

## **Bio Politics and Bio Economics from the Power of the Nation State's Control to the Uncontrolled Power of the Global Economy**

**Emma Palese**

Department of History, Society and Human Studies  
Università del Salento, Lecce, Italy  
[emma.palese@unisalento.it](mailto:emma.palese@unisalento.it)

---

**Abstract:** *The trinitarian combination of state, nation and territory, belonging to the modern age, today, breaks down and redistributes through the phenomenon of globalization, which - in turn - transforms biopolitics into bioeconomics. The state sovereignty on the individual, and on the entire population with the modern aim of social order, gives way to the sovereignty of the global market, of which the nation-state is nothing more than a mere performer. It is a power that is separated from politics, and that evaporates into cyberspace and into market world systems, where our public and private life is tacitly governed by economic and biomedical devices.*

**Keywords:** *Globalization; Nation-state; Welfare state; Global economy; Manipulation of the body; Power on life*

---

### **1. FROM PANOPTICON TO SYNOPTICON**

When M. Foucault, in the seventies, thematized biopolitics and biopower, designed to highlight a new relationship between politics and life that characterizes modernity. Indeed with the birth of the modern state, the natural events of human existence become the place where the same policy finds its true meaning and its primary structure. As long as the control, monitoring and management of life will make determinations of a very general form of the panoptical power. Form that refers to the idea of the philosopher J. Bentham<sup>i</sup>, which designs an ideal prison - the Panopticon precisely – with radiocentric structure and one central tower from which guards can keep in view all monitored people. Just because of these characteristics, the panoptic model is taken in different moments of history to highlight the power relations. We can think about the “Big Brother” of the novel “1984” by G. Orwell: a totalitarian reality, where every aspect of life of every individual is controlled by “the eye” of the omnipresent state. Or we can consider M. Foucault as well, who – thinking as feature of the twentieth century a disciplinary power of control that acts on both the individual and population- approaches the structure of the Panopticon to biopower.

Indeed, politics has always been involved in life, but, the control over the biology of the subject is since the origin of civil society, mediated by something else. For example, in ancient Greece, birth control is designed to achieve an ethical end, i.e., the summum bonum, the ultimate happiness of the polis. Consider, in this sense, Aristotle, which – thinking man as a representation of the union of rationality and politicization – identifies the origin of social life in the fact that the individual is not enough in itself. Not only in the sense that he can't provide *uti singuli* to his needs, but also in the sense that it can not by itself - that is, outside of the discipline imposed by the laws and education of the polis - reach the virtue: that is happiness, but above all, the pursuit of the ultimate purpose, the supreme good, which is ethical and political order. However, the modern age is characterized precisely by the direct relationship between politics and life: emblem of the Trinitarian composition of the state, nation and territory. Task of the state is to monitor on, and inside its borders in the name of national interest rooted in a well-defined territory. Indeed Foucault thematizes biopolitics and biopower following the intuition that «in the late eighteenth century we have entered into a society of the norm, health, medicine and standardization, which today is the essential way of functioning of our society»<sup>ii</sup>. This is a new political rationality that

