Wesleyan University
WesScholar

Division I Faculty Publications | Arts and Humanities

2005

Power/Knowledge

Joseph Rouse
Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: http://wesscholar.wesleyan.edu/div1facpubs

Part of the Philosophy Commons

Recommended Citation
Rouse, Joseph, "Power/Knowledge" (2005). *Division I Faculty Publications.* Paper 34.
http://wesscholar.wesleyan.edu/div1facpubs/34

This Contribution to Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts and Humanities at WesScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Division I Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of WesScholar. For more information, please contact dschnaidt@wesleyan.edu, ljohnson@wesleyan.edu.

Power/Knowledge

Joseph Rouse Wesleyan University

Michel Foucault wrote extensively about historical reconfigurations of knowledge in what would now be called the human sciences. During the 1970s, however, he argued (most notably in Discipline and Punish and the first volume of The History of Sexuality) that these reorganizations of knowledge were also intertwined with new forms of power and domination. Foucault's works from this period have often yielded contradictory responses from readers. His detailed historical remarks on the emergence of disciplinary and regulatory biopower have been widely influential. Yet these detailed studies are connected to a more general conception of power, and of the epistemic and political positioning of the criticism of power, which many critics have found less satisfactory. Foucault's discussions of the relation between truth and power have similarly provoked concerns about their reflexive implications for his own analysis.

The principal purpose of this essay is to offer a sympathetic interpretation of the understanding of power and of knowledge that informs Foucault's historical studies of prisons and of the construction of a scientific discourse about sexuality. Since Foucault discussed power in this period rather more thematically than he did knowledge, my discussion of knowledge will build extensively upon his remarks about power. The essay will proceed in three parts. First I will briefly recapitulate Foucault's account of the interconnected emergence of new forms of power and knowledge in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The second part will initiate my reflections upon the concepts of "power" and "knowledge" with a critical discussion of political and epistemic sovereignty. Foucault framed his investigations as an alternative to the preoccupation of political thought with questions about sovereignty and legitimacy. Many of his readers have found this critical concern troubling, because they worry that it undercuts any possible stance from which Foucault might be able to criticize the modern forms of knowledge and power that he has described. I will argue in the third part of the essay that this worry is plausible only if one ignores Foucault's understanding of both power and knowledge as dynamic. Foucault explicitly sketched a dynamics of power; I will show that his account also suggests a similarly dynamic interpretation of knowledge. In both cases, Foucault's account provides ample possibilities for reasoned critical response.

I. DISCIPLINES AND NORMS

Foucault had been writing about the history of knowledge in the human sciences long before he ever explicitly raised questions about power. What had interested Foucault was not the specific bodies of knowledge compiled through disciplined investigation at various times. Instead, Foucault had written about the epistemic context within which those bodies of knowledge became intelligible and authoritative. He argued that particular investigations were structured by which concepts and statements were intelligible together, how those statements were organized thematically, which of those statements counted as "serious,"[1] who was authorized to speak seriously, and what questions and procedures were relevant to assess the

[1] Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, 45-56, offer an extensive and useful discussion of what it means for a statement to be a "serious act" in Foucault's earlier work.

credibility of those statements that were taken seriously.[2] These historically situated fields of knowledge (which Foucault in The Archaeology of Knowledge called "discursive formations") also included the objects under discussion. Foucault was thus committed to a strong nominalism in the human sciences: the types of objects in their domains were not already demarcated, but came into existence only contemporaneous with the discursive formations that made it possible to talk about them.

What made Foucault's inquiry into the structure of such discursive formations interesting was the possibility that there might be significant changes in the organization of such a discursive field. Thus, it might be that what counts as a serious and important claim at one time will not (perhaps cannot) even be entertained as a candidate for truth at another. Statements can be dismissed (or never even be considered) not because they are thought to be false, but because it is not clear what it would amount to for them to be either true or false.

Foucault's earlier studies were in fact directed toward significant changes in the "discursive formations" that governed the serious possibilities for talking about things. He proposed that there were important shifts in what counted as serious discussion of madness, disease, wealth, language, or life, shifts that were evident in the historical archives. His aim was not to explain those shifts, but rather to display the structural differences they embody, and to some extent to document the parallels between contemporary shifts in several discursive formations. Foucault was especially concerned to demonstrate the parallel shifts in several discursive fields in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, through which the modern sciences of "man" replaced the classical tables of representation that displayed the order of things.

Discipline and Punish expanded the scope of Foucault's inquiries into this modern reconfiguration of knowledge. His earlier studies had often associated the reconfiguration of discursive fields with the organization of new institutions, for example, asylums, clinics, and hospitals. Nevertheless, his emphasis had always been the structure of discourse.[3] In Discipline and Punish, however, the eighteenth-nineteenth century transformation of the human sciences was explicitly set in the context of practices of discipline, surveillance, and constraint, which made possible new kinds of knowledge of human beings even as they created new forms of social control.

Perhaps the most important transformation that Foucault described was in the scale and continuity of the exercise of power, which also involved much greater knowledge of detail. Foucault was interested in the difference between massive but infrequent exercises of destructive force (public executions, military occupations, the violent suppression of insurrections) and the uninterrupted constraints imposed in practices of discipline and training: "It was a question not of treating the body, en masse, 'wholesale,' as if it were an indissociable unity, but of working it 'retail,' individually; of exercising upon it a subtle coercion, of obtaining holds upon it at the level

---

[2] Undoubtedly the best discussion in English of Foucault's work in this period is Gary Gutting, Michel Foucault'sArchaeology of Scientific Reason.

[3] Gutting (ibid.) and Dreyfus and Rabinow (Michel Foucault) each provide a useful and interesting discussion of the nature and significance of this emphasis on discourse, although their accounts are not mutually consistent.

of the mechanism itself --- movements, gestures, attitudes, rapidity: an infinitesimal power over the active body" (DP, 136-37). Other ways of exercising force can only coerce or destroy their target. Discipline and training can reconstruct it to produce new gestures, actions, habits and skills, and ultimately new kinds of people.

> The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it.... It defined how one may have a hold over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, "docile" bodies (DP, 138).

