

Yayın Geliş Tarihi: 16.10.2021
Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 29.03.2022
Online Yayın Tarihi: 30.03.2022
http://dx.doi.org/10.16953/deusosbil.1010762

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Cilt: 24, Sayı: 1, Yıl: 2022, Sayfa: 245-259
ISSN: 1302-3284 E-ISSN: 1308-0911

Araştırma Makalesi

FOUCAULT, SEXUALITY AND BIOPOLITICS: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Pınar SARIGÖL*

Abstract

This paper analyzes Michel Foucault's theorisation on life, body and population in referring to the concepts of biopolitics and sexuality. In doing so, the paper puts critical attention to the relation between the rationality of politics and power. Tracing this relationship, the paper basically develops a conceptual framework in which truth and discursive practices of the truth regime gain strategic and operational position to produce social norms and to impose these norms on the idealisations of population and human-subjects. By the end of this paper, this conceptual analysis offers a way through which the subject formation and biopolitical subjectivity are clarified. Relying on this new way, this paper puts forward that biopolitics with its mechanisms and instruments is a perspective in order to reveal power relations and political regulations in general; and is a light to realize boundaries of different sexualities. This analysis ends by questioning the resistance, counteract and power relations in the light of these concepts.

Keywords: Foucault, truth, biopolitics, sexuality, population, body.

FOUCAULT, CİNSELLİK VE BİYOSİYASET: KAVRAMSAL BİR ANALİZ

Öz

Bu makale, biyopolitika ve cinsellik kavramlarına gönderme yaparak Michel Foucault'nun yaşam, beden ve nüfus üzerine kuramlamasını incelemektedir. Bunu yaparken, makale siyasetin rasyonalitesi ile iktidar arasındaki ilişkiye ciddi bir dikkat göstermektedir. İzini sürdüğü bu ilişkiyle makale esasında hakikatin ve hakikat rejiminin söylemsel pratiklerinin sosyal normlar üretmek için ve bu normları nüfus ve insan-özne idealleştirmelerine dayatmak için stratejik ve operasyonel konum elde ettiği bir kavramsal bir çerçeve geliştirmektedir. Makalenin sonunda, bu kavramsal analiz, özne oluşumu ve biyopolitik özneliliğin açıklığa kavuşturulması için bir yol sunmaktadır. Bu alternatif yoldan ilerleyerek, makale biyopolitikanın mekanizmaları ve araçlarıyla genel olarak iktidar

Bu makale için önerilen kaynak gösterimi (APA 6. Sürüm):

Sarıgöl, P. (2022). Foucault, sexuality and biopolitics: A conceptual analysis. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24 (1), 245-259

*Dr., ORCID: 0000-0001-5420-8892, pinar.sarigoel@gmail.com.

ilişkilerini ve siyasi düzenlemeleri ortaya çıkaran bir perspektif ve farklı cinselliklerin hadlarını fark etmek için aydınlatıcı bir kavram olduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Makale bu analiz ışığında direniş, karşı koyma ve iktidar ilişkilerinin sorgulanmasıyla sona ermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Foucault, hakikat, biyopolitika, cinsellik, nüfus, beden.

INTRODUCTION

How is it that in a society like ours, sexuality is not simply a means of reproducing the species, the family, and the individual? Not simply a means to obtain pleasure and enjoyment? How has sexuality come to be considered the privileged place where our deepest "truth" is read and expressed? (Foucault, 1988, pp. 110-111).

The above remark of Foucault suggests that sexuality is an issue that is not merely concerned with the private life of people in their micro space of bedroom. For Foucault's part, the essential question is to display how sexuality becomes connected up to politics and truth or, in his own phrase, 'politics of truth'. In this sense, Foucault conceptualizes sexuality in relation with politics. Looking at the contemporary studies on sexuality, I see that sexuality is increasingly taken up within the scope of biopolitics. Biopolitics is the one of subsequent studies of Foucault at the closing years of 1970s. Foucault himself made a crucial turning while he was dealing with the issue of sexuality towards a new conception of politics and power. Accordingly, politics and power came to be reformulated as biopolitics (or biopower). Therefore, in Foucault's thinking, one cannot speak of sexuality without reference to biopolitics and the other way around. Here I am posing the question of sexuality with its relation to politics in light of Foucault but by keeping in mind that the conceptual framework of Foucault is much wider in scope. In other words; discourse, discipline, government, security, criminality, health and many other concepts should be taken into account to explain sexuality thoroughly. Yet I believe that to think of the sexuality as a main concept within the scope of politics is a crucial departure point as Foucault himself makes a critical turning in his thought while thinking the relation of sexuality, politics and power.

