this supremacy, however, he began to posit a gulf between his nature and theirs. He denied the possession of reason to them and to himself he attributed an immortal soul, and made claims to a divine descent that permitted him to break the bonds of community between himself and the animal kingdom." Darwin put an end to this presumption. "Man is not a being different from animals or superior to them; he himself is of animal descent, being more closely related to some species and more distantly to others." Although this point has been hard for civilized adults to accept, Freud insists that children and primitives readily assume a closeness with animals.

3. The *psychological* blow. This, in Freud's self-serving opinion, is probably the most wounding. Man has already been humbled externally but now must accept that he is not sovereign even within his own mind. Philosophers had previously understood this point, but its scientific demonstration

has nevertheless been fiercely resisted. Man, it seems, must also accept that he is thinking about sex all the time, and that only Sigmund Freud has explained why.

Regardless of how one evaluates Freud's overall thesis, it is important to note that he does not explain under what historical conditions scientific truth becomes socially acceptable, or even address this question in any way. Greek scientists knew the earth traveled around the sun, children feel a kinship with animals, and philosophers knew that we know not what we think. But all these truths were resisted by the culture at large. Yet somehow, eventually, even grown-up Europeans saw, and would see, the light of day. In this faith, despite all his pessimism about civilization and its discontents, Freud remains an enlightenment thinker. Not only does he dare to know—fulfilling the highest commandment—but he assumes that ultimately the truth will, as it were, come to light. That light, sooner or later, will shine forth, and humanity will awaken. Was Freud's faith his ultimate defense mechanism, or a sign of his maturity, a maturity running ahead of the rest of mankind and presaging where it is heading?

Science as a Vocation: Truth versus Meaning

In 1917, perhaps on November 17, the very day of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia, Max Weber delivered a lecture, "Wissenschaft als Beruf" ("Science as a Vocation"), to a crowded hall of German university students in Munich.[7] It stands as one of the great—unsurpassed, in my view—twentieth-century statements of the ethics and ethos of science and scientists. It may well be considered one of the first twentieth-century statements, especially if one agrees with my old German humanist professors at the University of Chicago, who felt that Western civilization had come to an end by 1917. The lecture fits within the general framework Weber had elsewhere set for himself of characterizing the "life orders" (*lebensordnungen*) under modern capitalism. Al-

though Weber does not phrase it this way, the central theme of the lecture might well be epitomized as, What is maturity, within modernity, for those who dedicate their life to seeking knowledge and understanding? In the triad of science, enlightenment, and history, Weber privileges history and science. He presents a challenging diagnosis of the historical moment and the ethical demands it poses for those who desire to remain loyal to science. Loyal, that is, without illusions. Weber chillingly refers to the enlightenment as "the laughing heir" of capitalism, an heir that, by 1917, had long lost its "rosy blush."[8] For Weber, we lived enmeshed in processes of modernity rather than enlightenment.

Weber divided his lecture into three parts: (1) the material conditions of science, (2) the inner ethic of science, and (3) the value, or cultural significance, of science in modernity. Although this set of distinctions is totally out of fashion today, I believe it remains a powerful mode of orientation for those who study science and practice *Wissenschaft*.

MATERIAL CONDITIONS

Weber cast his discussion of the material conditions of science as a comparison between the work conditions and career trajectories of graduate students in Germany and the United States. German students, after a lengthy apprenticeship and the publication of a book, received permission to begin offering lectures, for which they were compensated only by the fees of those who attended. While providing limited monetary resources, this system left the student a good deal of freedom of thought and time to conduct research. In the United States, by contrast, an academic career began with a regular faculty position. Hence the young person joined a bureaucratic system and was assured of being paid, though often, Weber observes dryly, the equivalent of the wages of a semiskilled laborer. (Only football coaches were well paid in American universities, Weber observed.) In return for this position and the modest level of financial security that came with it, the young scientist was required to do a great deal of teaching,

although ultimately his career would be judged on his research. Whatever else it might be, *Wissenschaft*, for Weber, required labor and institutional resources.

With a certain regret, Weber observed that the old humanist university in Germany was on its last legs.

> In very important respects German university life is being Americanized, as is German life in general. [. . .] The large institutes of medicine or natural science are "state capitalist" enterprises, which cannot be managed without considerable funds. [As in all such enterprises, there is a separation] of the worker from his means of production. The worker, that is, the assistant, is dependent upon the implements the state puts at his disposal; hence he is just as dependent [. . .] as is the employee in a factory upon the management. [. . .] As with all capitalist, and at the same time bureaucratized, enterprises, there are indubitable advantages in all this.[9]

And disadvantages. Not only was science operating under capitalist and bureaucratic constraints, it further labored, like the Vatican, under conditions of consensus formation that rarely rewarded exceptional people. Weber paints a stinging and remarkably contemporary, portrait of the role played by chance, arbitrariness, and consensus formation in academic life. "It would be unfair to hold the personal inferiority of faculty members or educational ministries responsible for the fact that so many mediocrities play an eminent role at the universities. The predominance of mediocrity is rather due to the laws of human cooperation."[10] Consequently, a young person contemplating a scientific or scholarly future must ask himself, "Do you in all conscience believe that you can stand seeing mediocrity after mediocrity, year after year, climb beyond you, without becoming embittered and without coming to grief?"[11] Enthusiastic young people always answer that their "calling" for science will see them through, Weber remarked, but few actually make it, without succumbing to ressentiment or resignation.

Finally, not all were allowed to play the game of science. Weber does not mention gender, even though his wife was an ardent

socialist-feminist, but he does add that if the would-be scientist was "a Jew, of course one says *lasciate ogni speranza* [adandon all hope]."[12] This equation of the gates of *Wissenschaft* with the gates of hell is, upon reflection, a rather bizarre one. It should serve as a lesson to those who pine for the good old days when science was pure. By this I do not mean that the recent couplings of science and industry are unproblematic, only that historically their separation contributed to a certain castelike recruitment within Germany and beyond.

INNER ETHIC

Weber opens the section on the "inward calling for science" by continuing to specify the conditions under which science operates. The essential feature of contemporary science is that it has entered an irreversible "phase of specialization previously unknown, and that this will forever remain the case."[13] Science is not wisdom, science is specialized knowledge. A number of important consequences follow from this situation. First, "scientific work is chained to the course of progress."[14] All scientists knows that, by definition and in part due to their own efforts, their work is destined to be outdated. Every scientific achievement opens new questions. One might say that a successful scientist can only hope that his or her work will be productively and fruitfully outmoded rather than merely forgotten. Second, the knowledge worker must live with the realization that not only are specialized advances the only ones possible but that even small accretions require massive dedication to produce. Dedication or enthusiasm alone, however, are not sufficient to produce good science, nor does hard work guarantee success. "Ideas occur to us when they please, not when it pleases us."[15] The calling for science thus must include a sense of passionate commitment, combined with methodical labor and a kind of almost mystical passivity or openness. The scientific self must be resolutely willful and persistent, yet permeable. Androgynous, if you will.

Here Weber opens a parenthesis that is one of the most celebrated in his entire work. What exactly, he asks, does scientific

progress provide to the individual, to society, and to civilization? His answer is a stark one: science alone does not produce either enlightenment or meaning; in fact, under conditions of modernity, science stands in a fraught, perhaps mortal, tension with both enlightenment and meaning. For Weber, scientific work forms part of a larger "process of intellectualization" that has been developing for thousands of years. What does this mean?

> Does it mean that we, today, for instance, [. . .] have a greater knowledge of the conditions of life under which we exist than has an American Indian or a Hottentot? Hardly. Unless he is a physicist, one who rides on the streetcar has no idea how the car happened to get into motion. And he does not need to know. [He can depend on others.] The savage knows incomparably more about his tools. [. . .] The savage knows what he does in order to get his daily food and which institutions serve him in this pursuit. The increasing intellectualization and rationalization do *not*, therefore, indicate an increased and general knowledge of the conditions under which one lives. It means something else, namely, the knowledge or belief that if one but wished, one could learn it at any time. Hence, it means that principally there are no mysterious incalculable forces that come into play, but rather that one can, in principle, master all things by calculation. This means that the world is disenchanted. One need no longer have recourse to magical means in order to master or implore the spirits [. . .]. Technical means and calculations perform the service."[16]

Now, this process of disenchantment or de-magification, which has been unfolding in Western culture, [does it] have any meanings that go beyond the purely practical and technical?"[17] Strictly speaking, within the constraints of the issue of the "inward calling for science," there can be no answer to this question, because it can not be addressed scientifically. If we recall that when Weber refers to *Wissenschaft* he means all forms of disciplined knowledge, we are unlikely to be let off the hook by bringing Shakespeare to the physicians nor ethics committees to the molecular biologists. For that move risks instrumentalizing the cultural sci-

ences (*Geisteswissenschaften*) rather than humanizing the life sciences.

THE VALUE OF SCIENCE

"To raise this question is to ask for the vocation of science within the total life of humanity."[18] The mission of science is quite specific: to invent concepts and conduct rational experiments. These concepts, however, no longer provide a window onto eternal verities, and the experiments no longer reveal absolute truth. Furthermore, they tell us nothing about the meaning of the cosmos, nature, or the psyche. Weber heaps scorn upon those who think otherwise. "And today?" he scoffs. "Who—aside from certain big children who are indeed found in the natural sciences—still believes that the findings of astronomy, biology, physics, or chemistry could teach us anything about the *meaning* of the world?"[19] Or, "After Nietzsche's devastating criticism of the 'last men' who 'invented happiness,' I may leave aside altogether the naïve optimism in which science—that is, the technique of mastering life which rests upon science—has been celebrated as the way to happiness. Who believes in this?—aside from a few big children in university chairs or editorial offices."[20] Or, "Natural science gives us an answer to the question of what we must do if we wish to master life technically. It leaves quite aside, or assumes for its purposes, whether we should and do wish to master life technically and whether it ultimately makes sense to do so."[21] Weber shares with Freud the view that science and its associated growth of instrumental capacities was not the path to happiness. He differs from Freud in refusing to believe that scientific truths yielded meaning. For Weber, science alone could not yield meaning; the only possible path toward that goal was experience yielding phronesis. Weber deeply desires to follow this path but despairs of making any progress in doing so.

For Weber, science contributes methods of thinking, the tools and the training for disciplined thought. It contributes to gaining clarity; that is all. Hence, for Weber, science contributes to an ethics; a critical ethos of "self-clarification and a sense of respon-

sibility." This sense of responsibility turns on a specific conception of truth. Such an ethics is a form of critique, in the Kantian sense of establishing where the limits of thought lie. It is also critical in the sense that it displays a suitable scorn for those who cannot accept the limits of what *Wissenschaft* provides. That science "does not give an answer to questions [of meaning] is indubitable." On that claim Weber brooked no gainsaying. However, that insight constituted not the end but only the beginning of the problem of science, ethics, and modernity. "The only question that remains," Weber continued, "is the sense in which science gives 'no' answer, and whether or not science might yet be of some use to one who puts the question correctly."[22] In the conclusion, we will return to Weber's far-reaching, still unanswered, and entirely contemporary query.

However, today it seems clear that Weber's views of history and of science (*Wissenschaft*) require modification. Specifically, they are too monotone and too substantialist. At times Weber remains a neo-Kantian, seemingly forcing science into a priori categories. At other times, he seems almost to hold a view of "rationalization" as the master term of Western history (although in other places he resists this hypostatization). Both tendencies go against the grain of other aspects of Weber's thought, in which categories such as science seem more like ideal types, hence become an analytic focus relative to particular value orientations and are historical and contingent. Wherever one comes down in these debates, Weber's question and concern about the status and challenge of the life orders within modernity, it seems to me, remains a compelling one, even if his answers seem dated.