Often these practices of subjection worked indirectly, by reconstructing the spaces and reorganizing the timing within which people functioned. The enclosure, partitioning, and functional distribution of activities enabled an inconspicuous direction of activity:

> Disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed.... Its aim was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits. It was a procedure, therefore, aimed at knowing, mastering, and using (DP, 143).

Similarly, schedules, programmed movements, and exercises correlated with developmental stages "served to economize the time of life, to accumulate it in a useful form and to exercise power over men through the mediation of time" (DP, 162).

These forms of detailed intervention also reversed the prevailing relationships between power and visibility or "audibility." Foucault documented a shift in political practice from the display of power as spectacle to the exercise of power through making its target more thoroughly visible and audible. There was a gradual development of techniques of surveillance, whose function was far more complex and subtle than massive and spectacular displays of force:

> Hierarchized, continuous and functional surveillance ... was organized as a multiple, automatic, and anonymous power.... This enables the disciplinary power to be both absolutely indiscreet, since it is everywhere and always alert, since by its very principle it leaves no zone of shade and constantly supervises the very individuals who are entrusted with the task of supervising; and absolutely "discreet," for it functions permanently and largely in silence (DP, 176-77).

Surveillance was often built into the physical structures of institutions that were organized to enhance visibility within them; here especially there was a new architecture of power ("stones can make people docile and knowable," DP, 172). Surveillance was also manifest in the creation or extension of rituals, such as the proliferating practices of examination: scholastic tests but also medical or psychiatric examinations and histories, employment interviews, prison musters, and military reviews (in which the commander no longer heads the procession, but instead stands aside to examine its passing).

Previously inconspicuous people became more audible as well as visible. In <u>The History of Sexuality</u>, Foucault extended his argument to show how

> We have become a singularly confessing society. . . . [The confession] plays a part in justice, medicine, education, family relationships, and love relations, in the most ordinary

> affairs of everyday life, and in the most solemn rites: one confesses one's crimes, one's sins, one's thoughts and desires, one's illnesses and troubles; one goes about telling, with the greatest precision, whatever is most difficult to tell.... One confesses --- or is forced to confess (HS, 59).

What is thereby seen and heard is then documented, as a resource for further examination and constraint.

> Among the fundamental conditions of a good medical "discipline," in both senses of the word, one must include the procedures of writing that made it possible to integrate individual data into cumulative systems in such a way that they were not lost; so to arrange things that an individual could be located in the general register and that, conversely, each datum of the individual examination might affect overall calculations (DP, 190).

These practices of surveillance, elicitation, and documentation constrain behavior precisely by making it more thoroughly knowable or known. But these new forms of knowledge also presuppose new kinds of constraint, which make people's actions visible and constrain them to speak. It is in this sense primarily that Foucault spoke of "power/knowledge." A more extensive and finer-grained knowledge enables a more continuous and pervasive control of what people do, which in turn offers further possibilities for more intrusive inquiry and disclosure.

Foucault saw these techniques of power and knowledge as undergoing a two-stage development. They were instituted initially as means of control or neutralization of dangerous social elements, and evolved into techniques for enhancing the utility and productivity of those subjected to them. They were also initially cultivated within isolated institutions (most notably prisons, hospitals, army camps, schools, and factories), but then were gradually adapted into techniques that could be applied in various other contexts. Foucault called this broadening of their scope of application the "swarming" of disciplinary mechanisms:

> the mechanisms [of the disciplinary establishments] have a certain tendency to become "de-institutionalized," to emerge from the closed fortresses in which they once functioned and to circulate in a "free" state; the massive, compact disciplines are broken down into flexible methods of control, which may be transferred and adapted.... One can [therefore] speak of the formation of a disciplinary society in this movement that stretches from the enclosed disciplines, a sort of social "quarantine," to an indefinitely generalizable mechanism of "panopticism" (DP, 211, 216).

Foucault did not see these new techniques as simply superimposed upon a preexisting social order. His nominalism remained prominent in his studies of power/knowledge, as he took these politico-epistemic practices to constitute new object domains for knowledge to be about: "biographical unities" (DP, 254) like delinquency, homosexuality, or hyperactivity; developmental structures, such as reading grade-levels or appropriate age-group attainments; significant distributions, as in a family history of heart disease, a low-income household, or an "advanced maternal age pregnancy"; and signs of a condition of life, such as cholesterol level or T-cell counts. Ultimately, these practices produced new <u>kinds</u> of human subjects. But they also produced new forms of knowledge along with new objects to know, and new modalities of power.

Foucault often spoke of the correlative constitution of two levels of knowledge through

the politico-epistemic practices he had been describing. On the one hand, there was the emergence of a systematic knowledge of individuals, through connected practices of surveillance, confession, and documentation:

> the constitution of the individual as a describable, analyzable object, not in order to reduce him to "specific" features, as did the naturalists in relation to living beings, but in order to maintain him in his individual features, in his particular evolution, in his own aptitudes and abilities, under the gaze of a permanent corpus of knowledge (DP, 190).

But Foucault thought that this individuating knowledge was connected in important ways to the

> emergence of "population" as an economic and political problem: population as wealth, population as manpower or labor capacity, population balanced between its own growth and the resources it commanded. Governments perceived that they were not dealing simply with subjects, or even with a "people," but with a "population," with its specific phenomena and its peculiar variables: birth and death rates, life expectancy, fertility, state of health, frequency of illnesses, patterns of diet and habitation (HS, 25).

What connected these two levels of epistemic analysis and political regulation was the practice of "normalizing judgment" and the construction of norms as a field of possible knowledge. Norms seem to have their place primarily in the knowledge of populations, since they demarcate distributions. We are all familiar with the "normal curve" as a representation of a distribution of traits around a mean. And as Ian Hacking (1990) has recently described,[4] this conception of a normal distribution has a nineteenth-century origin in the attempts to understand/impute statistical stability to the "avalanche of printed numbers" created by European statistical bureaus to survey their populations. Yet norms were also indispensable to the new knowledges of individuals. For how else was one to produce knowledge of individuals that did not simply subsume their individuality under a type? A normalizing distribution enables one to locate the individual within an epistemic field, without reducing the individual to the typical. Foucault most often discussed normalization as a technique of power, but its epistemic implications emerged clearly in his account. Normalizing judgment produced

> a whole range of degrees of normality indicating membership of a homogeneous social body but also playing a part in classification, hierarchization and the distribution of rank. In a sense, the power of normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialities and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another (DP, 184).