finds its primary source in the pastoral power belonging to the Christian tradition. A power, that is, not so much aiming at the achievement of a territorial sovereignty, but rather channeled towards the direct rule of the individual's life but also of the entire community, i.e., like the shepherd on a single sheep and the whole flock. And when the pastoral power undergoes a process of secularization, the rule «is multiplied in several areas: how to rule the children, to govern the poor and the beggars, how to govern a family, a house, how to govern the armies, the different groups, cities, states, the body and the spirit», thus witnessing, «the multiplication of all the arts of government - teaching art, political art, economic art - and the institutions of government, in the large sense that the government had at that time»<sup>iii</sup>. This is a real institutionalization of knowledge, which supplies a power with disciplinary face and, at the same time, regulatory and normative. It acts both on the individual and the population considered as a set of living beings and among them is to be identified the different, the misfit, the one who exceeds the norm<sup>iv</sup>. So, the regulation and standardization of society are part of a project of national order, which - often - transforms biopolitics itself into thanatopolitics. Think of the Nazi experience, which draws its source of legitimacy from the fact that the domination on the individual is substantiated in possession by the state of the physicality of the subject as a member of society<sup>v</sup>. Or to the same principles of eugenics which constitute determinations of state organization, that selects, manipulates its members to achieve a collective purpose. The perfect social order already for Plato is a guarantee of stability and strength for the state: «the best men must unite as often as possible to the best females, while the worst males to the worst females thus the children of the former must be raised, those of the others not, if the flock must be excellent. But no one except the rulers must know that all this is happening, if the flock of the guardians will be as immune from strife»<sup>vi</sup>. This is in line with modern social engineering, for which «the only really consistent and effective prototypes were also the most inhumane, cruel, heinous and scandalous, most notably those of the Nazis and Communists, followed at a short distance by the recent exercises in ethnic cleansing. Considering humanity as a garden that wants to become more beautiful and harmonious it is inevitable that some men appear to be weeds. Social engineering has proven to excel, more than anywhere else in the extermination of human weeds»<sup>vii</sup>.

The state power becomes functional to social order for which the “different” is a problem of the state to resolve and discharge. A problem that gradually evaporates from the state sovereignty, and is embodied in the individual, becoming functional to the autonomous choice of the consumer, who - deviously induced by new dynamics of global economic power- goes beyond state boundaries to build self-identity, his being “global”. And this particular transit seems to characterize our contemporary world, where we see the already occurred replacement of biopolitics with bioeconomics: that kind of economy that «appeals to bodies, to lives, in the form of commercial and marketing management, inducing and collecting a demand of empowerment, transformation, treatment to be satisfied just paying»<sup>viii</sup>. This is a new form of power over life and - most importantly - on the body of the individual to whom it requires a continuous updating according to the standards primarily generated by the policies of the global market. Being included in the “list of who's who” becomes personal responsibility in a passage that goes from the Panopticon to Synopticon. While «the Panopticon forced people to a position to be watched, the Synopticon does not need to force anyone just because it seduces people to watch»<sup>ix</sup> and be modeled deserving to be watched. It «is global in nature; the act of watching sets free the viewer from its location, and carries him, at least spiritually, into cyberspace, where the distance has no importance, even if, physically, you have not moved»<sup>x</sup>. Moreover, contemporary man seems to have to fulfill a new duty: the fitness since in the age of globalization - being naked means being unable to spruce up your physicality and «the raw body, unadorned, not reformed, nor “worked” is a source of shame: it offends the eye, invariably leaves much to be desired, and above all it becomes a living witness of a not performed duty by the ego, and perhaps by incompetence, ignorance, impotence and insignificance of his genius»<sup>xi</sup>. We move from health to fitness, according to the accession, the inclusion in the “list of who has importance” becomes personal responsibility of a global citizen who witnessed the sunset of all those dialectics that characterized the political, social economic systems to this day. The contemporaneity, in fact, is characterized by the erosion of the nation state, global capitalism, the exasperated privatization of every aspect of human life. The relationship between politics and power seems to have suffered a major failure because «the power nebulizes upwards, in cyberspace, in part flows laterally into markets actively and vigorously apolitical, and partly relies on the policy of life of individuals newly

enfranchised»<sup>xii</sup>. In addition, politics -abandoning its true essence- serves as an instrument for the implementation of economic power, delegating to the individual the choice of those means to access to the global society.