Therefore, the first question that needs to be addressed is how and why Foucault links sexuality up to politics. In order to come up with an answer to this question first it must be noticed how politics cuts its established link with sovereign power. In Foucault's eye, modern politics cannot be characterized by conventional philosophical and theoretical accounts of sovereign power. The nub of politics, *if any*, lies in power relations that spread to ever more domains of society. Power relations cannot be understood within the scope of juridico-sovereign models of rule. Therefore, Foucault's notion of 'power relation' is an objection against the Hobbesian conception of politics, power and the state. Yet, Foucault first goes into the depth of the sovereign model of politics and explores

the meaning of the right of sovereign over death and life of individuals. On closer examination, Foucault recognizes that even in this traditional conception of the state, power and politics developed a subtle bipolitical process to govern and rule society and individuals. Foucault's critique of this state- and sovereign-centered shows that the sovereign is the *one* (this one would be the state or society) who keeps individuals alive or not, and decides who deserve to be alive or death. Accordingly, the sovereign becomes a position to determine and inform the *essence* of politics. His critique shows that in the juridico-sovereign type of philosophical fictions of power, power becomes an issue to be taken over. What Foucault wants to show with his discussion of the old-fashioned conception of politics and power is that we need another solid foothold to step in order to understand power as relation.

Considering Foucault's path-breaking discussion on politics, two points should be kept in mind: First, politics should be understood as omnipresence 'power relation' instead of a captured power, and *functions* as biopolitics. Second, in order to see the changing nub of politics one should avoid philosophical fictions in political philosophy and turn to his/her face to the practice of politics. At this point, Foucault recognizes the developing modern sense and mechanisms of government. In retrospect, political philosophy made an earnest effort to explain politics in relation within power and government. Foucault goes into a critical reading of the ancient philosophy and questions the established conception with his new concepts in order to show underlying connections from a fresh view. In doing so, he identifies his main problematics with politics and government in the context of specific themes such as body, sexuality, madness, delinquency and perversity. However, by comparison, sexuality seems to have a wider context and scope, since it is related both individual and population. As a result, sexuality provides a gateway to see how politics and power *operates* as biopolitics, respectively. In Foucault's scheme of all things, politics can be understood better with sexuality, because for his 'analytics of power' the essential thing to be explored is how is it that body and life have become to the center politics on individual and population levels connected with power relations. This being so, sexuality traces out and structures not only individual life but also whole population. From his perspective, Foucault's conception of politics as biopolitics addresses the question of how micro and macro levels of political regulation of life intertwine within the scope of sexuality.

CONCEPTUAL INTRODUCTION TO BIOPOLITICS

Biopolitics, as Foucault puts, is not an expression of sovereign authority. It is simply another type of politics, which aims at ordering and governing life on the levels of individual and population. Biopolitics is neither the essence of politics nor its object. Biopolitics is an entry point to differing spheres of life of individual(s) to receive much more statistical and measurable knowledge/information and, one may well say, to take hold of ever more power over population. Obviously, biopolitics

as a conception and perspective would not necessarily engaged with individuals one by one as in the ‘pastoral power’ of the old Christian model of government. It adds specific discursive mechanisms to the ‘pastoral power’ and creates a focus for ruling, ordering and governing by having recourse to biological traits of the living beings so as to reconsider them as measurable, observable and governable in their private and social life as part of the population. Therefore, Foucault puts it as follows:

It seems to me that one of the basic phenomena of the nineteenth century was what might be called power’s hold over life. What I mean is the acquisition of power over man insofar as man is a living being, that the biological came under state control, that there was at least a certain tendency that leads to what might be termed State control of the biological(Foucault, 2003, pp. 239-240).

With this above remark it is all the clearer that population becomes measurable and controllable/governable with biological features of living beings. Yet it becomes also clear that Foucault’s notion of biopolitics is not permanent and stable in his writings since its meaning and reflections seem to be differing. For the sake of my future discussion, at this point, it would be helpful to clarify Foucault’s notion of biopolitics further. As Thomas Lemke sums up, there are three different conceptions of biopolitics in Foucault’s thought and research agenda:

First, biopolitics stands for a historical rupture in political thinking and practice that is characterized by a rearticulation of sovereign power. Second, Foucault assigns to biopolitical mechanisms a central role in the rise of modern racism. A third meaning of the concept refers to a distinctive art of government that historically emerges with liberal forms of social regulation and individual self-governance(Lemke, 2011, p. 34).