The stories Foucault told about the emergence together of these new forms of knowledge and power have an ironic side. They are intended as counterpoint to the familiar stories of the enlightened humanization of punishment and the liberation from sexual repression. Foucault's irony works by portraying the very practices of humane penal reform and sexual liberation as instead further enmeshing us in a "carceral society" and an enforced regimen of truth. Yet for many readers his irony is troubling.[5] The tone of Foucault's portrayal suggests that these new

---

[4] Hacking, The Taming of Chance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[5] Among the more prominent and sophisticated expressions of this concern are Charles Taylor, "Foucault on Freedom and Truth," in David Hoy, ed., Foucault: A Critical Reader, 69-

forms of power/knowledge ought to be resisted. Yet he resolutely rejects the idea that there is any ground or standpoint from which such a call to resistance could be legitimated. The connection he proposes between power and knowledge is not just a particular institutional use of knowledge as a means to domination. Foucault objects to the very idea of a knowledge or a truth outside of networks of power relations. The scope of his objection thus also encompasses the possibility of a critical knowledge that would speak the truth to power, exposing domination for what it is, and thereby enabling or encouraging effective resistance to it.

To see how Foucault's discussion of power/knowledge took him in this direction, and what its consequences are for the political and epistemic positioning of his own work, we need to consider his discussion of the problem of sovereignty. This in turn will enable us to assess the implications of his insistence on a situated dynamics of power and, I will argue, of knowledge as well.

II. POWER (AND KNOWLEDGE) WITHOUT SOVEREIGNTY

Foucault did not often explicitly address the relation between his discussions of power/knowledge and more traditional ways of conceptualizing knowledge. He had more to say about how his understanding of power differs from its treatment in mainstream political theories. Foucault repeatedly situated his own reflections as an attempt to break free of the orientation of political thought toward questions of sovereign power and its legitimacy: "At bottom, despite the differences in epochs and objectives, the representation of power has remained under the spell of monarchy. In political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king" (HS, 88).

Hobbes's Leviathan, and the social contract tradition more generally, had posed the scope and the legitimacy of the power of the sovereign as the original and fundamental questions of politics. But Foucault argued that both the underlying conception of power as sovereign power, and the questions of law and right with which it is engaged, have a historical location in the formation of European monarchy.

> The great institutions of power that developed in the Middle Ages --- monarchy, the state with its apparatus --- rose up on the basis of a multiplicity of prior powers, and to a certain extent in opposition to them: dense, entangled, conflicting powers, powers tied to the direct or indirect dominion over the land, to the possession of arms, to serfdom, to bonds of suzerainty and vassalage. If these institutions were able to implant themselves, if, by profiting from a whole series of tactical alliances, they were able to gain acceptance, this was because they presented themselves as agencies of regulation, arbitration, and demarcation, as a way of introducing order in the midst of these powers, of establishing a principle that would temper them and distribute them according to boundaries and a fixed hierarchy (HS, 86-87).

The conception of sovereignty that emerges from this historical moment has three crucial

---

102; Nancy Fraser, Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory; and Jürgen Habermas, The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures, trans. Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987). For further discussion of criticisms reflecting these concerns, see Michael Kelly, ed., Critique and Power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994).

aspects for Foucault. First, sovereignty is a standpoint above or outside particular conflicts that resolves their competing claims into a unified and coherent system. Second, the dividing question in terms of which these claims are resolved is that of legitimacy (often framed in terms of law or rights): Which powers can be rightfully exercised, which actions are lawful, which regimes are legitimate? Together, these two points present the sovereign as the protector of peace in the war of all against all, and the embodiment of justice in the settling of competing claims.

The third point concerns the specific conception of power entailed by this understanding of sovereignty as the embodiment of law or legitimacy. Although there are no limits to the scope of sovereign power (everyone and everything is, in principle, subject to the sovereign), the actual exercise of that power must always be discontinuous and negative. Sovereign power comes into play only at specific points where law or rights have been violated, and can only act to punish or restrain the violation. Thus, Foucault suggested that "power in this instance was essentially a right of seizure: of things, time, bodies, and ultimately life itself" (HS, 136). Sovereign power prohibits, confiscates, or destroys what sovereign judgment pronounces illegitimate. Foucault therefore speaks interchangably of "sovereign power" and "juridical power."

Although Foucault claimed that this conception of sovereignty and of sovereign power arose in response to the consolidation of the European monarchies, it would be a mistake to equate sovereignty in his sense with the state, for two reasons. First, power is conceived and exercised in terms of sovereignty in other social locations, wherever power is deployed to restrain or punish what escapes the bounds of a unified scheme of what is right. "Whether one attributes to it the form of the prince who formulates rights, of the father who forbids, of the censor who enforces silence, or of the master who states the law, in any case one schematizes power in a juridical form, and one defines its effects as obedience" (HS, 85).

Second, although sovereignty was conceived as a standpoint of judgment above all particular conflicts, no actual sovereign could realize this conception in practice. Thus, political theory increasingly deployed this conception of the sovereign's role against its nominal occupant.

> Criticism of the eighteenth-century monarchic institution in France was not directed against the juridico-monarchic sphere as such, but was made on behalf of a pure and rigorous juridical system to which all the mechanisms of power could conform, with no excesses or irregularities, as opposed to a monarchy which, notwithstanding its own assertions, continuously overstepped its legal framework and set itself above the laws (HS, 88).

This separation of the principle of sovereignty from its embodiment in any actual sovereign is crucial to understanding Foucault's position. Sovereignty in this sense has been removed from any real political location, and is instead a theoretical construction with respect to which political practice is to be assessed. Foucault, however, suggested in several places that such assessments dangerously misconceive both their target and their own critical practices. Consequently, he objected to the very conception of a sovereign standpoint from which the legitimacy of particular political struggles could be ascertained. His own criticism of this conception of sovereignty should therefore not be seen as another such attempt to hold a sovereign power to account to a higher principle of legitimacy.

