

SECURITY, TRANQUILITY, HAPPINESS

“War is becoming an anachronism; if we have battled in every part of the continent it was because two opposing social orders were facing each other, the one which dates from 1789, and the old regime. They could not exist together; the younger devoured the other .. There are two systems, the past and the future. The present is only a painful transition. Which must triumph? The future, will it not? Yes, indeed, the future! That is, intelligence, industry, peace. The past was brute force, privilege, and ignorance. Each of our victories was a triumph for the ideas of the Revolution. Victories will be won, one of these days, without cannon, and without bayonets.” (Napoleon Bonaparte, *Napoleon in His Own Words*, p. 107)

“It is good policy to make a people believe they are free. It is good government to make them as happy as they wish to be.” (Napoleon Bonaparte, *Napoleon in His Own Words*, p. 60)

“The following winter was spent on schemes of social betterment. Agricola had to deal with people living in isolation and ignorance, and therefore prone to fight; and his object was to accustom them to a life of peace and quiet by the provision of amenities. He therefore gave private encouragement and official assistance to the building of temples, public squares, and good houses. He praised the energetic and scolded the slack; and competition for honour proved as effective as compulsion. Furthermore, he educated the sons of the chiefs in the liberal arts, and expressed a preference for British ability as compared with the trained skills of the Gauls. The result was that instead of loathing the Latin language they became eager to speak it effectively. In the same way, our national dress came into favour and the toga was everywhere to be seen. And so the population was gradually led into the demoralizing temptations of arcades, baths, and sumptuous banquets. The unsuspecting Britons spoke of such novelties as 'civilization', when in fact they were only a feature of their enslavement.” (Tacitus, *Agricola and the Germania*, ‘Agricola’, § 21)

“A republic or state is a unification of a multitude of people under a supreme power ... or we may say, a republic consists of a multitude of people who are combined with each other by means of a general interdependence and certain fixed institutions ... The supreme power in the state accordingly originates without doubt from the people, a principle which today is as universally recognized as true as it was formerly regarded dangerous by little minds.” (Justi, in Albion Small, *The Cameralists*, p. 317)

Introduction/statement of problem

- *The birth of a certain kind of 'technology of power'*
- *Cameralism and mercantilism; key features*
- *The real endgame: the political technology of security*

In this session we aim to get a better understanding of the development of 'civic philosophy' during the 18th century by focussing on the writings of a relatively clearly defined group of practitioners and administrators; the German and Austrian 'cameralists', or 'police theorists'. This group - contemporary to the ascendance of medical science, following on from the mapping of bodies and the body of the territorial state, provide us with the clearest expression of the particular *technology of power* that we've been trying to locate in the practical domains that we've looked briefly at thus far (madness, disease, warfare), and will cover in the coming weeks (discipline, economy, education). This technology of power is one concerned above all with the security of the state, carefully defined. As we said in the first session, this "security of the state" is first and foremost - at least this is our working hypothesis - security *against* the mass, the multitude, the crowd. How is the state to govern the rabble? How is government to be made as efficient and economic as possible? How is a certain 'order of things' to be established, and inscribed, invisibly, into that 'ensemble of machines' that Hobbes and Descartes, La Mettrie and Frederick II, Napoleon and Clausewitz saw as the animal being, Man? Security, then, is about blunting the unpredictable energies of human bodies and facilitating ones which serve the purposes of the social order defined by the state. In this sense the question of security is immediate, right before us, urgent and practical, and not at all esoteric, 'up in the clouds', vague or mysterious. Nothing could in fact be more visible, and nothing has been followed with such rigour by those who perceived in the multitude - the masses, the crowd - a danger (Colbert, Bentham, Napoleon, Goebbels, etc.).

That said, let us not forget: the training of bodies and minds; indeed the *sanitation* of the state and the domination of disciplinary power, are but *techniques* in a deeper, more profound historical emergence; the birth of modernity, and its self-organization, self-learning - it's battle to establish its legitimacy along with other historical epochs - and its battle to clear a space for what would be its crowning achievement: modern man himself, stumbling onto the stage of life. Thus - let us not forget - all that we are delineating here, during these weeks - is merely a collection of means to a broader end. This end being the securitization of man's relation to the historical horizon upon which he finds, and has found himself; the social order within which he is immersed, and has been immersed; and the words and images with which his life will be filled, and with which his own history is filled. The 'constitution of tranquility', the forging of a certain stability of state - what we've been so interested in so far - is but a fragment of this broader, deeper, and more urgent goal of regularizing the historical and immediate environment of mankind itself.¹