Therefore, the notion of biopolitics can be thought in these above-mentioned contexts: Criticism of the established political philosophy with an eye to coming up with new conception of politics and power; exploration of the role and results of genetic traits in and for modern power; liberal and neoliberal governmentality. On the basis of this broad scope conception of biopolitics, on the one hand, governing population and individuals requires new tools like statistics, demographical and biological ‘dispositives’. Given the fact that, as Pasquale Pasquino once noted, “power needs to know” (Pasquino, 1978, p. 51). As Ian Hacking also clarifies:

Statistics has helped determine the form of laws about society and the character of social facts. It has engendered concepts and classifications within the human sciences. Moreover the collection of statistics has created, at the least, a great

bureaucratic machinery. It may think of itself as providing only information, but it is itself part of the technology of power in a modern state (Hacking, 1981, p. 15).

On the other hand, in Foucault's conception of biopolitics, I also find a critique of philosophical juridico-sovereign model of power which ignores the wide scope of social relationality of power. Accordingly, biopolitics implies that power and politics cannot be reserved for a single logic and oppressive mechanisms. In a sense, power as a relation by means of biopolitical mechanisms is everywhere and omnipresence. It is upon this account that it may be said that there is not a single homogenous sovereign but various tactics, programmings, maneuvers and strategies. As this point, it is notable to see that Foucault sets forth the question of 'how' to be defined his fundamental understanding of power and biopolitics. The new insights into power are based upon two questions: "What are the rules of right that power implements to produce discourses of truth?" and "What type of power is it that is capable of producing discourses of power that have...such powerful effects?" (Foucault, 2003, p. 24). At this point, I come upon Foucault's other essential notion that is directly related with the politics of sexuality: Truth.

Actually, the question of sexuality resides in the production of truth. For Foucault, truth is composed of power relations and discourses. All individuals contribute to the production of truth in their daily 'normal' life mostly even without knowing it. Therefore, life itself acquires its own meaning within truth. Truth is also essential to characterize power relations. In other words, the notion of biopolitics suggests that there cannot be a subject or subjectivity that remains unconnected to power relations and truth that comes as an outcome of these relations. In this sense, I should turn back sexuality as one of Foucault's fundamental concepts because sexuality is a main discursive domain of biopower. Sexuality is the main way to approach life of body and life of the species as population that is subject to specific knowledges. To illustrate it with Foucault's own phrase, "...birthrate, the age of marriage, the legitimate and illegitimate births, the precocity and frequency of sexual relations, the ways of making them fertile or sterile, the effects of unmarried life or of the prohibitions, the impact of contraceptive practices"(Foucault, 1998, pp. 25-26) are all the subjects of power and truth.

SPECIFICITY OF SEXUALITY AS AN IMPORTANT TECHNOLOGY OF BIOPOLITICS

Sex regulates individual's life and its life at population level, population itself and all relations by considering differences and similarities. In Foucault's thinking this occurs at two levels (Foucault, 1998, p. 139): Disciplining of the individual body and the regulatory control of the population. The disciplinary technologies were first formulated in theory and practice in the eighteenth century and mainly targeted at disciplining body. Foucault calls it "anatomy-politics of human body". Then in the nineteenth century another epoch began what Foucault

call 'biopolitics'. Accordingly, human body began to be perceived and led as if it were a complex machine. Population is now the new name of the *body*. This population of body is not a legal entity. Instead, Foucault depicts the population as biological organism because population is depicted as biological organism or social body that is subject to death and birth rates, health level, lifetime, wealth or poverty. That is, power is not necessarily always negative. Instead the basic aim of the power is to provide a realm for individuals through which they can carry out their bodily performances functionally for the general social production. Power, in a way, encourages individuals to keep themselves healthy and in an orderly way. Namely, power mechanisms are not prohibitory; on the contrary, it aims more production, more growth, and proliferation. Namely, human being individualizes himself around certain procedures and norms, and sexuality *per se* establishes a connection between subjectivity and body because sexuality gives an identity beyond bodily pleasure (Foucault, 1998, pp. 139-141). Along the same line, beyond the practices of bodily disciplining and the regulation of population, collective subject positions and self-constitution of individual draw attention with intend to get better life, to have more beautiful body and more happiness. Individuals imagine and aim just the better one or the best.