That political criticism invoking principles of sovereignty and right misunderstands its

targets is a claim that Foucault took to follow from his account of the emergence of disciplinary and regulatory power relations. He claimed that although many of the political forms and practices of sovereign power remained in place, they were gradually taken over and ultimately sustained on the basis of power relations that functioned at a different location and scale. Increasingly, the sovereign apparatus (such as courts, prisons, the army) became both dependent upon and productive of disciplinary and regulatory power. These power relations were disseminated through more extensive social networks, and did not transmit power in only one direction. They did not simply impose sanctions that might be amenable to a binary classification as legitimate or not. They were instrumental to the production or enhancement of various "goods," such as knowledge, health, wealth, or social cohesion. Thus, political theories of sovereignty failed to recognize the many ways in which power nominally deployed through the state apparatus (or, for Marxists, through the class ownership of capital) was more complexly mediated. Foucault concluded from this failure that the traditional concerns for rights and justice provided an inadequate framework for political criticism of the modern nexus of power/knowledge.

> When today one wants to object in some way to the disciplines and all the effects of power and knowledge that are linked to them, what is it that one does ... if not precisely appeal to this canon of right, this famous, formal right, that is said to be bourgeois, and which in reality is the right of sovereignty? But I believe that we find ourselves here in a kind of blind alley: it is not through recourse to sovereignty against discipline that the effects of disciplinary power can be limited, because sovereignty and disciplinary mechanisms are two absolutely integral components of the general mechanism of power in our society (PK, 108).

But Foucault was more fundamentally concerned that political criticism in terms of sovereignty, right, and law dangerously misunderstands its own positioning. Here we find perhaps his most basic reason for juxtaposing knowledge and truth with power. It is one thing to articulate and take up a stance on the political struggles in the midst of which one finds oneself situated historically. It is another thing altogether to seek an epistemic standpoint outside those ongoing conflicts from which that stance can be validated. The move to which Foucault objected is therefore that of identifying one's own political and epistemic position with the standpoint of sovereignty. In the French intellectual context especially, the aspiration for such a position of <u>epistemic</u> sovereignty was designated by the quest for the status of <u>science</u>. Foucault's response to that aspiration was withering:

> Which theoretical-political <u>avant garde</u> do you want to enthrone in order to isolate it from all the discontinuous forms of knowledge that circulate about it? When I see you straining to establish the scientificity of Marxism I do not really think that you are demonstrating once and for all that Marxism has a rational structure and that therefore its propositions are the outcome of verifiable procedures; for me you are doing something altogether different, you are investing Marxist discourses and those who uphold them with the effects of a power which the West since Medieval times has attributed to science and has reserved for those engaged in scientific discourse (PK, 85).

Although Foucault does not use the term "epistemic sovereignty," it is not hard to see that there is a close parallel within epistemology to the preoccupation of political reflection with

sovereignty as Foucault construes it. Recall the crucial constituents of political sovereignty: a unitary regime, representing legitimacy through law, established from an impartial standpoint above particular conflicts, and enforced through discontinuous interventions which aim to suppress illegitimacy. Just as a sovereign power stands above and adjudicates conflicts among its subject powers, epistemic sovereignty is the standpoint above disputes among competing truth-claims. Epistemic sovereignty constitutes knowledge as the unified (or consistently unifiable) network of truths that can be extracted from the circulation of conflicting statements. They are legitimated as truths by the precepts of rational method, the epistemic surrogate for law. Yet this legitimation does not produce knowledge, in the sense of producing new possibilities for truth. Rather, it allows truth to stand forth by suppressing error and irrationality, that is, those statements that do not conform to method and cohere with the regime it establishes. Foucault has the same dual objection to this conception of epistemic sovereignty as to that of political sovereignty. On the one hand, this conception of knowledge overlooks the micropractices through which particular candidates for knowledge and their objects are produced (this network of micropractices is the parallel in Foucault's later work to what he had earlier called a "discursive formation"). Both knowing subjects and truths known are the product of relations of power and knowledge. On the other hand, it demarcates an aspiration to power, to the suppression of all conflicting voices and lives, which Foucault saw as one of the chief dangers confronting us.

Consequently, just as Foucault aimed to "break free ... of the theoretical privilege of law and sovereignty" (HS, 90) in the analysis of power, his conception of a genealogical investigation "should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from subjection [to the hierarchical order of power associated with science], to render them, that is, capable of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal, and scientific discourse" (PK, 85) . It is precisely this aim that has troubled many of Foucault's readers and critics. Charles Taylor and Richard Rorty have between them expressed this worry with particular cogency. Taylor concludes that on Foucault's account, "There can be no such thing as a truth independent of its regime, unless it be that of another. So that liberation in the name of 'truth' could only be the substitution of another system of power for this one."[6] Foucault, according to Taylor, gives us no reason to think that the succeeding system of power will be any better than the present one, and hence no justification for a struggle to change it.

Rorty sees a resulting hopelessness in Foucault's vision, "a remoteness which reminds one of the conservative who pours cold water on hopes for reform, who affects to look at the problems of his fellow citizens with the eye of the future historian ... rather than suggest[ing] how our children might inhabit a better world in the future. "[7] Taylor's and Rorty's criticisms suggest a multiple incoherence in Foucault's rejection of any standpoint of political or epistemic sovereignty: he makes truth-claims while denying that they could have any claim upon us; he objects to domination while denying that there can be anything like liberation from it; and he

---

[6] Taylor, "Foucault on Freedom and Truth," 94.

[7] Richard Rorty, "Habermas and Lyotard on Postmodernity" in Richard Bernstein, ed., Habermas and Modernity (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985), 172.

portrays dangers (Taylor even uses the word "evils") while insisting that any attempt to avert or ameliorate them would inevitably reproduce them in new guise.