## **2. THE LIQUID MODERNITY**

This is the Zygmunt Bauman's liquid modernity: a term that can overcome the concept of modernity and post-modernity. Indeed the contemporary world is a reality in which life considers highly what is transitory rather than permanent, the immediate rather than long term; and regards utility as prior to any other value. Consequently it is fundamental to understand in advance and profoundly the concept of liquidity around which Bauman interweaves his most recent philosophical and sociological reflection. Solidity and liquidity are the distinctive features of two eras: modernity and postmodernity, which becomes liquid modernity as it relates to contemporary existence. It is an existence where the need gives way to the desire that dismays men in the constant changes and transformations that affect their lives, and that turn identity from fact into a task: each of us runs into the self-building, which replaces the project itself. Indeed, in our contemporary age the relationship between the individual and society is changing because the concepts of identity, individual and individuality are becoming meaningless. The world demands to the individual a constant and increasingly controversial search for identity and tracking of parameters for standardizing in order to obtain the "role" of individuals, because, today, the identity is a task. Being individuals in the liquid society does not simply mean being good consumers, but also being competitive goods in the global market. Such condition does not only require the purchase of "fashion items", but, also, the purchase of a "fashionable body" assisting to the complete passage from self-manipulation of our own physicality, to the real direct and independent choice of the body we want for our children. Structured on this pattern, Bauman's futuristic view asserts that "being suitable for the global" will not be satisfied for long with plastic surgery and remodeling on the basis of topoi which are continuously generated by the policies of the global market. It is important not only to buy what makes us "suitable" for the contemporary, but above all to change ourselves, the closest part to our possibility of manipulation and intervention: the body. It becomes a free space on which to shape the visible Self, since if we are not able to dress up our own physical, it means that we are lacking in something. The autonomous management of our corporeality, personal responsibility, which bears the "responsibility of being individuals", derives from the concept of having and not of being. To have means to possess because some form of control is capable of generating security in a world lacking in its solid points of reference. For this reason the conditions of having also falls on the body of contemporary man, who finds in it a form of certainty: to manipulate and control his physical means acting on what you are sure to possess. Incorporation and possession are part of having, that - in our times -is accomplished through consumerism as «The act of consumption is a form of having, perhaps the most important for today's opulent industrial society. Consumption has ambivalent features: it relieves the anxiety, because what one has, could not be taken back, but it also requires that consumers increasingly consume, since the previous consumption soon loses its rewarding peculiarity»<sup>xiii</sup>. And this vicious spiral, which runs between the possession and consumption, is the most evident effect of what Bauman calls liquid modernity, which -unlike postmodernism - has a continuous relationship with the modernization process, which has its origins in modern times -but it prolongs and intensifies until it reaches the liquidity of our time, characterized by rampant consumerism. And in the convergence between identity and consumption lies one of the main features of our age, because «contemporary society relates to its members primarily as consumers, and only secondarily, and in part, involves them also as producers. To meet the standards of normality and to be recognized as a mature and respectable member of society, we must respond quickly and efficiently to the temptations of the consumer goods market. It should be offered regularly a contribution to the demand fit to absorb the supply and, in the stages of reflection or stagnation of the economy, we must participate to the recovery led by consumers. The poor and the idlers, those who have neither a decent income, or credit cards, nor the prospect of better days, are not up to these requirements. Consequently the rule broken by the poor today, the violation of the rule distinguishes them and tags them as abnormal, is the standard of competence or fitness as consumers, not that of employment. The poor of today (ie those that constitute a problem for others) are first and foremost consumers rather than