1917–1989: Enlightenment Betrayed

The twentieth century, amply endowed with megalomaniac projects, has been the scene of further wounds to mankind's naïveté and its narcissism. The ever-reasonable, prudent, and cautiously hopeful Jürgen Habermas observes, "historical scepticism about reason belongs more to the nineteenth century, and it was not

until the twentieth century that intellectuals engaged in the gravest betrayals."[23] Although Habermas is presumably referring to intellectuals such as Martin Heidegger (and his obscene allegiance to the Nazis) and Georg Lukacs (and his horrific indentureship to Stalin), his remark applies to natural scientists as well. The twentieth century witnessed the establishment of a potent and malign connection between knowledge and the military (or forces of destruction more generally), from the horrific effects of poison gas (and other gifts of the chemical industries), through the atomic bomb (and other gifts of physics and engineering), through the Nazi nightmare of racial purification (and other gifts of anthropology and the biosciences), to the indigestible fact that close to three-quarters of the spending on scientific research during the Cold War was devoted to military ends. The industries and sciences of thanatos have had a glorious century. We should never forget that what is nostalgically seen today as the golden age of science — the one before capitalism supposedly despoiled the life sciences — was the age of the Cold War. Today it seems implausible to maintain any longer that accumulating knowledge per se automatically leads to beneficial results, or, given its fragmentation, furthers our general self-understanding. Nor can we — and this is where Weber helps us avoid the fatuous denunciatory cant so widespread today — equivocally maintain that the opposite is the case, that is, that science is malign and darkens our self-understanding.

It is striking that in *The Human Condition* (1958), Hannah Arendt chose physics as her exemplary science. So did C. P. Snow in *The Two Cultures*, published the same year. However, four years later, in the book's second edition, Snow replaced physics with molecular biology. He was prescient. The immense achievements of molecular biology and biochemistry during the 1960s and 1970s — the discovery of the fundamental principles and mechanisms of the genetic code and its operation — will surely stand as a monumental threshold in the history of science. However, with the development of recombinant DNA technology and the emergence of a new type of industry — the biotechnology industry — another blow was dealt to those who wanted to believe

that the production of knowledge about "life" must remain pure
of worldly taint. Over the last two decades it has been shown
that there can be no life science without substantial amounts of
money. During the Cold War this money came from nation-
states. Although the State still contributes substantially to the life
sciences, an even greater flow of funds issues from the huge mul-
tinational pharmaceutical companies and from the fleet-footed
and highly mobile purveyors of venture capital. Please note that I
am not claiming that this situation is intrinsically either horrific
or wonderful: I have no regrets for the cessation of the Cold War,
or for much of what nationalistic science produced in the twen-
tieth century. I have no doubt that the goals and means of capital-
ist enterprise and character will inflect, perhaps radically, what
used to be known as the scientific ethic. My goal is simply to note
a watershed change and to urge us to reflect on it.

Although hype and cant have dominated the coverage of the
emergence of genome mapping, what we have learned from the
first decade or so of this enterprise are neither the secrets of the
Holy Grail of life nor the meaning of its Code of Codes. Nor has
it been demonstrated that genetics inevitably brings with it a new
eugenics. Rather, we have learned that all living beings, at the
level of the genetic code, are materially the same and that the
very techniques that were developed to make this profound dis-
covery enable, even oblige, further intervention into that mate-
riality. François Jacob, the French Nobel Prize winner, frames
these two points in simple, elegant prose: First, "All living beings,
from the most humble to the most complex, are related. The rela-
tionship is closer than we ever thought." Second, "Genetic engi-
neering brought about a total change in the biological landscape
as well as in the means of investigating it. Where it had been
possible only to observe the surface of phenomena, it now be-
came feasible to intervene in the heart of things."[24] Of course,
Jacob's tropes — "landscape" and the "heart of things" — are ar-
chaic. As he is an "old European," to use a phrase from Haber-
mas, we can be tolerant of Jacob's figurations; and since he is a
wise European, we should be attentive to what he sees. But we
should also be alert to the fact that our practices may well be

outrunning our core metaphors.[25] In that case, inventiveness in the cultural sciences would have to be placed extremely high on an agenda of value orientations.

Consolations

Let us return to *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Freud concluded his book in a clinical manner, simultaneously incisive and hesitant. "The fateful question for the human species" is whether their civilization can master "the human instinct of aggression and self-destruction." But any answer to this question is unfortunately directly linked to the advance of knowledge; the remedy and the malady proceed together. "Men have gained control over the forces of nature to such an extent that with their help they would have no difficulty in exterminating one another to the last man. They know this, and hence comes a large part of their current unrest, their unhappiness and their mood of anxiety."[26] And indeed, the decades after 1930, when these sentences were written, would witness unparalleled slaughter and brutality in world history. Although Freud had offered his audience a predominantly pessimistic diagnosis, his tone should not, he says, be read as advocating any specific value judgments. "My impartiality," he added, "is made all the easier to me by my knowing very little about these things." However, what Freud does know "for certain [. . .] is that man's judgments of value follow directly his wishes for happiness—that, accordingly, they are an attempt to support his illusions with arguments. [. . .] I can offer them no consolation: for at bottom that is what they are all demanding— the wildest revolutionaries no less passionately than the most virtuous believers."[27] Freud was surely correct in foreseeing a prosperous, if discontented, future for the hard-working humans devoted to crafting themselves as prosthetic gods.

Freud's use of the term "consolation" [*trost*] is striking and unexpected. It is unexpected because clearly the would-be prosthetic gods are seeking happiness; hence they will not even notice that Freud isn't offering either happiness or consolation. The gift

of consolation appears, rather, to be precisely what Freud can offer to himself and to those who would join him in his heroic *Wissenschaft*. To those, that is, who would bear the lack of solidarity that Weber posited as the price scientists pay for progress.

Consolation, however, need not be so bitter, and in English it falls on the sweeter end of a spectrum of physiognomy. "Consolation" is semantically layered. In English the transitive verb "to console" means to "alleviate the grief, sense of loss or trouble." The Oxford English Dictionary claims that the verb is modern. Its core meaning is "to support," for the verb is a transformation of the noun "console," first used in 1664 to refer to "an architectural member projecting from a wall to form a bracket for ornamentation." Although Freud disdained support for those seeking a firm stand for their ornamentation, he did hope to alleviate to some extent the sense of trouble of those seeking an orientation in life, especially a life in science, understood as the pursuit of enlightenment. Even so, enlightenment was a hard road, reserved, in Freud's view, only for the few strong enough to travel it; it was no longer a wave of beneficial historical progress, carrying along the many in its wake.

These German men sought to be upright within a modernity their scientific understanding had led them to see as yielding many dangers and few consolations. Their diagnosis is ever so close to Nietzsche's: humans would rather value something than nothing; an active nihilism is better than a reactive one. In that light, Freud's pathos and Weber's bathos can be seen as both courageous and virtuous.

Chapter 7
Demons and *Durcharbeiten*

> One could say that each person who philosophizes
> must make their own sense of the first sentence of
> Aristotole's *Metaphysics*.
> —Hans Blumenberg

After a seminar in Heidelberg in December 2001 at which I had
presented a version of the previous chapter, my gracious host,
Halldór Stefansson, asked me why the part of the paper that
dealt with discontents and consolations had stopped in the past.[1]
What about *our* discontents and consolations? The question de-
serves an answer, although providing one is not easy. Immediately
upon hearing the query, I realized that I had framed the paper as
a foreshortened version of a "history of the present" in which,
quite consistently, one does not arrive at an analysis of the pres-
ent per se. Rather the goal of the history of the present is to
identify a contemporary problem—precisely to identify that the
affects of discontent and consolation were interrelated and histor-
ically took specific forms at different times. I say "foreshortened"

because in the "history of the present" as invented and practiced by Michel Foucault the historical time periods in question were much greater than those with which I was dealing. Nonetheless, quite appropriately, Halldór was asking for more; and indeed moving from the truncated history of the present to an approach that diagnosed the "recent past/near future" was what I had been advocating elsewhere as the task of anthropologists today.

Malaise in Motion

Science and scientists today are probably producing both for themselves and for others, many different discontents and consolations, although some cohesion between diverse positions is apparent. Some cohesion, as well as some diversity, is exactly what one would expect, given that the object of study is enmeshed in a problematization: a problematization always contains multiple possibilities for thought, action, and affect as well as diverse responses that have already taken place and that form a part of the current configuration. The object under study in the last chapter was composed in part of affects: discontents and consolations. A parallel inquiry today would certainly find that these affects won't be precisely the same as either Weber's in 1917 at the climactic point of the world war, or Freud's in 1930, stemming from his pessimistic vision of the scale of barbarism of which the twentieth century was capable — a vision that was prescient even if it had not quite seized how far such modern barbarism would be pushed within little more than a decade.

Both Weber's and Freud's positions contain an ambiguity about which sciences they were speaking. Their presentation of *Wissenschaft* tended to be in the singular, although there are countercurrents present in their work as well. Science was a conceptual, experimental, and ultimately progressive practice that contributed to progress in the sense that its discoveries were cumulative. Further, scientific breakthroughs constituted basically irreversible epistemological ruptures that other researchers, sooner or later, would have to confront. Both Freud and Weber also desired,

however cautiously and pessimistically they framed it, that their knowledge, their *Wissenschaft*, could and should be instrumentalized, that is, put to work for the good of individuals, nations, peoples, or humanity. This is all to say that it was worth pursuing science as an at least partially unified vocation, one potentially connected in a significant manner with the construction and conduct of an individual life. Said another way, both Weber and Freud thought they were making foundational contributions to new sciences: on the one hand, psychoanalysis, and on the other, a comparative and interpretive cultural science whose name Weber could never settle on.[2]

The discontents Freud identified arose from the failure of the technical mastery of nature to bring along with it a correlative sense of well-being. The prosthetic gods were unhappy. Moreover, they were anxious, because they knew that collectively they were gaining the power to destroy the world, and they knew enough about themselves to see that such barbaric destruction of their own civilization was far from impossible. Freud concurred that this autodiagnosis was plausible. His task was to clarify the causes of the affect—the drive to mastery as the path to happiness—that many people were feeling. However, naming the causes and the affects was a diagnosis and not a cure. Freud was not engaged in a historical pathos of loss: in his view there had never been a time when the human situation had been radically different in a qualitative sense. It was only that the technical means and consequent power of contemporary humanity were growing in magnitude. Freud could offer, he said, no consolation from either his science or his life experience. The project for his new science was a positivist one, albeit partially hermeneutic, because of its object of study and the consequences that would follow from the new self-understanding it intended to produce. That understanding was all Freud could offer to what he took to be the culture of his time.

For Weber, the domain of discontents was located in the dilemma that despite the claims and hopes of its advocates, science understood as a means to mastery of the world did not bring along with it an adequate response to the question, Why master

the world? Science had succeeded in establishing the principle of the purging of culture (understood in the broadest and most comparative of senses) of its longstanding and unknowing dependence on, as well as its desire for, a world saturated with magical relationships. Weber was adamant, however, that while scientific truth and its incessant advance was deficient in the premodern world, comparative sociology unequivocally demonstrated that premodern arrangements of social life lacked neither a meaningful social-psychological environment for a flourishing life nor a sufficient practical control of the natural environment (again understood broadly) for a nourishing one.

The seemingly inevitable dissolution of cosmological worldviews, abetted by scientific advance and capitalist and bureaucratic organization, yielded unease and dislocation. It presented a cultural and existential challenge whose magnitude was so vast that Weber could not envisage how that challenge could be adequately addressed. Consequently, scientific advance could be characterized as progress only in the most restricted of senses. This dynamic situation led to a disproportion between the growth of knowledge — its ceaseless accumulation and motion, the nearly unbearable effort to undertake it — and the very small personal or cultural payoff that resulted from it. Weber rejected "turning back" as utterly impossible and thoroughly incoherent. Given all these historical conditions and sociological constraints, the perspective of the future yielded by Weber's *Wissenschaft* was vertiginous for anyone sufficiently hardy to face up to the fate history had in store.