¹ if the voices that speak to us from the archive - the lost centuries of writing, inscribing, shouting and acting - were as serious in their endeavors as the evidence suggests (despite the carnival, the reverie, the play), the fact that these questions remain entirely marginal, if not entirely overlooked, by the major stock of international relations theorists is both astounding and shocking. More especially so when it is at least supportable - if not possible to prove - that this very 'modern world' is - and has been - undergoing something of a primary transformation, comparable (though very different) to the waning of the Middle Ages. That remains to be seen; and such a view might be more ideological than accurately historical, but perhaps we'd do well to arm ourselves in advance, and watch for signs which all of the models (realism, marxism, liberal-institutionalism) will

The birth of a certain ‘technology of power’

“ .. every citizen ought to be interested in the security of the state .. ”
(Napoleon Bonaparte, *Napoleon in His Own Words*, p. 41-2)

Napoleon is so profound. There we have in one statement the entire aim of that heterogenous group of social thinkers, fiscal administrators, jurists and magistrates that were borne out of the early modern period, some of who would become associated with the school, cameralism, but all of which would be begin - without thinking - to understand the principles of the police. These principles are not difficult to grasp in essence: put rather schematically, the police - of the function of *polizei* more generally - aimed to take on the question that was gaining significance ever more since the waning of the Middle ages. This being the question of *people*, and their organization and government. *Polizei* - the practice and theory of organizing bodies - would take as its aim - above all - the securitization of these populations: the placing of each individual into their appropriate position (and posture) in society as a whole. By far the best way, and the most efficient way by which to do this is to get the people themselves - the mass as a whole - to govern its own behaviour, and constitute its own self in relation to a set of issues already predetermined by the state. This is exactly what is meant by Napoleon’s incredible statement: ‘every citizen ought to be interested in the security of the state’. How is it possible to place people in a matrix - *a social grid* (grille) - in which at once they’ll feel secure and at home, and become productive and useful along the lines of a broader *state-geometry* governing life in general.

Such is the question of **police**.

Cameralism/police science ²

In the 17th and 18th centuries ‘the police’ certainly did not refer to a body of men whose task it was to investigate illegality: rather it referred to the internal civil administration of a city or town.

- *what is cameralism?*

“The greatest happiness of the greatest number.” (Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*)

“.. a true cameralist must understand: (a) the true qualities of natural objects, and what can be brought to pass by means of them; (b) how nature can be made more skillful in bringing forth what is possible for her; (c) how other things for the use of men may be produced from the yield of

woefully miss.

² the only two full length secondary english-texts that deal with ‘police science’ in depth are: i) Albion W. Small, *The Cameralists: The Pioneers of German Social Polity* (New York, 1909) - packed full of rich analysis and quotation from the source; and ii) Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the early modern state* (Cambridge, 1982) - a stunning piece of work. One of the most important and comprehensive studies of the early modern period available in any language. Chapters 8 & 9 are especially important. Beyond that look for the original thinkers: Osse, Obrecht, Seckendorff, Becher, Schröder, Gerhard, Rohr, Gasser, Dithmar, LeMare, Zincke, Darjes, Justi, Sonnenfels, Frank, and later Bentham and Rau.

nature. We speak of the ‘use of men’ not in a oral, but in a political sense according to which everything is useful for the human race which may bring about its preservation, happiness and the improvement of welfare. The science with which we are now concerned demands that we should attach such a meaning to the word.” (Darjes, in Albion Small, *The Cameralists*, pp. 280-1)

- *what are the functions of ‘police’?*

- to see, to regulate movement, to look into each and every detail
- omnipresent surveillance, the control of highways (speed, and speed limits)
- the defense of the city, of happiness, of property, and the ‘order of things’
- to facilitate production, to free up movements, to see all illegalities
- to ensure ‘transparency’, tranquility, to prevent contagions/epidemics/panics
- to ensure in every detail the *stable functioning of society*

“*Policeywissenschaft* is the science which treats of the foundation and operation the security in a state.” (Sonnenfels, *Grundsätze der Polizey, Handlung und Finanz*. Vol. 1, p. 57)

- nourishment, comfort, order, modesty, courteousness, respectability, security, peacefulness, welfare, contractual guarantees, guardianship, community, protection from danger, domestic administration ..

“*Policey* or *Polizey*, Lat. *Politia*, is either the community, republic, forms of government (*Regiments-forme*) or also the laws, institutions and regulations given to and prescribed a town or province, which all (*jedermann im Handel und Wandel*) observe so that all affairs proceed in a peaceable and orderly fashion and human society might be maintained.” (Zedler, et.al., *Großes vollständiges Universallexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, 1741, p. 1503)

or, from the *Prussian Code of 1794* (Allgemeine Landrecht)

“In their capacity as ‘Polizei’ authorities of the land and the governments (Regierungen) are charged with the care and well-being of our loyal subjects, in positive as well as negative aspects. They are hereby permitted and bound not only to prevent and as such remove all that can bring danger or disadvantage to the state and its citizens, consequently the concern of the necessary institutions for the maintenance of public peace, security and order, but also to ensure that the common good is promoted and improved and that each citizen of the state has the opportunity to increase his capabilities and powers from both moral and physical points of view, and to do this in the most advantageous fashion within the boundaries of the law. Governments therefore have supervisory powers in matters of public improvement, education and culture.” (Preuß, G. Slg. 1806-1810)