unemployed people. They are defined primarily by the fact of being bad consumers: indeed, the most basic of social obligations, which they do not comply, is the duty to be active and effective purchasers of goods and services offered by the market»<sup>xiv</sup>. This means that in a modern times consumption assumes the function of a secondary activity compared to production, in the contemporary world the ability of a person to consume determines his own social integration in a society no longer limited to the local context or the sheer size of the daily existence, but, in a macro society demanding accurate and specific entry requirements. And the access falls directly on the responsibility of the individual, who, in order to build his own individuality, prefers to invest its available economic resources for the purchase of those means suitable to classify, to modernize and introduce in the list of who matters. Moreover, in a period of severe economic crisis like the one we are currently experiencing, other statistics show that the primary consumption, referring to the basic necessities, is put aside to buy advanced technology products, clothing and cosmetics. These products aim at updating the body in accordance with the minimal standards required to be “in”, ie, to acquire a social status that does not differentiate, if anything, incorporates all those who appear to be able to modernize themselves, regardless of social productive capacity and the role everyone can play. Today consumption seems to be a homologating activity, and according to Bauman it is a way to measure how much a person - in liquid society - is able to be individual. On that concept, Bauman builds his thought about the individual and society, which runs on two main lines. The first is embodied in the idea that in the liquid world the conquest of identity goes hand in hand with the adherence to rules of a consumers society directed by the policies of the global market: being individuals is equivalent to being consumers. The second line, however, going further that consideration, expands to incorporate the individual in the products. The relationship between the individual and the self, as well as between the individual and the others, acquires through Z. Bauman’s thought - a new meaning, which is based on a real anthropological metamorphosis. Being consumers and being consumed become, in fact, most general determinations of an individual who is affected the most problematic effects of the process of de-socialization, started by globalization, now arrived at one of its most acute and extreme phases. Social aggregation and organization are deprived of their traditional tasks: they stop being identity dimensions of the subject capable of providing a set of standards and benchmarks. The individual becomes an isolated monad always looking for new forms of socialization, which instead of providing safety and welfare, increase the gap between man and the Self and between man and the other. It is a social system that - despite being in possession of increasingly innovative means to communicate and interact with their fellows - generates discomfort and loneliness. This is a networked individualism: « a social model, not a collection of isolated individuals», just because «the most important role of internet in the structuring of social relations is the contribution to the new model of sociability based on individualism. More and more people are organized in social networks, which communicate via computer. Thus, it is not the internet to create a model of networked individualism, but the development of the Internet to provide adequate material support for the spread of individualism in the web as the dominant form of online socializing»<sup>xv</sup>. And this new form arises as a matrix of the identity update required by the global world in order to “be included”, as the need for inclusion is nothing more than legacy of the abandonment of the authentic sense to belonging. The belonging, in fact, is characterized as a natural human feeling, that, being suppressed nowadays - is manifest in surrogate forms of virtual social aggregation that are the attempt to satisfy the natural human sociability. The consumer society, in fact, does not aggregate, at any rate, disaggregate turning groups into isolated monads, with weak and fragmented bonds, where the individual is crystallized between the search for Self and the disarray in the not - Self. The idea of society survives in terms of common trends to follow, where the groups are directed almost anonymously in the pursuit of that “happiness”, whose traces are designed by external actors. According to Bauman it is a review and revision of the “mechanical solidarity” in Durkheim<sup>xvi</sup>, whose characteristics distinguish it from the “organic” one. The singularity and uniqueness of the individual is replaced by the flow of the needs of a group, which - in our contemporary world - seems to assume the appearance of a swarm. Just in the distinction between swarm and group Bauman identifies the radical changes that affect the individual and society in the liquid-consumerist reality, where «the swarm tends to replace the group and its leaders, its hierarchy and its “pecking order”. A swarm can do without all the ceremonial and tricks without which it would neither form nor survive. They come together, scatter and gather again, from an