If the civilizational and cultural horizon was bleak, the vocationally devoted researcher at least could turn to a stern ethic of self-clarity and intellectual, as well as political, responsibility. Weber consoled himself with the knowledge that he was not one of Nietzsche's "last men." He closed "Science as a Vocation" by affirming that "[. . .] nothing is gained by yearning and tarrying alone and we shall act differently. We shall set to work and meet the 'demands of the day,' in human relations as well as in our vocation. This, however, is plain and simple, if each finds and obeys the demon [daimon] who hold the fibers of his very life."[3]

We have been exploring what Weber meant by the "demands of the day." But who is this demon "who holds the very fibers of his life"? And how shall we identify this demon?

The French psychoanalyst Gérard Huber has generously provided me with an insightful commentary on the *Discontents* text.[4] He convincingly notes that the translation of Freud's term *unbehagen* as "discontents" is inadequate. Although older translations in both English and French had used the term "discontents," the more accurate translation, in both French and English, is "malaises." A malaise indicates a more troubled and troubling condition, one that is both more pervasive, harder to localize, and more difficult to mollify than a discontent. Furthermore, we should add that the term malaise semantically implies a corporal state that links it to anxiety, an affect Freud identified through its bodily expressions. Finally, the metaphoric extensions of malaise to the social body are historically deep. This extension of subject status from the individual to the "society" is a highly contestable one, arguably constituting one of the core reifications in the Western philosophic tradition.

Huber argued that, equally, the rendition of the German *Kultur* in Freud's title as "civilization" is incorrect; the better translation is "culture," in both French and English. This suggestion seems to me less convincing. Norbert Elias's classic essay on the semantic differences but functional equivalence between *civilisation* as a social process in France and *kultur* as an individual accomplishment in Germany in part sanctions the caution about equating these terms, but it also demonstrates the difficulties of the proposed alternatives.[5] Thus, substituting "culture" for *kultur* is not satisfactory either as Elias's essay made clear. Although such a translation might work well enough in English, there is simply too much ambiguity in the referent of the French term *culture* to make it suitable as a substitute for Freud's *Kultur*.

For the moment it seems best to indicate that the identification of the subject at issue — civilization, culture, epoch, individual, person, humanity, *Homo sapiens* — is obscure, in the sense of unclear analytically. This obscurity, and the desire to clarify it, may

well constitute one of the sites to locate our contemporary affects concerning who it is that is not only experiencing but producing things today. It will come as no surprise to recall that the name I have been using to occupy this topos is "anthropos." So let us accept Huber's substitution of "malaises" for "discontents" as well as Stefansson's question about our actual situation, while suspending judgment about how to name the subject at issue. The question, then, might well be, Is there a new ethos (in the double sense of culture and ethics) today?

Today, there is a widespread consensus that one of the central developments, and consequently concerns, in the Western world is that scientists are now capable of purposively changing the nature of living beings. They have achieved this power through what was originally called genetic engineering, although today it is more commonly referred to as genetic manipulation. The fear exists that molecular biologists and others in the cutting-edge life sciences, as well as those who finance them (states, corporations, philanthropic institutions), have entered into the ambit of self-production. This state of affairs has been characterized, with the suitable *gravitas*, by an apparently endless procession of "prophètes de malheur," as alternatively Faustian, or Promethean, or Frankensteinian, or, most amusingly of all among this hodge-podge of metaphoric excess and confusion, Godlike.[6]

At the same time, this phobic reaction to scientific action is complemented by the anxiety that another threshold has already been crossed—unintentionally, without plan or purpose, through sheer negligence or blind greed, et cetera—and the environment has been irreparably degraded. The damage to the basic conditions of life was inflicted without the use of genetic techniques; the older industrial apparatus of both capitalist and socialist regimes that the previous generations of would-be prosthetic gods had produced for themselves proved to be perfectly, if unwittingly, adequate to this global perfusion. Thus, a fear of purposiveness when it comes to the molecular sciences and anxiety about lack of purposiveness when it comes to the effects of social productions on the fundamental environmental conditions of life make up, to say the least, a distinctive mélange. Of course, these

apprehensions are not groundless. Today, in sum, prophetic diagnosis and reactive anxiety about science and scientists are well articulated and massively publicized, in the sense that they circulate freely in the sphere of publicity: a sphere of publicity that devotes significant attention to circulating fear and anxiety. No further hermeneutics of suspicion is required to buttress this diagnosis or to set it in motion. Rather, one might say that it is the presence, production, and proliferation of demons (not those Weber wanted to be possessed by but those we want to exorcise) that has been neglected and deserves to be reflected upon with a rather more sustained seriousness.

Thus, the judgment that a threshold has been crossed with the introduction of the techniques of genetic manipulation, while no doubt perceptive and pertinent, must, I believe, be complemented by further considerations. These considerations turn on the following claims, which I can only assert here (but for which I have attempted to provide detailed demonstrations elsewhere). Man's self-production is a diacritic of modernity as both epoch and ethos.[7] Following from Michel Foucault's definition of "Man" in his 1966 *Les Mots et les choses* as the intersection of "labor," "language," and "life," we can establish a historical series in the process of self-production. "Labor" was the first modern domain where a set of changes proclaimed as unsettling, unprecedented, and epochal were taking place. The thesis that "man makes himself" through his labor was argued for philosophically by the young Hegel and then given world-historical importance in the writings of Karl Marx. The modernization of labor — with its positive and negative effects on anthropos — was followed by that of language. The theme of man's self-formation through discourse is developed most clearly in the structuralism of Claude Lévi-Strauss, Jacques Lacan, and Roland Barthes, but also by Roman Jakobson and many others. Hannah Arendt's claims that it is only through public discourse that human beings become fully human continues the tradition.[8] "Society" and "discourse" have already been modernized through science and planning; now it is the turn of life.

Although one can establish this series (labor, language, life) as

113

a historical progression, such a move would be misleading if it did not take into account that this is first and foremost an analytic frame, stemming from a value orientation, as Weber has taught us. It is only within such an analytic frame that these domains can be so sharply and neatly delimited. Thus, for example, it is self-evident that considerations of labor invariably contain considerations of language and life, and that language and life, similarly, are always interwoven with each other and with labor. If one were to introduce the nondiscursive dimensions of these practices into the narrative, then the story would become more complicated and yet more interesting. For example, social planning and its associated social technologies, which were aimed at increasing the docility and efficiency of labor, yielded massive effects on human health and disease, demography, as well as on what we now call the environment. Therefore, in addition to a primary diagnosis of the contemporary conjuncture, the further analytic work to be done is to see how subsidiary couplings (language/labor, labor/life, language/life) are refigured within it. How, we should inquire, do the historically forged and figured domains of labor and language change when they are brought into an encompassing frame of life understood as molecular?

Schematically, the major changes are

(1) an altered scale. The operative rationality and political ontology is global. This obviously does not mean that everything is taking place at a planetary scale, or that previous formations of sovereignty and the like have disappeared, but it does mean that they are in a process of reconfiguration.

(2) emergence of new actors/vectors shaping this global field of action and possibility. A range of trans- or paranational entities are becoming increasingly important: NGOs, multinational corporations, venture capitalists, bioethical and human rights discourses and practices.

(3) a renewed problematization of anthropos.

Thus, for example, one could assert that the previous formation of life + sciences, the one now being reconfigured, was assembled basically within the purview of the *state*. During the Cold War,

science was state-funded and state-regulated (although areas of international cooperation and competition were present, they were precisely "inter" + "national"). Strikingly, there was no institutional regulation of science in explicitly ethical terms (the rhetorical register was moralistic or pantheistic); the Nuremberg conventions did not play this role, as they were dedicated to identifying and regulating pathological conditions. National commissions and hospital committees appeared first in the United States during the 1970s, stimulated by other political causes such as civil rights, the anti-war movement, environmentalism, feminism, and consumer advocacy. Many of the political activists grew up in what Huber has called a post-Nazi generation.[9] Although some physicists of this generation struggled with their consciences about the nature and limits of their vocation, from all appearances the revolutionaries in the life sciences (from James Watson and Francis Crick forward) do not seem to have experienced any significant existential crisis over the import, direction, or possible negative consequences of their work. All they expected was more funding, more trust, and more glory.

Today, in the name of safety and ethics, states do regulate medical practice and scientific experimentation on living beings, both human and animal (and more recently, plants). But such regulation remains limited, for a number of structural reasons. The extension and transformation of these regulatory practices beyond national boundaries has taken the form of bioethics, which was produced (along with human-rights culture) as a para-national phenomenon. This book is not the place to explore these developments. The pertinent point is that the main mode of regulation is now "ethical." In principle, and by principle, ethical regulation operates now at the scale of living beings (*le vivant*) and takes as its task the protection of life—life and living beings that are presumed to be threatened and endangered.[10]

The relationship of those authorized to produce truths about living beings and those authorized to judge the modes of production and dissemination of those truths and their related practices currently is one of either blithe reciprocal ignorance or a truce-like state of enforced mutual toleration, or sporadic antagonism.

One can compare this state of affairs to the ethic of agonism—self-regulated and intense competition among equals aimed at excellence—that had been normative within the self-understanding of the sciences themselves. Although today that ethos is being inflected by bioethical regulation, it is also being blunted, some would claim fundamentally perverted, by commercial entanglements and their contractual restrictions in a manner similar to the normative distortions introduced by the security arrangements dictated by state military sponsors during the Cold War.

Regulation is (epistemologically, spatially, legally, affectively) external to medical or scientific practice. David Rothman captures this state of affairs well in the title of his highly informative book about the emergence of medical ethics in the United States, *Strangers at the Bedside*.[11] If someday someone were to write the companion piece, *Strangers in the Laboratory*, it would deal in part with the fact that bioethicists do not spend the bulk of their time in laboratories. Rather, they sit on national committees, work in philosophy departments, participate in conferences, produce legislation, express their opinions in the press, participate in conferences, et cetera. Bioethics has been assigned the task of thinking about, judging, and proposing regulation for what comes out of the laboratory, not what goes on within it. Consequently it is consistent that the field has had little to offer to possible ethical reinventions of science as a vocation.

Bruno Latour and Steven Woolgar's *Labouratory Life* (1978) marked the penetration of laboratories by sociological specialists. Latour and Woolgar sought to produce an estrangement effect, the inversion of traditional ethnographic practice. The anthropologist Georges Condominas entitled one of his books *L'Exotique est quotidien*; Latour and Woolgar sought to make the everyday life of laboratories exotic and, as such, a stimulus to reflection. This genre is now well ensconced within a small subfield of "science studies," characterized by intense internal debates and vigilant boundary maintenance.

The quaint prose of these social-scientific researchers contributed to (but was not the cause of) the ease with which their work was ignored by natural and biological scientists. However, the

explosion of the science wars during the 1990s can be interpreted in part as a brutal abreaction on the part of certain scientists. But the question to be answered is, An abreaction to what trauma? First, one dictionary defines abreaction as "the expression and emotional discharge of unconscious material (such as a repressed idea or emotion) by verbalization, especially in the presence of a therapist." The more accurate word would have been "physician." As Jean Starobinski shows in his book *Action et réaction*, the term "abreaction" was employed by Freud and Josef Breuer at the end of the nineteenth century for about a decade and was at that time coupled consistently with the term "catharsis."[12] Distinctively, the status of the couple—abreaction/catharsis—vacillated between a neurological (mechanical) pole and a narrative (signification) pole. This topical vacillation was never stabilized. Eventually Freud dropped the term, partially because he had broken with Breuer, but mainly for conceptual reasons. In its stead he began using the term *Durcharbeiten*, "perlaboration," or "working through." Freud came to think that "perlaboration" better captured the processural and temporal dimension of the sporadic release of blocked emotion. There were stages of psychic work, work that included the patient as well as the therapist.