For Foucault (1988), our lives are formed with 'desire', 'being hungry for better one' and more pleasure as well. Therefore, modern political system or liberalism should be adhered to biopolitics and power relations because liberalism is not a system in governing individual and population. Liberalism deploys between success or unsuccessful of life, instead of licit or illicit. In other words, the system displays the definition of good society, not good state. For good society, inputs and outputs are just clarified and individual aims being good as part of power relation and main subject of biopolitics. Power relations are hidden in the social body, and our inside as well. In this sense, security mechanisms are for freedom and naturalness of population and freedom is secured by law, which provides settlement of norms in society or which makes up the truth. Therefore, the functions of power cannot be evaluated by state apparatuses because all of us are part of it to produce or change it (Foucault, 1988, p.119).

Following this argument of view, biopower is the essence of capitalism, which reinforces the connection of body and population with the production in every sense. However, we see just political life that "...exists when the possible excess of governmental practice is limited by the fact that it is the object of public debate regarding its "good or bad", its "too much or too little." (Foucault, 2008, pp. 321-322). For Foucault, liberalism imbued that one always governs too much, at least it is expected because governmentality subsists on the critique more radical than a test of optimization.(Foucault, 2008, p. 319). In this point, it should be analyzed why one governs for good and what goodness is, who decides my goodness. However, before that, it should be concretized the concepts of biopolitics, and its relation with truth and power. Biopolitics exists on the stages of life and it needs knowledge of life and living being to create cognitive and

normative maps to specify objects for intervention. Stages of life are clarified by its own knowledge in order to be easily understood and changed. However, the truth must take into consideration with power relations because it is not independent from power. As said, knowledge creates strategies and tactics for power and as a result, structures of asymmetries, which are reproduced by biopolitics, seem. Whose life is worthy or not is determined by truth and power relations change or transform these impressions of worth and unworthy life.

In this context, I want to draw attention to sexuality as the pivotal technology of biopolitics for constituting the concept of power and pertinent relations with knowledge. Accordingly, the essential point here is the answer as to how power can coexist with pleasure and knowledge through sexuality. Hence, the deployment of sexuality firstly needs to be clarified in the light of problems raised by the issues of demography, health, security and many other frames in the course of the eighteenth century and onward. It is crucial to remember of that at the juncture of the body and population; sex became a technology around life rather than death (Foucault, 1998, 1988). Second, binding status of sexuality between individual and population compels me to focus on Foucault's power calling for multiple domains of knowledge emanating from the technology of sexuality. In this context, Foucault does not endeavor to find the reasons as to why our sexualities are repressed, but rather the reasons as to why we need to talk about our sexualities as an activity of sin against power and why we want to reveal everything about our 'hidden' desires in order to free our soul from the feeling of guilt. In other words, he wonders why sexual freedom and sexuality started to be discussed more than anything within the realms of human science and medicine; more importantly, it is questionable whether or not power has an effect on the generation of discourses and knowledge about sexuality (Foucault, 1998). Third, the particularly apt description of power needs elaborative thinking in order to highlight the proliferation of political technologies and neoliberal governmentality, which assure the necessary regulatory and corrective mechanisms for the pervasive power (Foucault, 1998).

In 19th century are there two phenomena: One is that subject or living being is not aware of its desires, but the other one is that there is too much mushroomed knowledge of desires on the cultural and social sense. This knowledge seems theoretical but simple forms as intensive and widespread. In other words, in spite of repressed sexuality, too much knowledge is being overproducing about it. For Foucault, these phenomena, which are perceived paradoxical, are obviously normal. That is not dilemma. Namely, the production of discourses on sexuality, irrational and false discourses, emotive and mythological discourses are in order to keep knowledgeable individuals on their own urges and sexuality (Foucault, 1997a). Pressure on sexuality creates misery, which causes more wonder and curious. Foucault states clearly that "far from making sexuality taboo or bringing strong sanctions against it, our societies have never ceased speaking of sex, and making it speak"(Foucault, 1988, p. 111). That is why, seductress and