occasion to another, every time inevitably for a different reason, and are attracted by changeable aims. The seductive power of mobile objectives is a rule sufficient to coordinate movements, and this is enough to render superfluous any other command or imposition from above. In reality, the swarms do not even have a high and low: only the momentary direction of flight to place the units of the swarm (working self-propelled) in position of leader or followers, usually only for the duration of a given flight, or even a part of it». Then, even the traditional hierarchies that generate order, dissolve and become strong inviolable nucleus in which the individual can find himself, directing and limiting his own desires. This means that every opportunity to address the human being collapses. Consequently the individual is considered as a momentary unity of the passing swarm and driven by the fleeting current. That is a dimension impregnated with an illusory security of a free and optimal choice since it is the choice of a large number of people. The choice is what aggregates in a liquid world, as these spaces are to be rethought and redesigned according to certain canons able to shape the communities in which the individual - consumer can find and fulfill their sense of belonging. The malls seem to be hives of swarms, as offering the ideally imagined community: a place where the purpose of purchasing aggregates. Thus, «the shopping /consumption places offer what no “real reality” outside can give: an almost perfect balance between liberty and security. Within their temples buyers / consumers may also find what they were searching outside, uselessly as inexhaustibly: the comfortable feeling of belonging, the reassuring impression of being part of a community»<sup>xvii</sup>. Taking part is one of the ways in which consumption becomes a primary activity of contemporary man, and – especially - the principle of inclusion and exclusion of the subject. Moreover, in this sense, Bauman tracks in the anthropophagic strategy theorized by Levi-Strauss<sup>xviii</sup>, the practice of elimination of differences between individuals, which is reproduced in the supermarket: the privileged places of consumption in which is performed the aggregating power of purchase. Anthropophagic places contrast, in fact, to the “emic” ones, consisting in «vomiting and spitting the others out, considering them as being incurably strangers and aliens, in prohibiting physical contact, dialogue, social relationships and any kind of commercium, commensality or connubium. The extreme variants of this emic strategy are, today as always, imprisonment, deportation and physical suppression. Two updated forms, refined (modernized) are the spatial separation, urban ghettos, the selective access to spaces. The second strategy consists of a so-called “disalienation” of stranger substances: “in swallowing”, “eating” the bodies and the extraneous spirits to make them, through metabolism, identical and no longer distinguishable from the body that swallows them»<sup>xix</sup>. Therefore, the consumption becomes a surrogate way for social gathering, which, however, replaces the sense of belonging with the need for inclusion. This process inevitably excludes those who are not in possession of the means fit to perform this activity, which, indeed, remains essentially solitary. Here in this game of appearances and reproductions the group gives way to the swarm, which, in the collective whirl, loses that authentic sense of belonging that makes each man a member of society, in which – mentioning Durkheim - it performs the natural duality of the subject: animal with socialized personality, union of instinct and reason, of self and world.

Thus, in the liquidity of consumers society, is also part the “adaptation” of man to the global: a dimension impregnated by continuous technological, mediatic, economic flows which deplete the same political action on the territory of a single State and release the political power from the Local one. Essentially we are now facing a power-free policy and a policy free from power. The power is already global while politics remains miserably local. The territorial nation-states act locally as police stations in charge of maintaining “law and order”, and as dustbins and installations for the discharge and recycling of risks and problems generated on a global scale. Moreover, the welfare state itself – the highest expression of the idea of belonging to a community and the feeling of assurance provided by state institutions - is lost in the maze of individual power conceived, now, as that held by the individual, the means to achieve a desired purpose. Here, the individual power becomes ability to do, to choose and pursue his own welfare, which - in turn - becomes a visible but never fully attainable goal, given that the “feeling good” is part of the global sphere managed by extraterritorial economic policies. Thus, the state can no longer guarantee security, stability, and even less social rights, which seem to have assumed the role of “rights of the unfit”. Today, the welfare state is a mechanism that deals with that part of the residual individuals unable to secure their survival because without adequate resources. It is about