III. THE DYNAMICS OF POWER AND KNOWLEDGE

There is nevertheless something unsatisfying about these criticisms. Rorty's and Taylor's criticisms (and others' as well) depend upon crucial disjunctions: either a critique of power in the name of legitimacy, or an acceptance that power makes right; either the validation of one's claims from a standpoint of science/epistemic sovereignty, or an acceptance that all claims to truth are of equivalent standing. Yet these disjunctions themselves presuppose a standpoint of epistemic sovereignty, and to invoke them may beg the question. Even the positions that in the end are attributed to Foucault (epistemological relativism and/or a reduction of truth to domination and legitimacy to forced acceptance) are positions that claim sovereignty by standing outside epistemic and political conflicts to adjudicate the claims competing parties can legitimately make upon us. My point is not to dismiss these criticisms out of hand for questionbegging, but instead to pose a question. Foucault's critics take attempted rejection of the problematic of sovereignty to reduce to some position within that problematic, which suggests that they cannot (yet) conceive what power or knowledge without sovereignty could mean. So the question that needs to be posed is how Foucault thought his account might successfully go beyond sovereignty.

To this end, I will argue that Foucault accomplished this aim by conceiving of power dynamically. Although once again he did not discuss this explicitly, I believe that his account also requires a dynamical understanding of knowledge. Together, these accounts suggest an engaged political and epistemic criticism that does not project itself into either the standpoint of the sovereign who adjudicates all political struggles in the name of right or the standpoint of a science that would resolve disputes in the name of truth.

Foucault's more general understanding of power as dynamic begins with his rejection of any reification of power. He insists that "power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away" (HS, 94) or that "power is employed through a net-like organization" (PK, 98). Thomas Wartenburg's discussion of power as always mediated by "social alignments" may help us make sense of Foucault's claim. As Wartenberg uses the term,

> A field of social agents can constitute an alignment in regard to a social agent if and only if, first of all, their actions in regard to that agent are coordinated in a specific manner. To be an alignment, however, the coordinated practices of these social agents need to be comprehensive enough that the social agent facing the alignment encounters that alignment as having control over certain things that she might either need or desire.... The concept of a social alignment thus provides a way of understanding the "field" that constitutes a situated power relationship as a power relationship.[8]

Wartenberg's point is that even in situations in which we might characteristically describe one person as having or exercising power over another, that power depends upon other persons or groups acting in concert with what the first person does. In Wartenberg's examples, when

---

[8] Thomas Wartenburg, The Forms of Power: From Domination to Transformation (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 150.

teachers grade students or employers discipline or fire employees, they exercise power only when others (the school admissions officers, or possible future employers) act, or are prepared to act, in ways oriented by their own actions. Agents may thereby also exercise power unbeknownst to themselves, or even contrary to their own intentions, if other agents orient their actions in response to what the first agents do.

It is in this context that we can understand Foucault's assertion that "power is everywhere not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (HS, 93). Power is not possessed by a dominant agent, nor located in that agent's relations to those dominated, but is instead distributed throughout complex social networks. The actions of the peripheral agents in these networks are often what establish or enforce the connections between what a dominant agent does and the fulfillment or frustration of a subordinate agent's desires. Certainly this must be true of a power exercised discreetly through surveillance and documentation. Such practices can embody power only as far as and insofar as a significant alignment of agents orients their actions to what is thereby disclosed and recorded. Indeed, Foucault would go on to emphasize the heterogeneity of the alignments (dispositifs) that distribute power. They include not just agents but also the instruments of power (buildings, documents, tools, etc.) and the practices and rituals through which it is deployed.

This sense of power as dispersed emphasizes the importance of what Foucault called the "swarming" of the disciplinary mechanisms; those mechanisms were thereby transformed from a local exercise of force within the confines of a particular institution into far-reaching relationships of power. Indeed, as Wartenburg has pointed out, these practices exert power only to the extent that they reach far enough to affect the availability or absence of alternative access to the goods that the exercise of power would enable or prevent.[9]

These networks through which power is exercised are not static. Foucault speaks of power as "something that circulates" (PK, 98) and as being "produced from one moment to the next" (HS, 93). Wartenburg points out that such a dynamic account is inherent in the recognition that power is always mediated by social alignments. In exercising power through a coordinated social alignment, "the present actions of a dominant agent count on the future actions of the aligned agents being similar to their past actions. But this faith in a future whose path can be charted entails that the dominant agent not act in a way that challenges the allegiance of his aligned agents, for only through their actions can that future be made actual.[10] Power can thus never be simply present, as one action forcibly constraining or modifying another. Its constitution as a power relation depends upon its reenactment or reproduction over time as a sustained power relationship.

Foucault does not conceive of such relationships as being imposed from the top down. The configuration of power relations emerges instead from "the support which force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunction and contradictions which isolate them from one another" (HS, 92). Foucault therefore does not deny that there are large-scale structures of power. He claims only that they are the dynamic outcome

---

[9] Ibid., 149-61.

[10] Ibid., 170.

of the ways in which "infinitesimal mechanisms of power have been --- and continue to be --- invested, colonized, utilized, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended, etc., by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination" (PK, 99).

This conception of power as constituted by the reenactment or reproduction of social alignments explains why Foucault is drawn toward conceiving power in terms of war or struggle, and its intelligibility in terms of strategy and tactics. Foucault makes two different contrasts when he says he wants to conceive of politics as "war continued by other means" (PK, 90). On the one hand, the military metaphor is an alternative to "the great model of language and signs" (PK, 114). On the other hand, he sees it as perhaps the only alternative to an economic model of power, either as itself a form of exchange or contract, or as subordinate to the functioning of the economy (PK, 88-90).

The contrast between war and language may seem surprising at first, until one recalls the structuralist conception of language as a system of signs governed by rules. Foucault seems to be making two connected points in proposing to model power relations upon war. First, war is senseless. Likewise, the totality of power relations cannot be understood as a meaningful system (Foucault explicitly refers to Hegelian-Marxist dialectic and to semiotics as examples of what the model of war is opposed to). Without doubt, meaningful actions and situations do occur within specific alignments of power, but these have only local intelligibility, which Foucault understands as tactical. That is, they make sense only as responses to a particular configuration of forces within an ongoing conflict. Second, war is not governed by rules. Proponents of just-war theory have of course attempted to specify rules adjudicating when and how it is legitimate to wage war, but Foucault is not talking about such attempts to constrain war within the forms and strictures of constitutional politics. In practice war is governed only by the actual play of forces within an ongoing struggle (which may of course make some conformity to accepted norms of conduct strategically advisable).