Starobinski instructs us that as opposed to the neologism "abreaction," the term *Durcharbeiten* was already a perfectly acceptable German word. Goethe, among others, used it. In *Elective Affinities*, Goethe describes how Charlotte, the heroine, quietly withdraws from the public scene in order to evaluate her acts and feelings through the silent work of self-reflection. Thus, as opposed to "abreaction," *Durcharbeiten* can be a quiet affair, one that requires time, demands reflection as well as affect, and works through the production of a form of narration. Further, the production of that form of narration required more than one participant: analyst and analysand in a psychoanalytic setting, author and reader in a literary one.

This concept, I feel, helps to explain why the reaction of the scientific community during the science wars—as articulated by a few spokesmen, principally physicists in the United States (Sokal, Weinberg)—was alternately disturbing and comic. Upon reflec-

tion, the violent reaction to scrutiny is not surprising coming from an elite community whose culture privileged agonistic, if unbrotherly (to use Weber's phrase), relations. Weber had also remarked to his student audience that science was not a question of democracy but of "aristocracy." By this Weber was positing merit as a norm, but of course, the conditions for the production and identification of merit are social. In that light, Starobinski's remarks on Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals* (1887) are helpful. Nietzsche had distinguished the "noble souls" from the "men of *ressentiment*" basically by the power and clarity with which the former lived their emotions; they were carried away by sudden enthusiasms, "rage, love, respect, gratitude, and vengeance." For Nietzsche, it was the cleansing discharge with which these emotions were expressed that characterized the noble soul.[13] Nietzsche's advocacy of a healthy abreaction as superior to the poisonous pathology of ressentiment, while plausible up to a point, is dated. While the terms "nobility" and "aristocracy" and "soul" apparently still had deep resonance for these German men, today we live in another world, a world in which elites must find ways of performing at peak levels while not confusing their highly specialized feats with any other form of superiority.

The violence of the scientists' reaction, then, indicates an abreaction with very little *Durcharbeiten*, "working through." One of the causes of this lack of motion was that there had been a displacement. Essential to the collective defense (or defense mechanism) of those speaking in the name of science was the misrecognition of the interlocutor. Sokal and others mistook the presence of an innocuous, if not entirely innocent, interlocutor for a dangerous enemy. This misrecognition produced much abreaction but no catharsis. For indeed there were others who had intervened in the internal affairs of the sciences, and these others were much harder to criticize in public: the politicians who defunded projects such as the supercollider when the Cold War ended; venture capitalists eager to fund projects in information technology and biotechnology; and bioethicists poised to apply their universal principles to these new undertakings. One reason that these new couplings were hard to criticize publicly was that

so many in the scientific communities were complicit with them. After all, the politicians had provided lavish funds for previous particle accelerators; Nobel Prize winners and members of the most prestigious scientific academies had legitimated the venture capitalists by joining the boards of the companies they were funding; and everyone was in favor of broad humanitarian principles, especially when they remained broad. Obviously it was easier to rail against the "postmoderns" than to face up publicly to the new realities, realities whose self-production one had been more or less comfortably complicit in bringing into being.

Demons and *Durcharbeiten*

Most bioscientists, physicists, anthropologists, science studiers, psychoanalysts, philosophers, lawyers, physicians, journalists, laboratory technicians, janitors, CEOs, accountants, bankers, venture capitalists, and politicians go about their quotidian business with relative equanimity, meeting the demands of the day, day in and day out. Of course, very few of them have reflected upon the fact that there is such a thing as "the demands of the day." The reason for this neglect, is simple: most people are just doing their job. For the few who are engaged in a vocation of knowing—and these can not be located merely through categories of caste or status—"meeting the demands of the day" becomes both simpler and more complicated. Simpler, because their work is, in its essence, its own reward. The reward is a strange one, and the adjective "happy" would not be the one to apply to them, although there are distinctive pleasures involved. Furthermore, they think that they could do no other work; they feel, in any case, no desire to do so. Their situation, on the other hand, is more complicated than that of other workers because the conditions (institutional and cultural) within which their work is carried out and compensated often present multiple obstacles to the pursuit of their vocation. The problem of *Beruf*—and I am convinced that it continues to be a problem—is situated amidst the external conditions for the production of knowledge and the role

that knowledge plays (or is expected to play) in the broader culture.

What, then, is the name of this demon that controls the very fibers of the life of those caught up in *Wissenschaft als Beruf*? At one level, the answer is very straightforward. The demon is identified in the first sentence of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: the desire to know. It is Spinoza's *conatus*, Nietzsche's "will to truth" (but not his "will to knowledge"), Blumenberg's "theoretical curiosity." At another level, nothing could be more complicated, elusive, and troubling. If anthropos by its nature desires to know, if the *conatus* is a natural drive, if there are so many men of knowledge, if science is ever advancing, if theoretical curiosity is such an acknowledged virtue, then why are we so ignorant? Especially, as Nietzsche insisted, "we men of knowledge."

The question of why we are so poor at knowing poses a further problem, because it is hard to know how one might answer it. Yet, for some, it is an inescapable question. It is, one might say, a question that must be worked through. Even if the "through," one eventually realizes, does not lead one to a separate space where answers are found. In this regard the concept of *Durcharbeiten* is helpful. Extending the scope of *Durcharbeiten*, making it not just a psychoanalytic technique but a form of inquiry and self-formation, Starobinski praises it in the following terms: "A theory that sets itself in motion and becomes a method, just as research itself, has a great advantage."[14] Inquiry, since it is an inquiry about something, must pass through specifics and singularities. These specifics and singularities include the inquirer in a situation. That is why there can be no single answer to the question of what is the demon of *Wissenschaft als Beruf*. Weber referred to the demon who holds the fibers of "one's life." For, in thinking through problems, Starobinski observes, the one who inquires "expects to transform himself, at the mercy of the resistances that he must surmount."[15] No doubt this process creates a certain malaise. The challenge is not to get rid of this affect but to find ways of living through it such that one's life attains, at least temporarily, though always in motion, a different relation to it. This challenge, this process, and this affect are common to all

those who have this vocation. However, as different scientists (both human and natural) do different things, encounter different things, and produce different things, the process of *Durcharbeiten* will take different forms. And that difference, if one thinks about it, is a good thing.

Conclusion

From Progress to Motion

> It is not so much that children don't know how to talk: they try out many languages until they find one their parents can understand.
> —Jean Piaget, quoted by Pierre Bourdieu

At the end of the last book he was to publish before his untimely death in January 2002, *Science de la science et réflexivité*, Pierre Bourdieu invokes Leibniz's concept of God as the space in which all the partial perspectives of finite beings come together, the "géométral de toutes les perspectives."[1] Not only do these partial perspectives come together in a common space but they are reconciled with each other. From the absolute "point of view" of which only God is capable, the world appears as a unified and unitary spectacle. Leibniz's God is this "view without a point of view, view from nowhere and from everywhere, of a God without place, who is simultaneously everywhere and nowhere." But God, Bourdieu insists, is nothing more nor less than the field, the place, where all antagonistic points of view, socially located and conditioned, come together—"s'intègrent progressivement"—through

Quoted by Pierre Bourdieu in afterword to Paul Rabinow, *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), p. 166.

"national confrontation." God is the social field. This equation of God and society is one Bourdieu had defended previously on a number of occasions. For example, in 1997, in his *Les Méditations pascaliennes*, Bourdieu had invoked Pascal and his God. There, again at the very end of the book, God and the sacred were equated with the social—an equation that Pascal could not have made nor one to which he would ever have assented.

Bourdieu, addressing himself in a kind of interior monologue, remarks in *Science de la science* that even the greatest of sociologists—"*le sociologue singulier*"—must remember that while he is constructing the point of view of everywhere and nowhere, that he too is socially conditioned. Through the scientific ascesis that he performs on himself, the sociologist alone can achieve a point of view that he knows does not and cannot coincide with those of other actors, all of whom are more or less happily enmeshed in the illusions of their lives. The sociologist alone—if he lives up to the demands of his science—is capable of attaining the point of view "*en survol et en surplomb de spectateur quasi-divin*." His task as social scientist is to construct "a scientific truth capable of incorporating the vision of the observer and the truth of the practical vision of an agent who ignores himself as such and tests himself in the illusion of the absolute."[2] The construction of what ordinary humans experience and endure—"s'éprouve"—is taken up by the sociologist as the supreme challenge, or *épreuve*. Through this supreme, and never quite fully successful, testing of the self, the logos of the social is brought to light—at the price of leaving the ethos of mere social actors behind and of overcoming, if one is to believe Bourdieu's narrative, the pathos of absolute illusion.

Pascal's Enterprises

Must we hold that Leibniz and Pascal were sociologists manqués? The verb s'éprouver can mean "to test, to feel, to distress." In its reflexive form, it means to test, "to feel, to distress oneself." Can we really interpret Pascal's testing of the self in the face of an

infinite universe and a mute God as an ultimately failed exercise in scientific method? As an exercise, furthermore, that would enable him to share God's point of view? Or were Pascal's meditations directed at providing aid in enduring all that one must "éprouve" without the solace of absolute knowledge? To pose the question in these terms is, obviously, to answer it. But there are other things we can learn from Pascal.

In his perspicacious book *Les Carrosses à cinq sols: Pascal entrepreneur*, a certain Éric Lundwall presents an unexpected portrait of Pascal. That portrait, as a leading scholarly authority on Pascal, Jean Mesnard, underscores in his introduction to the book, is hardly the most prudent [*sage*] figuration possible, but one nonetheless that is credible and thought-provoking.[3] Blaise Pascal died in the late summer of 1662, at the age of thirty-nine. During his lifetime he had suffered a great deal, both physically and spiritually. By the end of 1661, eight months before his death, his headaches had become so intense that he was obliged to stop writing. During the winter of 1662, severe famines were afflicting France, and Pascal engaged in charity work, selling his furniture and lodging young people in his house. The pathos and mystery of suffering certainly constituted a privileged site of experience, religious reflection, and worldly practice for Pascal. He brought the available arts and sciences of his day to this site and deployed them with discernment (a Jesuit virtue, it must be said). As he was fully aware, the results achieved were uncertain. Pascal's work and his life contain multiple instances of a quest for knowledge (of nature, of injustice and folly, of the self) as well as an unceasing search for means by which that knowledge could contribute to the care of the self and of all those who suffered deprivation and evil in this all-too-imperfect world. Pascal believed that the two searches were linked.

The broad lines of Pascal's thoughts are well known. Their connection to practical concerns and "a life," to use an expression of Gilles Deleuze, are, unfortunately, not so well known,[4] but the work of Lundwall has to some extent uncovered it. While exploring the *Prière pour demander à Dieu le bon usage des maladies*, in volume 4 of Pascal's collected works, Lundwall encoun-

tered a singular dossier entitled *Les Carrosses à cinq sols*.[5] Pascal, who harbored little doubt that his life was not to be a long one, had devoted the last years of his pain-racked existence to three projects. They were (1) A spiritual enterprise, the *Apologie de la religion chrétienne*; (2) an mathematical enterprise, *Relative à la figure géométrique de la cycloïde; ou, Roulette: Pascal soumet six problèmes sous la forme d'un concours doté de prix*; and (3) a commercial enterprise, described in *Les carrosses à cinq sols*, the first public transport system in Paris that began to criss-cross the city in March 1662.