inflammatory knowledge or narratives are more interesting rather than restrictions and moral. In this vein, the truth of sexuality is not for its own nature to get much more pleasure, rather the truth displays that sexuality is uniquely for reproduction of living beings. As a result, monogamy was encouraged as well. Obviously all these moral norms are related to Christian morality, which accepts it as a sin. Before Christianity, it was repressed too but through Christianity new power mechanisms were brought in order to jog these norms individuals' memory (Foucault, 1997b: 224-225). Therefore, clarification of sexuality occurred not only in discussions but also in the reality of institution and practices. While numerous strict prohibitions exist, they are part of a complex economy along with incitements, manifestations, and evaluations. They are case of entire complex of apparatuses, which express themselves as reason and result: Prohibitions and repressive power, insanity and its incarceration, the anomaly and its exclusion, delinquency and its imprisonment. It is important to ask what is the truth of all of these and which discourse makes someone insane or guilty (Foucault, 1988). Therefore, new power mechanisms have brought about new subjection and domination on society; however, this subjection rendered by single and specific individuals, which are not only prudish and important in the meaning of their duty in society. They are like shepherd, who has their own herd whose goodness and optimization are aimed by shepherd. For Foucault, the metaphor of shepherd-herd is seen at Mediterranean societies, for example jews and Egyptian. Obviously, god is shepherd of society or people are the herd of god. For Foucault, this is pastoral power, which governs the individuals, not land. Pastoral power does not aim to conquest of the land and vandalize people. On the contrary, it keeps eye on people. In other words, pastoral power's moral existence poses being sacrifice to people or its herd and takes care of them. At this point, we meet the history of sexuality. Pastoral power, in a way, brings a series of truth and its reproduction. It teaches the truth, namely, sacred commandments and moral norms. In this sense, determined rules and norms causes unconditional duteness, otherwise who not obey the rules is punished because the humble priest displays how to be good towards yourself and towards society. In addition, personal and social salvation needs an authority, which can surveil, damn or confirm the behaviors and ideas. Therefore, every individual should take its own responsibility at least by completely and regularly confessing all knowledge about itself in order to produce truth, which is the main service of priest (Foucault, 1997b, pp. 225-230).

Person individualizes around some procedures and rules. Sex is an important factor to render the connection subjectivity and identity of the person. Foucault states that "...to know who you are, know what your sexuality is. Sex has always been the forum where both the future of the our species and our "truth" as human subjects are decided." (Foucault, 1988, p. 111) However, on the other hand, sex and sexuality lead to the possibility of the seduction. They lay on the hearth of sin. That is why, discourses on sexuality create power relation among people themselves to surveil each other. What we understood is that sexuality is not totally

excluded, rather it is main machine as to create and regulate family life, reproduction of livings and functions of society. Foucault states:

How the relation of two individuals can be validated by society and benefit from the same advantages as the relations-perfectly honorable-which are the only ones recognised: marriage and family (Foucault, 1997c, p. 162).

In this sense, confession and self-consciousness provide more wakefulness and self-control in state of committing a sin. That is, not only prohibitions or sacred commandments but also technologies of self provide the biopower inside and outside, explicitly and implicitly.

HEALTHY LIFE AND SEXED BODY

According to Judith Butler (2009), the 'being' of life is not outside the operations of power, and the body is exposed to social and political forces, which include language, work and desire. Therefore, the living being exists as norms that generate the subjects across continuum of life. In this context, Butler reminds us of the distinction between 'living' and 'life'. According to her, not each living refers to 'life'. The recognition of living is not possible outside the norms system. Otherwise, it becomes problematic to manage the living situated outside the norm system of life. That is intrinsically germane to the reproduction of life. If someone is outside the circle of life in one way or another, he could be living but does not possess a life, the frame of which is drawn by norms. According to Butler, one's life is thereby always in the hands of another. It means that 'life' is invigorated and re-constructed within new modes of knowledge-power. This argument points to the way of identifying the discourse of life within the field of biopolitics and of biomedicalization (Butler, 2009, p. 17). Regarding the hysterical woman, the feminine body was examined around the techniques of discipline and security in order to reinforce biological and moral responsibilities since the beginning of eighteenth centuries. Firstly, the qualification of the feminine body was the target in the sense of its sexuality. In the sphere of medicine, feminine body was explored with all its functions, capabilities, features and categorization of its (dis)qualified. Namely, hysterical women were reduced to bad mother, frigid wife, and unruly daughters. Then, the integration of this body into society was framed, so to say, through which its communication with the social body was enabled. The feminine body was eased into a family space and the life of children merely by being a woman, wife and mother. The second strategic unity centering on sex dealt with the pedagogization of children. Children's sexuality was accepted as preliminary domain for controlling, managing, disciplining and regulating. In order to stop the child masturbating, especially parents, teachers, doctors and psychologists put their hearts and souls into child's intrinsic world so as to reorder and reshape, eventually to change the child's focus point. More interestingly, after carving out the rules as to how to be docile bodies and have a 'conscious mind', the Malthusian couple took its place within the economic, medical and political socialization, which refer