It is in this context that we can understand Foucault's insistence on a close connection between power and resistance. Resistance cannot be external to power, because power is not a system of domination with an inside or an outside. Here, once again, Wartenburg's conception of power as mediated by dynamic social alignments can help us understand Foucault. Power is exercised through an agent's actions only to the extent that other agents' actions remain appropriately aligned with them. The actions of dominant agents are therefore constrained by the need to sustain that alignment in the future; but, simultaneously, subordinate agents may seek ways of challenging or evading that alignment. Wartenburg concludes that a

> subordinate agent is never absolutely disempowered, but only relatively so.... just as the dominant agent's actions are subject to the problematic of maintaining power by maintaining the allegiance of the aligned agents, the subordinate agent is always in the position of being able to challenge the aligned agents' complicity in her disempowerment."[11]

Foucault's conception of power relations in terms of war elevates this sense that resistance to specific alignments of power is always possible to a conception of power as itself the outcome of ongoing struggles to sustain or undermine networks of domination: "the strictly

---

[11] Ibid., 173.

relational character of power relationships [is such that t]heir existence depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power relations. These points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network" (HS, 95). Power is not something possessed or wielded by powerful agents, because it is co-constituted by those who support and resist it. It is not a system of domination that imposes its rules upon all those it governs, because any such rule is always at issue in ongoing struggles.

The classic form in which power relations have been thought to be rule-governed is that of the contract. Hobbes's war of all against all is constrained by the cession of power to the sovereign in exchange for protection of life and property. We have already seen that Foucault rejects Hobbes's project and its successors. But neither is Foucault's modeling of power relations upon war a return in theory to Hobbes's state of nature. Foucault pictures a society shaped by militant conflicts:

> one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance, producing cleavages in a society that shift about, fracturing unities and effecting regroupings, furrowing across individuals themselves.... Just as the network of power relations ends by forming a dense web that passes through apparatuses and institutions, without being exactly localized in them, so too the swarm of points of resistance traverses social stratifications and individual unities (HS, 96).

In any case, we can now see the connection between Foucault's two contrasts to the model of war: the form in which politics has most typically been taken to be a rule-governed system is that of a system of economic relations. Even Marxism, which rejects the idea of a social contract, models power on the economy, which contemporary French Marxists in turn frequently model on structural linguistics. We now have a picture of Foucault's dynamics of power: power is dispersed across complicated and heterogeneous social networks marked by ongoing struggle. Power is not something present at specific locations within those networks, but is instead always at issue in ongoing attempts to (re)produce effective social alignments, and conversely to avoid or erode their effects, often by producing various counteralignments. But what could it mean to conceive similarly of a dynamics of knowledge? This notion may seem initially very strange, because the conception of knowledge as a body of warranted true beliefs has such a strong hold upon us.

Foucault had taken a first step toward such a dynamic conception of knowledge even before Discipline and Punish, when he distinguished the formation of a discursive field of knowledge (savoir) from the specific statements held true at specific points within that field (connaissances). Knowledge (savoir) in this sense is dispersed across the entire field, rather than located in particular statements or groups of statements. Foucault spoke in this way to indicate that the "seriousness," sense, and possible truth of any particular connaissances were determined by their place within a larger field. What was missing from this earlier conception, however, was a sense of the heterogeneity of epistemic fields, and of their temporal dimension shaped by ongoing epistemic conflict.

Knowledge is established not only in relation to a field of statements but also of objects, instruments, practices, research programs, skills, social networks, and institutions. Some elements of such an epistemic field reinforce and strengthen one another, and are taken up, extended, and reproduced in other contexts; others remain isolated from, or conflict with, these

emergent "strategies" and eventually become forgotten curiosities. The configuration of knowledge requires that these heterogeneous elements be adequately adapted to one another, and that their mutual alignment be sustained over time.

The temporality of these epistemic fields is evident in the construction of such epistemic alignments and in the conflicts and resistances they engender. Taken by itself, a statement, a technique or skill, a practice, or a machine cannot count as knowledge. Only in the ways it is used, and thereby increasingly connected to other elements over time, does it become (and remain) epistemically significant. But these uses and alignments encounter snags and generate conflicts with other emerging epistemic practices. These conflicts have a particular configuration that arises historically from the development of competing epistemic alignments and from the specific respects in which they come into conflict. Such conflict, however, spurs further investigations, articulations, and technical refinements. Conflict thus becomes the locus for the continuing development and reorganization of knowledge. It is ironic that where knowledge does not encounter resistance, it is likely to receive little or no further articulation, and to risk becoming isolated and inconsequential. Foucault used the term "strategies" for the multiple ways in which heterogeneous elements align or conflict with one another to constitute power relations. Once we recognize the complex and contested dynamics of knowledge production, we might say of knowledge as well as of power that "it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society" (HS, 93).

What relation between the strategical alignments that constitute knowledge and those that form a configuration of power is Foucault describing? Foucault noted that

> Relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations), but are immanent in the latter; they are the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums which occur in the latter, and conversely they are the internal conditions of these differentiations (HS, 94)

Foucault is thus not identifying knowledge and power, but he is recognizing that the strategic alignments that constitute each contain many of the same elements and relations. Indeed, their alignment as relationships of power is part of the makeup of an epistemic field, and vice versa. How knowledge and power come together is historically specific and may vary significantly in different domains. Foucault proposed these remarks about knowledge and power first and foremost as an interpretation of his particular historical studies. They were put forward to make sense of how the observation, documentation, and classification of individuals and populations contributed to newly emerging strategies of domination, which themselves were part of the complex social field within which those techniques and their applications came to constitute knowledge.

We can now approach the crucial question. Even supposing we grant everything I have said about Foucault's insistence upon the interrelated dynamics of knowledge and power, how would that respond to Taylor's or Rorty's concerns about the epistemic coherence and political significance of Foucault's work? Their worry was that Foucault could not coherently make truth-claims, criticize power, or offer hope for a better world. I suggest instead that Foucault has offered a different sense of what it is to make truth-claims, criticize power, or offer hope. Foucault's critics presuppose a conception of epistemic and political sovereignty: to claim truth

or to criticize power is to try to stand outside an epistemic or political conflict in order to settle it. Truth and right are conceived as the unified structures from which conflict, struggle, and difference are banned, as all competing assertions and all conflicting agents receive their due.