The connecting link of these three projects was the attempt to impart order (a guiding principle) by providing the means of beneficial motion. First, Pascal sought to initiate spiritual movement in nonbelievers, especially the mocking libertines of the day; second, he sought a form to incarnate the motion of an ideal wheel that would move forward tracing perfect circles; third, and this project is initially the most surprising one to us moderns who cast Pascal as a deep thinker concerned with salvation and infinite spaces, Pascal sought to impart (*imprime*) mobility to Paris's bourgeoisie, a mobility previously restricted to the aristocracy.[6] For this access to movement and to prestige, the bourgeoisie would have to pay what to them was only a modest sum. However, that sum, multiplied many times, rapidly grew in its importance. Pascal's intention was to use the wealth accumulated by this project to benefit the poor, whose material needs for food and care were pressing. Should Pascal's project be qualified as political? Or ethical? Or spiritual? Or philosophical? Are these projects to be seen as a challenge to the sovereign? For, after all, the needs of the king's subjects, as well as those of God's flock, were not being adequately met in 1661.

Although Pascal's projects are diverse, they were not disparate. In each project it was difficult to distinguish the practices that applied to matter and the theory that provided the form. For in Pascal's work flesh was penetrated by theory, and theory always manifested itself in material things. The much celebrated complexities and joys of Pascal's own thought — "Différence entre l'esprit de géométrie et l'ésprit de finesse" — have been com-

mented on by a multitude of scholars over the generations. It is not easy to move beyond the clichés; after all, discoursing on grand topics of depth and spirituality can be a comfortable occupation in a postbourgeois republic. Lundwall's provocation is to qualify each of the projects Pascal undertook in his last years as "une enterprise"; the subtitle of his book is *Pascal entrepreneur*. What is an enterprise? At the beginning of the twentieth century, Werner Sombart defined "enterprise" in his book *Le bourgeois* as follows: "Every realization of a long-term plan whose execution requires the enduring collaboration of several persons animated by a single will."[7] Lundwall glosses this definition by saying that one can distinguish the entrepreneur from the inventor by the presence of teamwork and by the fact that the entrepreneur does not directly access the public: he is obliged to first convince and organize a team that will filter his work. Joseph Schumpeter had developed a similar distinction between invention and innovation. The latter presupposes technical or scientific advance but above all demands skill in understanding social relations.[8] Successful innovation requires productive combinations of skills and domains. Schumpeter summed this point up in his 1939 book *The Business Cycle*: "it was not sufficient to make a good soap, one had to train the people to wash."[9]

More than two centuries after Pascal's death, Stéphane Mallarmé wrote a scathing letter to his fiancée opposing the beauty of art to the dirt of commerce. In that letter, Lundwall observes, Mallarmé seems to share the worldview of Emma Bovary, who dreamt of balls and châteaus. In this very nineteenth-century vision of things, we find a powerful and enduring discourse of antithesis and contempt.[10] Pascal was less absolute in his oppositions, in part because he thought in terms of hierarchies. A hierarchy is a relational order. Commerce had its place; it was not inherently sullying, but it had only a certain place and nothing more. Of course, I am no expert on Pascal; this study is not about the seventeenth century. Hence I am merely using Pascal's projects as a rhetorical device to orient those who choose to attend to such matters toward contemporary concerns and problems.

Pascal's father was a royal tax collector.[11] In part to aid his father, the nineteen-year-old Blaise invented a "machine arithmé-

tique," to perform multiplication through mechanically aided addition. Today, this type of system seems self-evident, but then it seemed strange, even miraculous. Filial piety, however, was not the whole story. Pascal dreamed of making his own fame and fortune by demonstrating the enthralling powers of the machine and then selling it to the rulers of Europe. The challenge Pascal faced was exactly how to present his curious machine to those who could afford to purchase it—how to move such personages as Queen Catherine of Sweden to purchase one. Pascal was concerned about proprietary relations, and in 1649 he was awarded a "privilège royal" that protected his invention. Although shielded from competitors, the invention was not profitable. The price was too high, sixteen thousand euros, and Pascal had failed to do more than merely impress the rich and powerful with its performance. Much to his chagrin, he sold not a single machine.

Pascal had chosen to emphasize the machine's originality. By so doing, he made a case for its future importance but also provided the grounds for explaining its possible rejection. If there were to be a rejection, it causes would lie in a misunderstanding. Pascal in all sincerity, felt that the machine's detractors lacked the intelligence to appreciate its scope, style, and applications. In defense of his arithmetic machine, Pascal opposed the "savants imparfaits," his critics, to the "*savant universel*" capable of synthesizing several disciplines. His critics may have been competent, even adept, at mechanics or geometry. However, they lacked the capacity to bring these different domains to bear jointly on a common project. Since they lacked a general understanding of things, they were capable only of bringing forth "conceptions imaginaires." This conceptual imaginary, by paying insufficient attention to the intimate connections between material things and thought, constituted a kind of laziness. This incompleteness constituted a moral failure of thinking. This separation led not to purity, a noble distance from the fallen world, but merely to thought's inconsequence.[12] Years later, in 1660, Pascal expressed his position lucidly in a letter to Fermat, to whom he wrote that although geometry is the highest "exercice de l'esprit," it serves only as a preliminary guide. Geometry provided the means to begin a process (*faire l'essai*) but not to put that process to use (*l'emploi*):

"the test [*essai*]: the exercise, the ascetic work that prepares a person for greater things — for divine love, if it is given to him."[13] While waiting expectantly for God to fill his life with grace, Pascal had many mundane things demanding his attention. And he did not despise these things, nor did he merely contemplate them.

The arithmetic machine was the invention of a single individual. The *Carrosses à cinq sols* was a group enterprise. Pascal was joined in the planning, financing, and profit of this undertaking by two close friends from Port-Royal and well-placed persons with connections at the court. This group had carefully calculated and evaluated the project's potential profits and risks (from Amsterdam, Huyghens had warned Pascal that the probability of, and liability for, accidents to the carriages and those they were transporting constituted a major hazard for investors); they had mobilized powerful allies; they acted decisively. They succeeded. The team proceeded not from a rhetoric of radical innovation but from an extension of existing practices. In France, there already existed a system of communal transport, one that operated, however, only in the countryside, linking the principal cities of France. Pascal and his partners extended this system to the city. In this enterprise Pascal sought to establish a continuity with existing customs; the carriages linked the principal parts of Paris. The principle of transport in common was a known one. The strategy was to change its scale of application and those to whom it was available. Preparations were made carefully, including tests on the carriages themselves and the routes as well as an analysis of the possible accidents, risks, and legal consequences of the undertaking. Full security measures were put into place. The enterprise was an immediate success. Pascal's profits constituted the major part of his wealth; he left half to a hospital that cared for the indigent poor.

Infinity

Hans Blumenberg underscores a dimension of Pascal's thought relevant to diagnosing our current conjuncture; the *topoi* of the

discourse of temporal form and its background assumptions. In *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, Blumenberg asserts that it was Pascal who was the first thinker to speak of "the infinity of progress." Blumenberg raises this point as part of a debate he was engaged in with Karl Löwith (with Carl Schmitt not very far in the background) concerning the status of the concept of "secularization." Against Löwith and Schmitt, Blumenberg argues that modernity cannot be accounted for adequately as simply a secularization of theological categories. Rather, he shows in great historical detail that while certain problems dealt with in theology may have been readdressed in later times, the answers given, and the consequent new problems that arose from those new answers, can neither be reduced to, nor accounted for, by some ineffable, mysterious, and hidden process (such as secularization) guiding history. It is precisely the belief — for that is what it is — that there is such a process that is the theological residue of the past. Blumenberg's approach is helpful in identifying such beliefs. Such insights aid us in seeing how older topoi have become beliefs and how such beliefs lead us astray in our inquiries.

For Pascal, "infinity in time and space signifies not the rendering worldly of a divine attribute but the epitome of metaphysical renunciations and the ambivalence of man between his greatness and his misery." It is precisely the opacity of man's relation to infinity that so troubled Pascal. That infinity existed was not in doubt; what was in doubt was whether we would ever know it. An essential dimension of that opacity and trouble, at least in terms of man's self-understanding, is found in the decoupling of the temporality of an individual life and that of humanity as a whole. Blumenberg seizes on a remark Pascal made in the incomplete preface to his 1647 *Traité du vide*, where he "connects the metaphor of the human life span with the idea of a universal man who can be thought of as a single ideal subject extending across the sequence of generations."[14] This conception of temporality prepares the way for understanding man's relation to infinity: his form.

At the very least, such an infinity, this perfection, however, demanded an altered metaphorics. For, Blumenberg writes, the "anthropological definition does not harmonize well with the meta-

phor that compares history to an individual growing to maturity and fulfillment at the high point of his life, then aging and dying. Infinite progress renders perpetual only the first half of the overall process depicted by the organic metaphor."[15] This stance toward man, time, and maturity verges on becoming a modern one; it constitutes a break with the traditional harmonization of the macro and the micro. A certain vertical movement is thereby disrupted, even if the space in which that movement had taken place remains. For Pascal, as Blumenberg puts it, "this infinity in process is the painful actualization of the unalterable disparity between the status of a point, which is all that anything finite possesses vis-à-vis the infinite, and the destiny of man, which finally, despite the fruitfulness of his exertions, allows him by a process of grace to participate in the transcendent infinite, the need for which he comes to know through his experience of the infinity of progress."[16] This figure may not directly presage the "Protestant Ethic and the Ethos of Unbounded Methodical Work as Faith," but its core insight, its point, is located not too far away.

The rending asunder of the temporality and forms of "life" and "a life" constitutes one of the problems thinkers attempting to be modern have found it necessary to confront ethically, that is, as part of an ethos, a stance to take up toward themselves, toward others, and toward things. Living with the answers remained thorny. "Pascal's conception," Blumenberg writes, "makes it clear that it is precisely the rationality of progress that withholds the attribute of infinitude from history, inasmuch as man finds his vocation for the infinite to be unfulfilled in history. The whole of humanity, the *homme universel*, is after all only a fictive subject of history."[17] Today, again — but differently — each of these terms ("rationality," "progress," "history," "man," "vocation," "humanity," "fictive," "subject") is a topos from which we must again set out to inquire. And we must find a way to live with what we find.

Exemplary Cases

An anthropology of the actual works with problems, diagnoses, and exemplars rather than theories, hypotheses, and data sets.

Let us turn briefly, in closing, to exemplars. In their book *The Uses of Casuistry*, the medical ethicist Albert Jonsen and the philosopher Stephen Toulmin proposed a reinvention of the Jesuit art of "cases" as a remedy for, and replacement of, the perpetually failed project to turn ethics, and the whole of the human sciences, into method-driven disciplines. In their account, the fatal crossing at which epistemē achieved its discursive domination of phronesis took place in the seventeenth century. This refiguration is of course that of Descartes's *Discours de la méthode* (1637) and its inauguration of the program to set philosophy on an indubitable path of certitude. The success of Pascal's *Les Lettres provinciales* (1656) — a withering, satirical denunciation of the Jesuits' casuistry as corrupt and sophistic — is given an equal place of honor, or shame.