to values of the individual and the species, to birth control practices through the responsabilization of couples towards the social body (Foucault 1998, pp. 103-105; 1984a, p. 279). In Foucault's theory, sex is biopolitical due to the fact that 'biopolitical sex' turns pervasive power into life. There is thereby a nexus between life and sex, which embraces procreativity (Foucault 1998, p. 147; Deustcher, 2012, p. 131). All these three unities were concentrated on family and family relations, which ultimately became the focus of clinical analysis for designating anomalies, assigning a role of normalization concerning all behaviors. Namely, subjects became objects of knowledge as well as domination (Foucault, 1998, p. 105; 1994a, p. 177), additionally, "the development of medicine, the general medicalization of behavior, modes of conduct, discourses, desires and so on, is taking place on the front where the layers of discipline and sovereign meet" (Foucault 2003, p. 39). Hence, all these four unities called upon the necessary knowledge-power in the nineteenth and twentieth century. Procreativity is not only connected with the birth rate but also exists to justify racist killings, the exclusion of individuals due to insanity or sexual orientation, and ignored women on the grounds of their race, ethnicity, and marital status or having children.

Concerning the point of hygiene and psychiatric power, the sexualities of children and adolescents were properly molded amenable to the bourgeoisie family and feminine sexuality was medicalized around the merits of (body) hygiene, discipline, descent and race. In the nineteenth century, the matters of longevity, hygiene, sexual health, the health of children were haunted by counting on the sexuality of workers and future workers in an attempt to moralize the poorer classes (Foucault, 1998, p. 122, 1984a, p. 282). The learning and the execution processes of these increasing health-cares constituted the processes of subjectivation at the same time. Free subjects such as the idealization of (neo)liberalism, the developments of mechanisms and techniques of medicine and psychiatry were deeply bound up in the self-technologies of power. In fact, while psychiatric interventions and designations on the personalities and personal choices seemed to aim at "implementing and helping" individuals in order to simplify them into a "normalizing process" and "perception of order", they intrinsically recast repressive forces in new surveillance strategies of knowledge-power across the spaces and practices of everyday life (Hormer-Nadesan, 2008, p. 153). In this context, not only living-space hygiene but also mental hygiene significantly came into prominence. This directly implies the empowerment of self-technologies by using the domain of sexuality. This means "to know who you are, know what your sexuality is" (Foucault, 1988: 111). In line with this, the confession practice of Christianity as the old form of knowledge-power could be compared to the previous model of psychiatric techniques "that permit one to produce, transform, to manipulate things; one to determine the conduct of individuals" and these techniques "that permit individuals to effect, by their own means, a certain number operations on their own body, their own souls, their own thoughts, their own conduct, and this in a manner so as to transform themselves, modify themselves

and to attain perfection, happiness, supernatural power” (Foucault, 1994a, p. 177). Instead of (or in addition to the religious gaze), the medical gaze needing objective knowledge in order to expose the illness, designates the needed cure reaches inside the body and leads people to different values and ways in which they can foster themselves. This knowledge in the hands of the medical authority is significant for carrying out a disciplinary and regulatory order; therefore, it should be clear that this authority is endowed with unlimited power, which one cannot escape. This medical authority leans on non-reciprocal power relations, the instructions of which one must comply with the instructions and one must believe this authority unquestioned (Foucault, 2006, p. 3). Foucault calls it knowledge-power, its power and authority comes from knowledge. Furthermore, medical and particularly psychiatric power did not stand between patient and doctor or only in asylums and hospitals, its reliable knowledge-power has permeated publicly and privately through the truth of ourselves, and our body with the implicit motto of “at once duty of each and the objective of all” (Foucault 1984a, p. 277). It is important here that Foucault does not reduce this authority to ‘doctors’, this shows us that knowledge-power does not belong to any institution or person, this biopolitics, in which people govern, conduct and manage themselves, each other and population through the reliable and reasonable knowledge. Hence,

New technologies of the self emerged as individuals were instructed in, and readily adopted, the practices of mental hygiene. Public (e.g., schools) and private (e.g., workplaces) establishments adopted mental-hygiene precepts and the welfare state funded programs aimed at securing the psychological adjustment of the population. Still, psychiatric institutions and prisons remained important disciplinary spaces for enclosing those deemed incapable of self-government due to their overt eccentricities or criminal tendencies. Sovereign power was exercised by psychiatrists, judges, and medical practitioners in their diagnoses, judgments, and treatments of such individuals (Hormer-Nadesan 2008, p. 139).