Foucault suggests a different image in which conflict and struggle are always present and inescapable. To make truth-claims is to try to strengthen some epistemic alignments, and to challenge, undermine, or evade others. To criticize power is to participate in counteralignments to resist or evade its effects. The question Foucault's critics insistently raise is, Why engage in these struggles rather than others? Why take this side rather than an opposing one? Their concern is that without some legitimating standpoint to provide reasons for them, these choices will always be arbitrary or dictated from "without." But Foucault was perfectly prepared to offer reasons for his choices of struggles and sides. He was equally prepared to offer reasons and evidence for the statements he made.

What Foucault was not prepared to do was to see these choices, statements, and reasons as more than a situated response to a particular political and epistemic configuration. Thus, he remarked in an interview that

> I am not looking for an alternative.... You see, what I want to do is not the history of solutions, and that's the reason why I don't accept the word "alternative." I would like to do genealogy of problems, of problematiques. My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So my position leads not to apathy but to a hyper- and pessimistic activism. I think that the ethico-political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger.[12]

Presumably such a choice requires a considered and informed judgment, but cannot be further legitimated by any appeal to a science or a principle of right. Foucault was in any case suspicious of the charges of arbitrariness or "external" determination, which are often alleged to be the consequences of doing without such sovereign legitimation. Political criticism is not arbitrary if it can be historically situated as an intelligible response to specific institutions and practices. "The theoretical and practical experience that we have of our [historical] limits and of the possibility of moving beyond them is always limited and determined; thus we are always in the position of beginning again. But that does not mean that no work can be done except in disorder and contingency"[13]. Rather, it means that such work must always be reflective about its historical limits, and experimental in spirit.

That Foucault's refusal to adopt a standpoint of epistemic or political sovereignty does not disable our capacities to reason, to criticize or justify statements or actions in ways that are not arbitrary or "ungrounded," is usefully highlighted by comparison to Robert Brandom's (1994) recent defense of a thoroughly pragmatic and situated conception of language, thought, and knowledge. Brandom joins Foucault in rejecting a standpoint of sovereignty, outside of ongoing

---

[12] Dreyfus and Rabinow, Michel Foucault, Second edition, 231-32.

[13] Michel Foucault, "What Is Enlightenment?" in Paul Rabinow, ed., Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth (The Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Volume I) (New York: New Press, 1997), 317.

contested practices of reasoning, from which to assess their outcome:

> Sorting out who should be counted as correct, whose claims and applications of concepts should be treated as authoritative, is a messy retail business of assessing the comparative authority of competing evidential and inferential claims. ... That issue is adjudicated differently from different points of view, and although these are not all of equal worth, there is no bird's-eye view above the fray of competing claims from which those that deserve to prevail can be identified, nor from which even necessary and sufficient conditions for such deserts can be formulated. The status of any such principles as probative is always itself at issue in the same way as the status of any particular factual claim.[14]

Foucault and Brandom would have offered rather different glosses upon reason and the normative accountability involved in its exercise, especially concerning what is at stake politically in this question (they would, for example, give quite different answers to Kant's question, "what is Enlightenment?"). Yet there is nothing in this crucial passage from Brandom that Foucault could not have endorsed.

Indeed, despite their substantial differences on other points, Brandom's expressivist conception of logical, semantic, pragmatic and epistemic vocabularies also provides a useful analogue to Foucault's treatment of knowledge and power, and his diverse uses of the concept of truth.[15] Brandom treats these vocabularies as enabling us to say what we would otherwise only be able to do (and thereby also enable to do something new as well, for example to reason for and against the performances and proprieties they articulate). Narrowly logical vocabulary enables us to articulate and discuss inferential practices and their proprieties; semantic vocabulary enables the articulation of what is done in asserting and naming or describing; intentional ascriptions make explicit speakers' attitudes toward semantic contents alongside the contents they express. Such expressive locutions do not identify new kinds of properties or relations, however. Thus, 'true' and 'refers' do not denote relations between linguistic and extra-linguistic items, but only enable new stances toward what is expressed in other assertions that do not employ semantic vocabulary. Similarly, for Brandom, 'beliefs' and 'desires' are not extant psychological states but normative statuses instituted by the practices of distinguishing attitudes from contents. The content of such expressive locutions then varies with the practices they articulate. Thus, Arthur Fine can claim on similar grounds that "the concept of truth is open-ended, growing with the growth of science. ... The significance of the answers to questions [about what is true and what are grounds for truth] is rooted in the practices and logic of truth judging, but that significance

---

[14] Robert Brandom, Making It Explicit: Reasoning, Representing, and Discursive Commitment (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), 601.

[15] For a more extensive discussion of Brandom's expressivist conception of logical, semantic, and pragmatic vocabulary, and its extension to a Foucauldian conception of power, see Joseph Rouse, How Scientific Practices Matter: Reclaiming Philosophical Naturalism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), ch. 5-7.

branches out beyond current practice along with the growing concept of truth."[16] Such historicism about truth and truth conditions thereby commits no equivocation, because the semantic role of the concept is consistent with diverse contexts and purposes of use, including shifts in the "styles of reasoning" that enable an utterance even to be a candidate for truth.[17]

Along similar lines, Foucault's invocation of 'power' does not describe a substantive property or capacity that agents or institutions possess or exercise, but instead enables him to express how actions "act upon ... existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future" rather than upon agents directly, by affecting "a whole field of responses, reactions, results, and possible inventions."[18] There can be various modalities of power (such as juridical power or bio-power), which are different modes of alignment through which the effect of actions upon other actions is distributed, just as there can be different styles of reasoning through which statements can bear on the truth-or-falsity of others. In neither case is power or knowledge invoked as a substantive constituent of the world over and above the actions and statements to which these concepts are applied. We can even understand Foucault's distinction between savoir and connaissance in these terms. The expressive role of connaître is presumably comparable to the "hybrid deontic status" that Brandom assigns to attributions of knowledge: "know" enables one simultaneously to ascribe a discursive commitment to someone else and to undertake the same commitment oneself.[19] The expressive role of savoir, by contrast, articulates the ways statements, modes of reasoning, and various bodily activities, material arrangements, and institutional configurations can align to enable distinctive patterns of intelligibility.