- *what is the 'police state'?*

“The sum of the means which need to be put into practice in order to ensure the ‘public good’ in a way which goes beyond the maintenance of peace and good order is, in general terms, that which in Germany and France is called the ‘police’. ‘The sum of laws and regulations which concern the interior of a State, which tends to strengthen and increase its power, to make good use of its strengths and to procure the happiness of its subjects’ (J.Von Justi). Understood in this way, the police extend their domain beyond that of surveillance and the maintenance of order. They look to the abundance of the population.. to the elementary necessities of life and its preservation .. to the activities of individuals .. and to the movements of things and people .. It can be seen that the police force is the whole management of the social body.” (Michel Foucault, et.al., *Les Machines à guerir (aux origines de l’hôpital moderne)*, Dossiers et documents d’architecture, Institut de l’Environment, CERFI-DGRST, 1975)

- *Utilitarianism (classical liberalism) is the direct descendant of cameralist ‘police science’. This can be seen first and foremost in the writings of Jeremy Bentham.*
- *Bentham argued that individuals seek to maximise pleasure and minimise pain, so society should be set up to attain the ‘happiness’ of the greatest number. Bentham classified acts, and evolved an enormously complicated table of crimes and punishments. Excessive punishment was seen to be ‘counter-productive’.³ The aim of punishment should be both deterrence, but also ‘reform’.*
- *the question then became; ‘can one punish and reform at the same time?’*

**From the ‘accumulation’ to assimilation of men:
“intelligence, industry, peace”**

- *Increasingly then we move from the task of ‘accumulating’ men, to that of ‘ingesting’ them into the state/capital social order.*

*It also means giving birth to the active individual (**vita activa** emerges) ..*

“If the means of a state in its internal constitution are to be used for the promotion of the common happiness, the subjects, apart from the

³ as opposed to being necessarily abhorrent in and of itself. The single hidden and unquestioned assumption in the whole debate about penal justice is the value of an ‘ordered’ and ‘tranquil’ society. So, those who argue that there is a value to punishment in itself have in the back of their minds the ordering of society. Those who argue that reform is the most humane way to deal with social disturbance have in the back of their minds the ordering of society. Take away that presupposition - of the value of a docile society - and you explode penal justice as a whole. There are, from this point, difficult, even awe-inspiring questions to face. But these questions lie at the very foundations of the societies in which we find ourselves. These questions - of the value of tranquility over the value of freedom - is the great unspoken question of the modern world. And yet liberalism would have us believe that we are free!

cultivation of the land and the promotion of the sustaining system, must also themselves possess such qualities, capacities, and talents that they can contribute their part to the realization of the common welfare. In this” (Justi, in Albion Small, *The Cameralists*, p. 449)

It does not oppose itself to established orders, but transforms them along the lines of a new social axis ..

“In this view religion deserves first to be considered. The members of a community are made by religion incomparably more capable of fulfilling their duties as citizens; and a state can hardly attain all the happiness of which it is capable if public institutions of religion [*ausserlicher Gottesdienst*] are not introduced. The more this cultus harmonizes with the nature and essence of men, and with the paramount purpose of republics, the more excellent it will be, and the more capable will it make the citizens of the state to work for the common welfare.” (Justi, in Albion Small, *The Cameralists*, p. 449)

Though not its first aim (its first aim being utility), police science also meets at the intersection of that grand project of morally perfecting men ..

“In the history of the world manners are gradually softened, the human mind takes enlightenment, separate nations draw nearer to each other, commerce and policy connect at last all parts of the globe, and the total mass of the human race, by alternations of calm and agitation, of good conditions and of bad, marches always, although slowly, towards still higher perfection.” (A.R.J. Turgot, *Reflections on the Formation and Distribution of Wealth*, 1793, quoted in: *The New Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol 4, p. 657)

The endgame of security

- *The essence of the police is the pursuit of security: first, the security of the state against the populace itself, second (and as a technology of the first) the pursuit of public safety as a means of ensuring the tranquility of the state. The emergence in the 18thC of new modes of production and workfare (industrialism) points the way to new social technologies (eudemonics) whereby both the productivity, well-being and security of the state could be pursued through active economic policies (cameralism, mercantilism). This is the foundation of the modern welfare state--a state form only revived at times of **state insecurity**.*
- *Modern notions of ‘economy’ emerge on the basis of this question of governing⁴ ..*

⁴ remember the sections of Foucault’s essay on ‘Governmentality’ where he makes the same point.