Yet again, “biopolitics was inextricably bound up with the rise of the life sciences, the human sciences and clinical medicine” (Rose, 2001, p. 1). With the growth of the industrial society and race-nation-religion concerns, the contemporary biopolitics would be more aptly called “risk politics”(Rose, 2001, p.1), which finds its way through the truth regime of the life sciences by urging the self-technologies and by inciting and teaching self-care minds (and selfish/individualistic) amenable to free market necessities. All in all, it reminds us of the art of governmentality, whose rationality of government draws its strength from “will to knowledge”.

Therefore, it is worth once more to stress the importance of Foucault’s *History of Sexuality Volume 1: Will to Knowledge*. In the first volume, Foucault

explores the organization of sexuality according to the double axis. On the one hand, he implores us to think of *Scientia Sexualis* based on the techniques of the medicalization of reproductive body, on the other hand, these categorizations and classifications inflicted by knowledge-power brought about *Ars Erotica* connoting the art of existence and practices of self. Therefore, to subjugate the domain of sexuality, in a way, refers to modernity that is the result of the triumph of medicalization of and sexualization of the body in the new form of power, that is, biopower, concerned with managing life and conducting population by means of emotions, norms, laws, religious values over the moral and material world of individuals (Foucault, 1998; Braidotti, 1994, p. 58). In *History of sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure* and *Volume 3: The Care of Self*. Foucault explicates the ancient Greek and Roman practices of discourses and control of sexuality, of which one might well say that sexuality is in modernity as the domain for the proliferation of discourses as well. He points in these last volumes to the art of existence and intentional and voluntary actions of the self, which necessitates changing and transforming their being into life as aesthetic values and criteria (Foucault, 1992, 1990; Braidotti, 1994, p. 128). After all, the essence of matter regarding sexuality bears down on the interwoven relations between life of individual and population and the guidance of institutions under the human sciences and medicine for implementing the rationality of government or governmentality. This expansionist feature of knowledge-power in biopolitics compels us to pursue a better discussion of the notion of power in Foucault's theory.

FOUCAULDIAN POWER: BIOPOWER/BIOPOLITICS

Foucault is not interested in 'what to be defined power', but he deals with 'how to be felt power' by understanding and identifying its mechanisms and technologies embodied in the truth through which power finds the ways, even the veins through which to penetrate everywhere. Therefore, "it is never localized here or there, it is never in the hands of someone...Power functions. Power is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in those networks" (Foucault, 2003, p. 29). Likewise, power is not represented by an institution or a structure, and it is self-produced at every point, repetitious and omnipresent. But it needs to be kept in mind, that "power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but it comes from every everywhere", more importantly, "power comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as general matrix (Foucault, 1998, pp. 93-94). One might "suppose rather that the manifold relationships of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups, and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects cleavage that run through the social body as whole" (Foucault, 1998, pp. 93-94). In this context, power in Foucault's understanding is not a kind of imposition of state over individuals; contrariwise, Foucault's power encourages individualization.

In other words, all history proceeds to the general insights of ideologies and systems. For Foucault, power relations and power itself cannot be grasped without taking into consideration its mechanisms because these mechanisms, tactics and strategies make power visible, and likewise, these techniques and mechanisms render power as outside the field of daily political analysis. That is why, the mental normalization of individuals, psychiatric interventions and penal institutions should be thought of as the wheels of the power (Foucault, 1984b, p. 58). These elements of power are the nexus to the truth, which is produced “only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 73).

Where sex and pleasure are concerned, power does nothing but produce gaps, distractive discontinuities by using mushroomed discourses in the domain of sexuality. Foucault states:

Power over sex is exercised in the same way at all levels. From top to bottom, in its over-all decisions and its capillary interventions alike, whatever the devices or institutions on which it relies, it acts in a uniform and comprehensive manner; it operates according to the simple and endlessly reproduced mechanisms of law, taboo, and censorship: from state to family, from prince to father, from the tribunal to the small change of everyday punishments, from the agencies of social domination to the structures that constitute the subject himself, one finds a general form of power, varying in scale alone (Foucault, 1998, pp. 84-85).