Toulmin and Jonsen present a detailed historical account of the social and political conditions under which the art of casuistry flourished after 1245, following the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*; how it fell into disrepute during the seventeenth century; and how it has endured as a marginal practice in pastoral sites such as medicine and in ordinary life. The practice of casuistry consisted essentially in the examination of particular cases of moral dispute — hence, "casuistry" — through their juxtaposition to similar paradigm examples. These paradigm examples (which I prefer to call exemplars so as to avoid confusion with the myriad uses of "paradigm" that have proliferated in the wake of the work of Thomas Kuhn) were case examples whose resolution focused substantial agreement among those qualified to judge such issues. Jonsen and Toulmin present detailed examples of the handling of profit, perjury, and pride. In the light of such exemplars, new cases confronting a practitioner could then be approached through a dialectics of comparison and difference. Jonsen and Toulmin remonstrate that casuistry is far removed from either ethical relativism or situationism; casuistry proceeds from well-established moral exemplars against which it refines distinctions so as to fit the circumstances of specific cases with more precision. Casuistry does not begin de novo before each case or each situation but only seeks, upon the basis of established precedent, to reach an appropriate evaluation. It thereby builds an in-

creasingly complex web of cases, arguments, and distinctions. This web serves as a flexible "moral taxonomy," a tool to guide practitioners until they arrive at a convincing resolution. The taxonomic procedure of ethics works its way through to still-disputed issues, taking into account and weighing the importance of circumstances, probable causes, and the cumulative strength of arguments.[18] Above all, casuistry is a set of techniques oriented to defining and resolving problems. This orientation is resolutely practical and favors an emphasis on chains of reasoning and evidence that lead toward making difficult cases available for resolution. Pragmatically oriented steps are privileged over others that might provide for more complex moral or theological speculation. Jonsen and Toulmin deftly characterize this difference between these directions. "Theoretical arguments are chains of proof, whereas practical arguments are methods for resolving problems. In the first, formal sense, an *argument*, is a 'chain' of propositions, linked up so as to *guarantee* its conclusion. In the second, substantive sense, an *argument*, is a network of considerations, presented so as to *resolve* a practical quandary."[19] Thus conclusions are tentative and open to reconsideration if symptoms or circumstances change.

Jonsen and Toulmin's approach to the history of ethics is a rich one in that it situates the rise and eclipse of ethical systems and practices in historical, institutional, and political terms. Thus they show how the dialectics of cases, maxims, and taxonomies held an important place in Jesuit pedagogy and pastoral practice. This pedagogy was suited to developing a "discerning" character in its practitioner, one open to careful consideration of local and foreign practice, with which Jesuits were frequently confronted in their missions. Jonsen and Toulmin are remarkably uncritical, however, in their historical account of the Jesuits' encounters with other cultures, including those of Europe. This coloration achieves a high saturation in their interpretation of the decline of casuistry as a dominant form. They don't examine with any seriousness why the two main alternative traditions that arose in Europe should have achieved such wide acceptance over the ensuing centuries.[20] This eclipse of casuistry was never total, even during

the three casuistically dark centuries dominated by the search for authoritative systems of theory and an ever more secular world-view. Jonsen and Toulmin sketch the manner in which moral theory became established in English university worlds, identifying as the low point the appearance and success of Henry Sidgwick's 1874 *The Method of Ethics*, with its doctrine of abstract meta-ethical issues rather than particular concrete cases. Events and forces outside of the university and external to professional philosophy, they argue, turned attention back to the real world and to cases.

Convincingly, they point to the various social, political, and medical changes taking place during the 1950s and 1960s as the seed bed for a new ethical reflection and practice.[21] It is not at all coincidental that the main arena in which the art of casuistry flourishes today is clinical. In that arena there is a mandatory attention to specifics, to the necessity for action even when conditions permit only "probable" knowledge. Further, clinical practice qualifies as a privileged site of casuistry because the good physician seeks to lives up to his vocational duties, both pastoral and pragmatic. Finally, in ethics as in medicine, practical experience is as much collective as personal. Perhaps less obviously, clinical practice operates in an arena that can plausibly be designated as that of modernity's most sacred values: life and health.

Progress or Motion?

Georges Canguilhem, in his essay "La décadence de l'idée de Progrès," argues that decadence overcame the idea of progress because during the nineteenth century the sciences were making discoveries that shattered the tacit coherence and connections of previous analogies. These analogies had held together disparate things that would henceforth be difficult to regroup under a common form or figure. Whether this situation is decadence or simply change — perhaps even progress — is a question appropriate to casuistry. My diagnosis is that worldviews concerned with progress and decadence as essential elements of a totalizing figure should

be allowed to retire into the past, to take their place as historical memories. By relinquishing them we will enable reason to better confront contemporary problems.

Chief among the discoveries that disconcerted previous harmonies was the law of conservation of matter, which showed the natural world losing energy. Nature was by its essence in a state of dissipation, not, as had been supposed, one of an ever-growing perfection. Although this insight was perfectly scientific, and hence could appropriately be referred to as advancement in a sectorial or restricted sense, it served to disrupt the connections that previously linked diverse domains together. It constituted, as Canguilhem put it, "alongside the principles of conservation, a principle of inequality or of degradation that regulates the irreversible transformation."[22] This scientific advance broke the connection that previously had sutured the idea of progress in the human sphere with stability in the physical. This rupture can be accounted for in at least two ways. Canguilhem chooses one but provides us the tools to imagine another. The one Canguilhem proposes turns on the consequences of a shift of what, following Blumenberg, might be called the core metaphors of the day. "In the nineteenth century," Canguilhem writes, "the physical phenomenon that symbolizes progress is no longer light, but heat."[23] The emergent industrial apparatus to which the concepts and tools of heat creating and heat harnessing were so essential contained its own dynamics. These unexpected and undesirable effects contributed to demonstrating inherent limitations of the system of metaphorics. "Unlike light, whose continuous emission is regarded as being guaranteed by the stability of the solar system, heat requires non-renewable deposits of earthly combustibles if it is to be used as an industrial tool."[24] Heat proved to be amenable to a growing set of metaphors of loss, of destruction, and of pollution. And of course it took a good deal of intellectual and poetic labor to imagine that the early stages of industrial capitalism could be connected to the progress of humanity. As Canguilhem says, "Progress now had a new face: the face of children working fifteen hours a day."[25] Of course many, including Karl Marx, un-

dertook the labor required to invent a narrative of hope out of this brutality.

Finally, a further set of embedded assumptions was undone. New technological inventions were appearing for which no scientific theory had prepared the way. Technology was preceding science and achieving a certain autonomy. This separation and this relative autonomy itself became a phenomenon that required new types of explanation, new narratives, and new metaphors. The impulse lingers to invent a comprehensive metaphorics to link diverse domains once again into a narrative or at least under a common figure. As we have seen, Blumenberg argues that such a desire can be located in the reflex to answer old questions, while the critical and creative response lies in knowing when not to answer. Canguilhem's choice of the word "decadence" — however ironic — is not helpful. Although it is true that decadence was a central symbol in European social discourses at the end of the century, the arts and sciences were flourishing. That flourishing, as many thinkers have observed, Jean Cavaillès among them, included a superbly creative disruption of the previous state of understanding of matter and mind, logic and language, reality and representation. After Cantor, Schönberg, and Cézanne, none of these things would ever be the same. Of course, new narratives of progress and emancipation from darkness and barbarism — many of which would privilege natural and social technologies designed to compensate for loss and imperfection — would proliferate throughout the dismal twentieth century.

Jean Starobinski advocates a criticism that seeks neither "the totality (as with the gaze from above), nor [. . .] intimacy (as does a self-identificatory intuition)."[26] The critical practice is one that finds the means to navigate these relations of distance and closeness. There is no "quasi-divinity" present here, only a disciplined human curiosity. Let us agree with Starobinski that method requires motion. A movement that goes on "*inlassablement*," tirelessly, steadfastly, persistently. I advocate pursuing in our thought and writing something like the motion, through different scales and different subject positions, that Starobinski proposes in the

135

quote and exemplifies in his criticism. Such movement is easy to initiate and hard to master. Yet I firmly believe that in the actual conjuncture of things, it is a paramount challenge for philosophy and the human sciences to experiment with forms that will be, if not fully adequate to, at least cognizant of, the need for such movement through scale and subjectivity. Such motion might help us to leave notions like progress behind and even to help us to take better care of things, ourselves, and others.

Notes

Introduction Modern Equipment

1. Peter Sloterdijk, *Règles pour le parc humain: Une lettre en réponse à la Lettre sur l'humanisme de Heidegger*, trans. Olivier Mannoni (Paris: Editions, Mille et Une Nuits, 2000), p. 7, English trans. mine. Orig. pub. as *Regeln für den Menschenpark: Ein Antwortschreiben zu Heideggers Brief über den Humanismus* (1999).

2. Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

3. Ibid., pp. xxiii–xxiv.

4. On "pathos" see my *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), p. 14.

5. Gros, "Situation du cours," Foucault, *L'Herméneutique*, p. 504.

6. Stephen Shapin, in his *Leviathan and the Air Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), as well as in personal communication, argues convincingly that the actual history was a good deal more complicated than this version. The moral status of gentlemen scientists, as well as their access to instruments, went a long way toward guaranteeing their credibility.

7. Foucault, *L'Herméneutique*, p. 442.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p. 308.

10. Foucault, *Résumé du cours*, p. 479.

11. Gros, p. 510.

12. Foucault, *Résumé du cours*, pp. 479–80.

13. Ibid., p. 312.

Chapter 1 Midst Anthropology's Problems

1. Michel Foucault, *Les Mots et les choses* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1966), p. 398.

2. Gilles Deleuze, "Appendix: On the Death of Man and Superman," in *Foucault*, trans. Sean Hand (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988. Orig. pub. by Editions de Minuit, 1986.

3. Foucault identified modern man as that being whose politics puts its existence in question: "l'homme moderne est un animal dans la politique duquel sa vie d'être vivant est en question." *La Volonté de savoir* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1976), p. 188.

4. John Dewey, *Essays in Experimental Logic* (New York: Dover, 1916), p. 1.

5. Ibid., p. 19.

6. Ibid., p. 70.

7. This issue is explored at great length in the magisterial biography by Robert B. Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991). On the misreading of Dewey as "naïve," see Hans Joas, *The Genesis of Values* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

8. Foucault, *Les Mots*, p. 670.

9. Ibid., p. 598.

10. "A critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest.

We must free ourselves from the sacralization of the social as the only reality and stop regarding as superfluous something so essential in human life and human relations as thought. Thought exists independently of systems and structures of discourse. It is something that is hidden, but which always animates everyday behavior. There is always a little thought even in the most stupid institutions; there is always thought even in silent habits." Michel Foucault, "Practicing Criticism," or "Is It Really Important to Think?" Didier Eribon interview, May 30–31, 1981, in Lawrence Kriztman, *Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1988), p. 155.

11. Michael Ignatieff, "Human Rights," in Carla Hesse and Robert Post, eds., *Human Rights in Political Transition: From Gettysburg to Bosnia* (New York: Zone Books, 1999), p. 313.

12. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1951).

13. Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999).

14. James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

15. Ignatieff, p. 320.

16. The outlines of a general anthropological critique of the universalism of bioethics is found in Arthur Kleinman, "Anthropology of Bioethics," in *Writing at the Margin: Discourse between Anthropology and Medicine* (Berkeley: Uni-

versity of California Press, 1995). On the institutionalization of moral philosophy in England, see Albert Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin, *The Uses of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

17. Ignatieff, p. 321.

18. Yves Dezalay and Bryant Garth, "Droits de l'homme et philanthropie hégémonique," in *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 121–22 (March 1998): 23–41.

19. Ibid., p. 23.

20. Ibid., p. 27.

21. Ibid, p. 40.

22. Tony Negri and Michael Hardt, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 36.

23. David J. Rothman, *Strangers at the Bedside: A History of How Law and Bioethics Transformed Medical Decision Making* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), p. 3.

24. Ibid., p. 12.

25. Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. Robert Wallace (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), p. 48.

26. Ibid., p. xx.

27. Robert Wallace, introduction to Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, p. xxviii.

Chapter 2 Method

1. In 1902 Sombart published his two-volume *Modern Capitalism*. In 1902, when Jaffé married Elsa von Richthofen, Weber's first female student, Jaffé gave the journal to Weber as a wedding present to Elsa. Arpád Szakolzai, *Max Weber and Michel Foucault: Parallel Lifeworlds*, (London: Routledge, 1998), p. 146.

2. Max Weber, Werner Sombart, and Edgar Jaffé, "Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy," in Weber, *Methodology*, p. 68.