“We might conceive of the using-up of our planet as the locale and substance of a gigantic factory, run by the masses of mankind. In the planet as thus conceived, there would no longer persist anything purely and directly natural. The material out of which the apparatus was made would, of course, be a gift of nature, but having been applied to human purposes, would have been used up and no longer have an independent being. The only substance remaining in the world would be that which had already been moulded by man. The world itself would be like an artificial landscape, consisting exclusively of this man-made apparatus in space and time, a unique product each of whose parts would be kept in touch with one another by incessantly-working means of communication, human beings being fettered to the apparatus in order, by their joint labour, to continue to make for themselves the necessities of life. Thus a stable condition would have been achieved.” (Karl Jaspers, *Man in the Modern Age*, p. 42)

- *But nothing better explains the transformation taking place than the history of the clinic, the birth of positive knowledge, the emergence of notions such as public hygiene, public safety, and life-necessity ..*

“You can never be too safe ..” (recent ad. for *LeSabre*, by Buick)

- *The policey sciences would align themselves firmly against one phenomenon: the accident.*

“It was no longer a question of leading people to their salvation in the next world, but rather ensuring it in this world. And in this context, the word *salvation* takes on different meanings: health, well-being (that is, sufficient wealth, standard of living), security, protection against accidents ..” (Michel Foucault, ‘The Subject and Power’, in, Paul Rabinow and Hubert Dreyfus (eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, p. 215)

the abolition of disorder ...

“ ... disorder was replaced by functional order, diversity by serial repetition, and surprize by uniform expectancy.” (Christine Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory*, p. 46)

Tranquil and happy, but not happy .. toward a criticism of modern political reason

“A free government is one which does its citizens no harm, but rather gives them security and tranquility. But this is a far cry from happiness, which something man must make for himself; for his would be a coarse

spirit who regarded himself as perfectly happy simply because he enjoyed security and tranquility.” (Stendhal, *Love*, p. 163)

also, remember⁵ the panic-theme of the early 19th/late 18thC - namely that “we’re governing too much” ... When polizei becomes institutionalized (as the modern police), the general practice comes under criticism ..⁶

“No governmental power is more dangerous to freedom than that of *Polizei* -- not simply the so-called superior or secret police, but the so-called welfare ‘*Polizei*’ above all. The prime function of the state *should be solely* to secure the domination of Law. According to basic constitutional principles *there is only one possible* place for *Polizei*, and that is the responsibility for security and order in the state; What is known as welfare ‘*Polizei*’ (especially surveillance and welfare ‘*Polizei*’) is nothing but open to interference with the freedom of the citizen.” (von Aretin / von Rotteck, *Staatsrecht der constitutionellen Monarchie*, p. 165)

by the late 19thC we’re dealing with a very different concept ... Polizei was protection against extreme dangers⁷, less than the general facilitation of a space of safety (though in effect, often, this amounted to the same thing) ..

“The police authorities are charged, within the framework of current law, to take according to their discretion the necessary measures for the suppression of general or isolated dangers which threaten public security or order.” (Preuß, G. Slg. 1931, 79)

⁵ cf. Foucault’s resumé on ‘The Birth of Biopolitics’

⁶ 1848 seems to be a turning point. Klüber characterizes *polizei* scornfully as ‘an ill-judged attempt to achieve total knowledge’. *Polizei* took on the connotation of *interference*.

⁷ “defence against danger”: this is the brief laid down for the reorganized *polizei* following the Yalta Conference, February 1945. “Inspectorates” were to replace *polizei*, e.g., Building Inspectorate, instead of *Baupolizei*, Health Inspectorate, instead of *Gesundheitpolizei*, Municipal Cleansing, rather than *Polizei-gemäßige Reinigung*.

“Polizei in the broadest sense is the totality of state activities directed internally to assuring the security and welfare of the state and its members, i.e., the internal administration of the state excluding the administration of justice ... The term is often restricted in its definition, although there is no general agreement on this form of restriction. Some place in the foreground compulsion by the state and thence conceive ‘Polizei’ as the forcible furtherance of public security and welfare. Others wish to confine the term to the activity of protection against transgressions of the law (security police), von Mohl for instance referring to the police in terms of ‘preventative judiciary’. Those who on the other hand wish to retain the wider usage distinguish security-from welfare-police. Yet others, for example Bluntschli, would only partially admit this last sphere of government, since they place alongside ‘Polizei’ separate administration of culture and economy. An over-extension of police tutelage which is dubbed a *Polizeistaat*. Contrasted to this is the attempt to establish a *Rechtstaat*, which is certainly pushed too far when all activities of the state and its origins are merely confined to the protection of law, but which is justifiable insofar as law provides the foundation of the state and all its affairs are conducted according to legal principles.” (Meyer, *Neues Konversations-Lexicon für alle Stände*, Vol 13, p. 165)