Power becomes visible in the different forms and in different faces. These differentiated characters of power should be identified and separated from repression. When I trace these different faces, I coincide again with sexuality. To illustrate, the adults concerned with the sex of children signifying the infinite lines of penetration in which power can advance, multiply its effects. Furthermore, incorporations of perversions and specifications of individuals allow power to classify the bad and the good, the true and the false, and they permit power to distribute its hierarchy points (Foucault, 1998, pp. 44-45). All in all, power moves across the lines and veins into the life of individual and population, it has indications and signs at a concrete level. By looking at the effects of mechanisms and techniques, the form of power and the power relations in a given domain and time can be determined. Ultimately, According to Foucault, power is the precondition of resistance. So to say, resistance is an inevitable and indisputable carrier of power. Though, the power relations, in which we are also involved, have no exit points.

IN LIEU OF CONCLUSION

I explained the deployment of sexuality between individual and population. Environmental conditions and governmental expectations focused their attention particularly on the increasing questions and the concerns of population, that is, longevity, health of life, birth rate, hygiene, normalizing and ordering the society as the principals of bourgeoisie, disciplining of children's sexuality and moralizing women's behavior and workers' lives. Sexuality was employed on two axes: on the one hand, its ability to moralize and affect people through pleasure were employed leading to the beginnings of understanding it as a sin against power and other values. Sexuality was confined and kept in the hidden and mysterious space of livings. On approaching the nineteenth century, the growth of capitalism and the growth of apparatuses of power opened a new way in which knowledge-power held the place of authority. It was such a great authority that it could penetrate the soul, each mind and each body. Its authority has been everywhere, publicly and privately. Knowledge regarding the body, individual, population, and environment and so on solely turned back more power over life. And sexuality and sex in biopolitics shed light on the feature of an important mechanism. In fact, sexuality provided great domains in that discourses could augment and truths on life appeared. That is why, it seems necessary to me to place an emphasis on knowledge-power and sexuality in the third subsection. In this subsection, an attempt has been made to highlight the importance of medicine and human sciences to govern and manage the population and individual. And a linkage between truth and knowledge-power was established. For a final word, power itself should be addressed in the view of Foucault because Foucault points out specific features of power and provides a methodology and sign to identify power and power relations. By doing so, he again refers to sexuality and its relation to power.

REFERENCES

Braidotti, R. (1994), *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Butler, J. (2009), *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable*, London: Verso.

Foucault M. (1984a), "The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century", in *The Foucault Reader*, Ed. P.Rabinow, New York: Pantheon Books, 273-290.

Foucault M. (1984b), "Truth and Power", in *The Foucault Reader*, Ed. P.Rabinow, New York: Pantheon Books, 51-75.

Foucault, M. (1988), "Power and Sex", in *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, eds. L. D. Kritzman, New York: Routledge, 110-124.

Foucault, M. (1990), *The History of Sexuality: The Care of the Self*, Volume 3, R.Hurleys (trans.), London: Penguin books.

Foucault, M. (1992), *The History of Sexuality: The use of Pleasure*, Volume 2, R.Hurleys (trans.), London: Penguin books.

Foucault, M. (1997a) "Sexuality and Solitude" in *Ethics: Essentials Works of Foucault 1954-1984 Volume One*. Ed. P. Rabinow, R. Hurley and the others (trans), New York: The New Press, 175-184.

Foucault, M. (1997b). "Technologies of the Self" in *Ethics: Essentials Works of Foucault 1954-1984 Volume One*. Ed. P. Rabinow, R. Hurley and the others (trans), New York: The New Press, 223-252

Foucault, M. (1997c), "The Social Triumph of the Sexual Will", in *Ethics: Essentials Works of Foucault 1954-1984 Volume One*. Ed. P. Rabinow, R. Hurley and the others (trans), New York: The New Press, 157-162.

Foucault, M. (1998), *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge*, Volume 1, R.Hurleys (trans.), London: Penguin books.

Foucault, M. (2003) *Society must be Defended*, D. Macey (trans.), London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2006), *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France 1973-1975*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2008), *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France*,

1978-1979, eds. M.Senellart, F.Ewald and A.Fontana, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hacking, I. (1981), "How Should We Do the History of Statistics?", *Ideology & Consciousness*, No. 8, 15-26.

Holmer-Nadesan M. (2008), *Governmentality, Biopower, and Everyday Life*, New York and London: Routledge.

Lemke, T. (2011), *Bio-Politics: An Advanced Introduction*, E. F. Trump (tr.), New York University Press: New York and London.

Pasquino, P. (1978), "Theatrum Politicum: The Genealogy of Capital, Police and the State of Prosperity", *Ideology & Consciousness*, No.4, 41-54

Rose, N. (2001). 'The Politics of Life Itself', *Theory, Culture&Society*, Vol. 18:6, 1-30.