3. Ibid., p. 51.

4. Ibid., p. 52.

5. Ibid., p. 57.

6. Ibid., p. 58; emphasis in the original.

7. Ibid., p. 67.

8. Ibid., p. 72.

9. Ibid., pp. 80–81.

10. Ibid., p. 81.

11. Ibid., p. 68; emphasis added.

12. Ibid., p. 101.

13. Ibid., p. 90.

14. Michel Foucault, "Table Ronde du 20 mai 1978," in *Dits et écrits* (Paris: Gallimard, 1980), 4:26.

15. Ibid., p. 27.

16. Ibid.

17. Weber, "Objectivity," p. 95.

18. Foucault, "Table Ronde," p. 27.

19. Ibid., pp. 27–28.
20. Ibid., p. 27.
21. Ibid., p. 34.
22. Weber, "Objectivity," p. 85.

Chapter 3 Object

1. Arpad Szakolczai documents this fact and provides an explanation for it in his *Max Weber and Michel Foucault: Parallel Life Worlds* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

2. The details of this process are found in Didier Eribon, *Foucault et ses contemporains* (Paris: Fayard, 1994). The project is described in *Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*, vol. 1 of *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: New Press, 1997).

3. Foucault defined "epistēmē" as "[t]he total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences, and possibly formalized systems." Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. Dana Polan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), p.191.

4. "[A] science can only pose problems on the terrain and within the horizon of a definite theoretical structure, its problematic, which constitutes its absolute and definite condition of possibility, and hence the absolute determination of *the forms in which all problems must be posed*, at any given moment in the science." Louis Althusser and Etienne Balibar, *Reading Capital*, trans. Ben Brewster (Verso Books, 1970), p. 25. Orig. pub. as *Lire le capital* (Paris: François Maspero, 1968).

5. Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits*: 1954–1988 (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1994), 4:597.

6. For an account of Foucault's personal relations with Althusser, see Didier Eribon, "Le Passé dure longtemps," in *Foucault et ses contemporains* (Paris: Fayard, 1994). Eribon points out that Foucault's views on power came to be seen increasingly as an attack on Althusser's state-oriented conceptions. Etienne Balibar has written a number of pieces exploring the conceptual relationship between the two thinkers, from an unrepentantly Althusserian point of view.

7. Foucault, *Dits et écrits*, 4: 597–98.

8. John Dewey, introduction to *Essays in Experimental Logic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916) p. 11.

9. Ibid., p. 16.

10. According to the index of *Dits et écrits*.

11. Foucault, *Dits et écrits*, 2:720.

12. Ibid., 3:18.

13. "Quel est pour toi le sens et la fonction méthodologique de ce terme: 'dispositif'?" Ibid., 3:298.

14. Michel Foucault, "Le Jeu de Michel Foucault," in *Dits et écrits*, 3:299.

15. The publication date of this article is later, but Foucault had written it earlier and reworked it a number of times. Quote taken from Hubert Dreyfus

and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), p. 224.

16. Ibid., p. 196.

17. Ibid., p. 197.

18. See Paul Rabinow, *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

Chapter 4 Mode

1. Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. Robert M. Wallace (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), from *Die Legitmität der Neuzeit* enl. and rev. ed. (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1966–76). Blumenberg addresses the topic of "epoch" in part 4, chapter 1. I take this issue up in *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

2. Rheinhardt Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985) p. 4. Orig. pub. as *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (1979).

3. Ibid., p. 5. Max Weber as well interpreted the Reformation as profoundly recasting modes of subjectivity in their relationship to temporality, both secular and profane. For another take on this changing subjectification, see Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989).

4. Koselleck, p. 6. A detailed recounting of many of those variations can be found in Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval and Modern*, 2d ed. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1994).

5. Breisach addresses the fact that the far-reaching decisions reached by this council had a delayed effect on the actual writing of historical narrative (p. 169).

6. Breisach, p. 180, quoting Jean Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. B. Reynolds (New York: 1945), p. 15.

7. Especially in France where "the analysis of institutions brought new insights and [. . .] that some authorities came to distrust the tendency of history writing to open the arcane act of governing to improper observers" (Breisach, p. 186).

8. Koselleck, p. 11.

9. Ibid., p. 14.

10. Ibid., p. 13.

11. Koselleck, "'*Neuzeit*': Remarks on the Semantics of the Modern Concepts of Movement," in *Futures Past*, p. 233.

12. Compare with Fredric Jameson's analysis of time in the "postmodern," in *Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991).

13. Thierry de Duve, *Pictorial Nominalism: On Marcel Duchamp's Passage from Painting to the Ready-Made*, (1984; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), p. 97.

14. Ibid., p. 102.

15. Ibid., p. 104.

16. Ibid., p. 98.

17. See T. J. Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* (New York: Knopf, 1985), for a different and compelling approach.

18. de Duve, *Nominalism*, p. 101.

19. Ibid., p. 106.

20. Thierry de Duve, *Kant after Duchamp* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), p. 177.

21. For architecture, see Paul Rabinow, *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (1989; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

22. de Duve, *Nominalism*, pp.179–80.

23. Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation," in C. Wright Mills and Hans Gerth, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford, 1946), p.139.

24. John Racjman, foreword to de Duve, *Nominalism*, p. xxii.

25. Ibid., p. xxii.

26. Ruprecht Paqué, *Le Statut parisien des nominalistes* (1970; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985).

27. In discussion, de Duve expressed surprise at this alternative use of his work. His quizzical assent was pleasing and confirmatory.

28. Pierre Boulez. *Le Pays fertile: Paul Klee* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1990). In chapter 5 I discuss exchange of letters as a philosophic practice.

29. Although artists such as Cézanne or Picasso have recieved monumental amounts of scholarly attention, Klee's reception has been more restrained. Nonetheless both Foucault and Blumenberg have written about his importance for them, as has Pierre Hadot.

30. Boulez, p. 175, my translation.

31. Ibid., p. 122.

32. Ibid., pp. 127–30.

33. Ibid., p. 130.

34. Ibid., pp. 130–31.

35. Paul Klee, "Approches de l'art moderne," in *Théorie de l'art moderne* (Paris: Editions Denöel, 1985), p. 9.

36. Paul Klee, *Journal*, trans. Pierre Klossowski (Paris: Grasset, 1959), p. 270.

37. These details are taken from a lecture delivered by Claude Frontisi at the Ecole Normale Superiéure on March 6, 2002.

38. Klee, *Journal*, p. 247.

39. Ibid., p. 256. He meets Delaunay on April 11, but his journal records no reaction to the meeting.

40. Ibid., p. 10.

41. Paul Klee, "Credo du Créateur," in *Théorie de l'art moderne*, p. 34.

42. Ibid., p. 28.

43. Michel Foucault, "What Is Enlightenment?" in *Dits et écrits*, 4:1389.

44. Boulez, p. 131.

45. Ibid., p. 127.

46. Claude Imbert, personal communication with the author, and in her book

Phénoménologies et langues formulaires (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002). On the relations of Klee to changes in mathematics (especially set theory), see Hubert Damisch, "Egale infini," in *Fenêtre jaune cadmium; ou, Les Dessous de la peinture* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1984).

Chapter 5 Form

1. Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987); Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); Ernest Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval and Modern*, 2d ed. (1983; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

2. White, "Narrative," p. 10.

3. Hans Blumenberg, *The Genesis of the Copernican World* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987).

4. White, "Narrative," p. 16.

5. Ibid., p. 24.

6. White, conclusion to *Metahistory*.

7. Peter Sloterdijk, *Règles pour le parc humain: Une lettre en réponse à la Lettre sur l'humanisme de Heidegger*, trans. Olivier Mannoni (Paris: Editions Mille et une Nuits, 2000). Orig. pub. as *Regeln für den Menschenpark: Ein Antwortschreiben zu Heideggers Brief über den Humanismus* (1999). As the lecture was delivered in Basle as part of a cycle of lectures on "the actuality of humanism," its contents are less surprising.

8. Sloterdijk, p. 7, my translation.

9. Ibid., p. 9.

10. On the overemphasis on communication, see Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie*? (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1991), p. 12.

11. Sloterdijk, p. 18.

12. Ibid., p. 11: "Les peuples se sont organisés comme *des amicales obligatoires*, intégralement alphabétisées, ne jurant que par un canon de lecture toujours obligatoire dans l'espace national."

13. Ibid., p. 13.

14. A beautiful invocation and giving-of-form to the issue of the reader—*cher lecteur*—is found in Patricia Duncker's *Hallucinating Foucault* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998).

15. I have explored this topic in various works, from *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) to *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

16. Pierre Bourdieu's work on academic positioning and competition is helpful in this regard, especially *Homo academicus* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1984).

17. George Stocking, *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983).

18. There is a large literature on the changing function of the university. See,

for example, Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996).

19. Rabinow, introduction to *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*.

20. Bruno Latour's *How to Follow Scientists through Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987) is one of many examples.

Chapter 6 Discontents and Consolations

1. Peter Sloterdijk, *Règles pour le parc humain: Une lettre en réponse à la Lettre sur l'humanisme de Heidegger* (Paris: Editions Mille et Une Nuits, 2000), p. 45.

2. Ibid., p. 18.

3. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Standard Edition, trans. and ed. James Strachey (New York: W.W. Norton, 1961), pp. 44–45.

4. Sigmund Freud, "A Difficulty in the Path of Psycho-Analysis," originally printed in *Nyugat* in Hungarian translation: Originally translated into English in 1920; Standard Edition, translation, 1925. The "three blows to human narcissism" are also described at the end of lecture 18 of Freud's *Introductory Lectures* (1916–17), part 3, pp. 284–85.

5. Freud does not discuss resistance to claims put forward by scientists in which resistant opinion turned out to be correct or cases in which science could not provide adequate answers.

6. Immanuel Kant, "What is Enlightenment?" trans. Louis White Beck, in Kant *On History* (Indianapolis: Library of Liberal Arts, 1963).

7. Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946).

8. Weber, *Protestant Ethic*, p. 182.

9. Weber, "Science as a Vocation," p. 131.

10. Ibid., p. 132.

11. Ibid., p. 134.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., p. 137.

15. Ibid., p. 136.

16. Ibid., p. 139.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., p. 140.

19. Ibid., p. 142.

20. Ibid., p. 143.

21. Ibid., p. 144.

22. Ibid., p. 143.

23. Jürgen Habermas, "Two Hundred Years' Hindsight," in James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, eds., *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997), p. 124.

24. François Jacob, *Of Flies, Mice, and Men*, trans. Giselle Weiss (Cam-

bridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), pp. 96, 92. Orig. pub. as *La Souris, la mouche et l'homme* (Paris: Editions Odile Jacob, 1997).

25. On the role of core metaphors, see Hans Blumenberg, *Die Lesbarkeit der Welt* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1981).

26. Freud, *Civilization*, p. 112.

27. Ibid., p. 111.

Chapter 7 Demons and *Durcharbeiten*

1. Halldór Stefansson, personal communication, Heidelberg, December 9, 2001.

2. On this point see Wilhem Hennis, *La Problématique de Max Weber*, trans. Lilyane Deroche-Gurcel (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996). Orig. pub. as *Max Webers Fragestellung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987).

3. Max Weber, "Science as a vocation," in H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, *From Max Weber, Essays in Sociology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946), p.156.

4. Gérard Huber, commentary at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, December 17, 2001.

5. Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982).

6. The immense complexity of what God supposedly was capable of doing and what Man could know of God's plans and actions is analyzed by Blumenberg in "The Second Over-Coming of Gnosis," section 2 of *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. Robert Wallace (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983). On the concept of "prophéte de malheur," see François Chateauraynaud and Didier Torny, *Les Sombres Précurseurs: Une sociologie pragmatique de l'alerte et du risque* (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1999).