Similarly, the different "faces of truth" that C.G. Prado has insightfully discerned within Foucault's writings are consistent with assigning to Foucault a broadly expressivist account of that concept.[20] Foucault's perspectivism about truth and knowledge differs from Brandom's also explicitly perspectival account of the conceptual domain primarily by "keeping score" on discursive alignments that are rather more encompassing than the utterances and actions of

---

[16] Arthur Fine, The Shaky Game: Einstein, Realism, and the Quantum Theory (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 149.

[17] Ian Hacking, Historical Ontology (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002) invokes the notion of styles of reasoning as historically variant patterns and norms of reasoning that enable utterances to be assessed as true or false. Statements such as "there is a 20% chance of rain tomorrow" only become assessable in conjunction with the emergence of the practices of adjudication that collectively comprise a statistical style of reasoning.

[18] Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," in Dreyfus and Rabinow, Michel Foucault, p. 220.

19. Brandom, Making It Explicit, p. 201-204.

[20] C. G. Prado, Starting With Foucault: An Introduction to Genealogy (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), 119-150.

individual speakers.[21] Although Brandom has reason give special emphasis to the interpretation of individual speakers, there is nothing in his model (or in Donald Davidson's closely parallel conception of "radical interpretation")[22] that prohibits keeping a collective interpretive score on a larger set of performances, such as those that comprise a Foucauldian discursive alignment. The only constraint upon such interpretive practices would be whether the outcome displays a sufficiently coherent pattern. Utter failures of interpretive "coherence" in either case would indicate that this pattern of utterance and action does not comprise, respectively, a speaker or a discursive alignment.[23] Indeed, Brandom's recognition of the importance of what he calls "interpersonal, intra-content inheritance of entitlements," the ways in which an utterance of p on one occasion can entitle (Foucault might have preferred "reinforce") utterances of p on other occasions, would parallel the ways in which Foucault identifies the gradual emergence of a discursive alignment from heterogeneous texts and performances.[24]

Taken together with an expressivist conception of truth, Foucault's dual concern to understand how utterances and performances can form discursive alignments much more extensive than just the attributable unity that comprises an individual speaker, and his concern to articulate how discursive performances act upon and with fields of power relations, is sufficient to generate the differences among what Prado calls Foucault's constructivist, perspectivist, experiential, and semi-objectivist faces of truth.[25] Indeed, the importance Foucault attributed to "limit experiences" and the resulting "experiential" face of truth emerges especially clearly in these terms: given the pervasively enabling and constraining effects of discursive alignments, the concept of truth can be used here to express how "major cognitive clashes [of discourse-dependent truths] and consequent changes in beliefs and attitudes perceived by subjects as hard-won achievements of insight occasioned by deeply disruptive intellectual trials .... are considered

---

[21] Brandom, Making It Explicit, models discursive practices as a mutual "keeping score" of the assertional and practical commitments and entitlements accrued by speakers who implicitly take one another to be fellow players of "the game of giving and asking for reasons."

[22] Donald Davidson, Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

[23] Foucault and Brandom would differ substantially in at least two respects concerning the significance of the individuated discursive scorekeeping that Brandom models and takes to be implicit in ordinary talk. First, Foucault would presumably have taken such scorekeeping to be much more loosely applied, and to result in rather more residual incoherence and resistance to rational discursive norms than Brandom's model seems to suggest. Second, Foucault would have been acutely sensitive to the power effects of this mode of subjectivation, and of resistance to the enforcement of discursive normativity.

[24] These distinctions are introduced in Brandom, Making It Explicit, 169-170, 175-176.

[25] Prado, Starting With Foucault, 121-145.

epiphanies or deliverances by their subjects and exert a powerful grip over them."[26] For Foucault, such cases are an especially revealing expression of how concepts and conceptually-articulated claims have us in their grasp, and point toward his insistent reworking of the broadly Kantian connection between freedom and conceptual necessity.[27]

I now conclude with two brief critical reflections. The first concerns Foucault's frequent appeal to images of war, conflict, and resistance. I have argued above that he explicitly proposed this martial imagery to emphasize the dynamics and non-systematicity of power and knowledge. Yet feminist theorists have often reminded us of the epistemological and political dangers of building militarism and violence into our very tools of theoretical analysis and political criticism.[28] So one important question to be raised about Foucault's work is to what extent his sense of the dynamics of power and knowledge remains tied to his Nietzschean imagery of war, and the related notions of strategy and tactics.

A second question concerns the scope of Foucault's argument. He repeatedly insisted that his arguments were of quite restricted generality, both historically and epistemologically. He wrote extensively about the interconnected disciplines of psychiatry, criminology, pedagogy, and clinical medicine, but was reluctant to extend his arguments beyond what he once called these "dubious" disciplines (PK, 109). Yet his more general remarks about power and knowledge are more difficult to constrain in this fashion. I have argued elsewhere that the natural sciences offer important analogues to detailed aspects of Foucault's historical studies of power and knowledge.[29] Whether or not these analogies can be sustained, however, Foucault's insistence that power and knowledge be understood as dynamic relationships rather than things possessed must have more general import. There are undoubtedly important structural differences in the ways that alignments of power and of knowledge are organized and deployed in different fields and

---

[26] Ibid., 137.

[27] See, for example, his explicitly Kantian evocation of "an attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits imposed on us and a experiment with the possibility of going beyond them" (Foucault, "What Is Enlightenment?" in Paul Rabinow, ed., Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth (The Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Volume I) (New York: New Press, 1997), 319.

28. Two excellent examples of such feminist reflection are Nancy Hartsock, Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1985); and Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," in Donna Haraway, ed., Simians, Cyborgs, and Women (New York: Routledge, Chapman, and Hall, 1990), 183-201.

[29] Joseph Rouse, Knowledge and Power: Toward a Political Philosophy of Science (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), esp. chap. 7, and "Foucault and the Natural Sciences," in J. Caputo and M. Yount, eds., Institutions, Normalization, and Power (State College: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993).

historical periods. Nor would one expect always to find the same patterns of interaction between knowledge and other kinds of relationship among us and the world. But if I am right in attributing to Foucault an account of the dynamics of knowledge, this should have important consequences still to be worked out for epistemology and the philosophy of science.