7. On this distinction see Michel Foucault, "What Is Enlightenment?" in Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).

8. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

9. Gérard Huber, commentary at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, December 17, 2001.

10. Alain Badiou has important things to say in *L'Ethique* (Paris: Hatier, 1993) about the place of the victim as the basis of contemporary bioethics. The point about protection is powerfully elaborated by Dominique Memmi in *Les Gardiens du corps: Dix ans de magistère bioethique* (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1996).

11. David Rothman, *Strangers at the Bedside: A History of How Law and Bioethics Transformed Medical Decision Making* (New York: Basic Books, 1991).

12. Jean Starobinski, chap. 4, "Pathologies réactionelles," chap. 4 of *Action et réaction: Vie et aventures d'un couple* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1999).

13. Ibid., p. 173.

14. Ibid., p. 181.

15. Ibid., p. 181.

Conclusion From Progress to Motion

1. Thanks to Bruno Latour for bringing this strange passage to my attention.
2. Bourdieu, *Science*, p. 222.
3. Éric Lundwall, *Les Carrosses à cinq sols: Pascal entrepreneur* (Paris: Science/infuse, 2000), p. 9. Those who prefer a different Pascal for our times have had an ample array of choices offered to them in recent years, ranging from the ever-so-serious sociological ponderations of Pierre Bourdieu's *Méditations pascaliennes* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1997) to the upbeat and ever-so-human Pascal of Jacques Attali's *Blaise Pascal, ou Le génie français* (Paris: Librairie Fayard, 2000). The word "portrait" is used as a hommage to a diametrically opposed but extremely rich interpretation of Pascal, that of Louis Marin. Marin's essays on Pascal are collected in *Pascal et Port-Royal* (Paris: Collège International de Philosophie/Presses Universitaires de France, 1997).
4. Gilles Deleuze, "L'Immanence: Une Vie," *Philosophie* 47 (1995).
5. Lundwall, p. 17.
6. Ibid., p. 19.
7. Werner Sombart, *Le Bourgeois* (Paris: Grou-Radenes, 1964), p. 54.
8. Jean-José Quilès, *Schumpeter et l'évolution économique* (Paris: Nathan, 1997), p. 5.
9. Joseph Schumpeter, *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*, trans. Redvers Opie (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 243–44.
10. Ibid., p.136.
11. Ibid. p. 23. "de la répartition des impôts en Normandie."
12. Ibid., p. 65.
13. Ibid., p. 101.
14. Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. Robert Wallace (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), p. 84.
15. Ibid., p. 84.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Albert Jonsen and Stephen Toulmin, *The Uses of Casuistry*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 23–44, 252.
19. The first step in casuistry is a choice of exemplar. The Aristotelian term "phronesis" and the Jesuit term "discernment" are pertinent here both in the experience necessary to identify exemplary cases but equally in the "tact" necessary to decide when and how, in any particular case, circumstances have been altered beyond the bounds established by the exemplar. One of casuistry's main strengths was its ability to move from general principles toward an attention to specific cases in which "morally significant differences between cases can be as vital as their likenesses." A conclusion is related to the evidence by *substantive* rather than formal connections. The conclusions follows as a *rebuttable* presumption, not as a necessary entailment. Finally, "the inference from the evidence to the conclusion is not timelessly valid, regardless of context, but thor-

oughly *circumstantial*: dependent on detailed facts about the circumstances and nature of the particular case" (Jonsen and Toulmin, *Casuistry*, p. 34).

20. Ibid., p. 278.

21. They choose 1974 as the threshold year, for it was then that the U.S. Congress established the National Commission for Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research.

22. Georges Canguilhem, "La Décadence de l'idée de Progrès," *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 4 (1987): 449. Rpr. as "The Decline of the Idea of Progress," trans. David Macey, *Economy and Society* 27, nos. 2–3 (1998): 322.

23. Canguilhem, "Decline," p. 316. So, if nature no longer provides a bedrock of stability, it follows that it becomes ever more difficult to deploy science as a means to undergird humanity's progress.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

26. Jean Starobinski, *L'Œil vivant* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 2000).

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

Althusser, Louis, and Etienne Balibar. *Reading Capital*. Trans. Ben Bruster. New York: Verso, 1970.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

———. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1951.

Badiou, Alain. *L'Ethique*. Paris: Hatier, 1993.

Blumenberg, Hans. *The Genesis of the Copernican World*. Trans. Robert Wallace. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.

———. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Trans. Robert Wallace. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983.

———. *Die Lesbarkeit der Welt*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1981.

———. *Le Rire de la servante de Thrace: Une histoire des origines de la théorie*. Trans. Laurent Cassagnau. Paris: Editions de l'Arche, 2000.

Bohman, James, and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, eds. *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997.

Boulez, Pierre. *Le Pays fertile: Paul Klee*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre. Afterword to Paul Rabinow, *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

———. *Homo academicus*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1984.

———. *Méditations pascaliennes*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2000.

———. *Science de la science et réflexivité*. Paris: Raisons d'agir Editions, 2001.

Breisach, Ernest. *Historiography, Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Canguilhem, Georges. "La Décadence de l'idée de Progr`es," *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 4 (1987).

Chateauraynaud, François, and Didier Torny. *Les Sombres Précurseurs: Une sociologie pragmatique de l'alerte et du risque*. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1999.

Clark, T. J. *Modernism: The End of an Idea*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

———. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers*. New York: Knopf, 1984.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Damisch, Hubert. *Fenêtre jaune cadmium; ou, Les Dessous de la peinture*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1984.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Appendix: On the Death of Man and Superman." In *Foucault*. Trans. Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

———. "L'Immanence: Une Vie." *Philosophie* 47 (1995): 3–7.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie*? Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1991.

Dewey, John. "Logic of Judgments of Practice." In *Essays in Experimental Logic*. New York: Dover, 1916.

Dezalay, Yves, and Bryant Garth. "Droits de l'homme et philanthropie hégémonique." *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 121–22 (March 1998): 23–41.

Dreyfus, Hubert, and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Duncker, Patricia. *Hallucinating Foucault*. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.

Duve, Thierry de. *Kant after Duchamp*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.

———. *Pictorial Nominalism: On Marcel Duchamp's Passage from Painting to the Ready-Made*. Trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Eribon, Didier. *Foucault et ses contemporains*. Paris: Fayard, 1994.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaelogy of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan-Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1971.

———. *Dits et écrits: 1954–1988*. 4 vols. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1994.

———. *L'Herméneutique du sujet: Cours au Collège de France, 1981–82*. Ed. and afterword Frédéric Gros. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, 2001.

———. *Les Mots et les choses*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1966.

———. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Ed. and trans. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

———. *La Volonté de savoir*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1976.

Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Standard Edition. Trans. and ed. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1961.

Hennis, Wilhelm. *La Problématique de Max Weber*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996.

Huber, Gérard. *Freud: Le sujet de la loi*. Paris: Michalon, 1999.

Ignatieff, Michael. "Human Rights." In Carla Hesse and Robert Post, eds., *Human Rights in Political Transition: From Gettysburg to Bosnia*. New York: Zone Books, 1999.

Imbert, Claude. *Phénoménologies et langues formulaires*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002.

Jacob, François. *Of Flies, Mice, and Men*. Trans. Giselle Weiss. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism; or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Joas, Hans. *The Genesis of Values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Jonsen, Albert, and Stephen Toulmin. *The Uses of Casuistry*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Kant, Immanuel. *Réflexions sur l'éducation*. Trans. Alexis Philonenko. Paris: J. Vrin, 1993.

———. "What is Enlightenment?" Trans. Louis White Beck. In *Kant: On History*. Ed. L. W. Beck. Indianapolis: Library of Liberal Arts, 1963.

Klee, Paul. *Journal*. Trans. Pierre Klossowski. Paris: Grasset, 1959.

Kleinman, Arthur. "Anthropology of Bioethics." In *Writing at the Margin: Discourse Between Anthropology and Medicine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Koselleck, Rheinhardt. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Trans. Keith Tribe. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985.

Kritzman, Lawrence. *Foucault, Politics, Philosophy, Culture*. New York and London: Routledge, 1988.

Lash, Scott, and Sam Whimster, eds. *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

Latour, Bruno. *How to Follow Scientists through Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Lundwall, Eric. *Les Carrosses à cinq sols: Pascal entrepreneur*. Paris: Science/infuse, 2000.

Macey, David. "The Honor of Georges Canguilhem." In *In Honour of Georges Canguilhem*, special issues of *Economy and Society*, 27.2–3 (1998): 171–81.

Memmi, Dominique. *Les Gardiens du corps: Dix ans de magistère bioéthique*. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1996.

Mills, C. Wright, and Hans Gerth, eds. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford, 1946.

Negri, Tony, and Michael Hardt. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Unfashionable Observations*. Trans. Richard Gray. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.

Paqué, Ruprecht. *Le Statut parisien des nominalistes*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985.

Perrot, Michelle, ed. *L'Impossible prison: Recherches sur le système pénitentiaire au XIXe siècle*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1980.

Quilès, Jean-José. *Schumpeter et l'évolution économique*. Paris: Nathan, 1997.

Rabinow, Paul. *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

———. *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

———. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

————. *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Rabinow, Paul, ed. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Readings, William. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Rose, Nikolas. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Rothman, David J. *Strangers at the Bedside: A History of How Law and Bioethics Transformed Medical Decision Making*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Schumpeter, Joseph. *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Trans. Redvers Opie. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Shapin, Stephen, and Simon Schaffer. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Sloterdijk, Peter. *Règles pour le parc humain: Une lettre en réponse à la Lettre sur l'humanisme de Heidegger*. Trans. Olivier Mannoni. Paris: Editions Mille et Une Nuits, 2000.

Sombart, Werner. *Le Bourgeois: Contribution à l'histoire morale et intellectuelle de l'homme économique moderne*. Trans. Samuel Jankélévitch. Paris: Payot, 1926.

Starobinski, Jean. *Action et réaction: Vie et aventures d'un couple*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1999.

————. *L'Œil Vivant*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 2000.

Stocking, George. *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

Szakolzai, Arpád. *Max Weber and Michel Foucault: Parallel Lifeworlds*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Weber, Max. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Trans. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch. New York: Free Press, 1949.

————. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's, 1950.

White, Hayden. *The Content of Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

————. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Index of Selected Names

Index of Concepts

freedom, 45, 47; and inquiry, 16–17, 19; and motion, 16, 47; and the multiple, 18; as object of thought, 8–9; as practice, 45, 89; and problematic situation, 16–17, 19; and problematization, 44; and self-objectification, 47; and thought, 8–9, 47

thought, 3, 8–9, 18, 42, 44–47, 102, 108, 127, 138n.10; and action, 46–48; and apparatus, 55; and coherence, 48; and concepts, 42; and diagnosis, 18; and epoch, 46; and ethos, 9; limits of, 102; and meditation, 9; and problematization, 47, 108; as singular, 3; and thinking, 8–9, 47

truth, 3, 7–8, 10, 21, 31, 34, 41, 94, 96–97, 102, 110, 115, 123; and ascesis, 7, 92; and events, 41; and genomes, 21; and living beings, 115; and method, 96; and philosophy, 41; and sociology, 123; and science, 31, 34, 94, 96–97, 102, 110, 123; and self, 10

wisdom, 92, 99, 104
Wissenarbeitsforschung, 83, 86, 90
working through. See *Durcharbeiten*
writing, 76–77, 79–82, 84, 86; and care of the self, 82; and chronicle, 86; and experimentation, 77, 79; and inquiry, 77

This page intentionally left blank

The Shadows and Lights of Waco: Millennialism Today
by James D. Faubion

Life Exposed: Biological Citizens after Chernobyl
by Adriana Petryna

Anthropos Today: Reflections on Modern Equipment
by Paul Rabinow