those “bad consumers of Z. Bauman”: individuals who do not respond to the primary request made to the subject that is considered worthy to enter the liquid society: consuming. Therefore, in our present time, democracy seems to be deprived of its most advanced feature: the inclusion of social rights, and a nation-state released from power, that is, devoid of that component which determines the primary function of state policy: limiting and ordering the power. The political will belonging to the idea of nation, and therefore a symbol of dignity and strength of a national community, weakens to give way - above all - to the economic powers, or rather, the bioeconomic powers, that rely directly on the existence of each of us: human beings now subject to the effects of globalization, before which the local state political action is ineffective. Indeed, it seems that the combination of power and politics<sup>xx</sup>, - matrix of the legitimation of power and primary source of political action - melts by evaporating the former in the local space and the latter in the global one. Where «the state makes the strip-tease and at the end of the show is left with the bare minimum: its powers of repression. Once destroyed its material basis, cancelled its sovereignty and independence, cleared his leadership, the nation state becomes a simple security service for great enterprises. The new rulers of the world do not need to govern directly. Governments are in charge of administering the affairs on their behalf»<sup>xxi</sup>. Therefore, globalization brings with it a disorder that is substantiated in the impossibility of predicting its own internal dynamics, and in the powerless to stem the global market policies, which shatter the traditional boundaries that determine the internal and external to state: able, i.e., to advance some form of containment and control of economic power. Moreover, «the instruments of control and limitation of power as we know, assume that all the power to control and limit is political, fully and openly manifested as a political power, it possesses a political grammar and syntax. To control and limit the political power has coincided with the limitation and control of power in general, because politics was the means by which it was possible to bind certain areas of economic power. But when - as is the case today - the hierarchy of political power is rewritten according to the hierarchy of economic power, the possibility that power could escape any control then it is high»<sup>xxii</sup>. If, then, in a time now past - the political action consisted of the limitation and division of power, today, politics remains local and the power becomes global. And right in the global sphere such power, or rather, the powers find an autonomous and free space in which to move and be implemented without political constraints. Thus, the state policy is weakening before forces that do not belong to the local context anymore, but they multiply in the global where «the state finds difficulties and is unable to control the commercial, human and symbolic flows crossing its borders». This is a «state which is very often unable to respond to internal fragmentation proposed by the development of localisms, now it is too small to satisfy the principles of democratic government and to pursue independent economic policies. So the nation-state’s form seems to be in crisis to meet the challenges posed by globalization and someone comes to decree the extinction »<sup>xxiii</sup>. What is experiencing a strong process of fragmentation is first of all the idea of nation closely tied to the concept of Western-style nation-state, which undergoes a process of erosion that occurs from below, with the explosion of ethnic and national particularisms or actors inside society capable of operating autonomously in the global arena, both from above, as a result of globalization of economy, culture and communication, with the consequent proliferation of flows (eg. the migratory and financial), and supranational organizations and transnational structures, and finally, in the same states with the formation of trans governmental coalitions often pursuing autonomous aims (and, in some cases different) from national decisions. It empties the idea of nation, or rather, the nation-state, referring also to the international environment, which becomes the viewer of a dangerous paradox: on the one hand there is the erosion of the territorial sovereignty of the nation-state, on the other hand to the proliferation of new and increasingly macro states such as India, Brazil, and China itself, which determine and characterize the era of hyper-state, having in itself all the elements from different traditional western state. So the explanation of the sunset of the welfare state incorporates issues outside the local context: « a welfare state that guarantees the existential safety of all is no longer conceivable, nor able to survive in the pattern of the nation-state, because for being that, it should be able to dominate the forces not under the nation-state. The attempts to use the state have been frustrated by the pressure of economic forces or global and extraterritorial markets»<sup>xxiv</sup>, that transfer sovereignty to the nation-state market, which instead of breaking down the status of insecurity, feeds him, relying on Foucault’s acute insight that the bodies are governed by their wishes. But if this theory is true, also applies to E. Durkheim, for which the man is that being from unlimited wants, and - consequently - highly vulnerable. And

the non-fulfilment, the vulnerability led him to be a victim of himself, to be consumer of himself as exposed to conditions apparently anomic, but, indeed, tacitly dictated by the bioeconomic power, which is based not only on the immoderate and boundless purchase of objects but also of trendy bodies promptly able to respond to the requested update in order to be “in”. That foucaultian time, eager to clean the society from the different and the surplus, gives way to the era of “new bodies” beings constantly induced to excess to have the opportunity to access. We can think about plastic surgery, which, by now, «has nothing to do with the elimination of a physical defect or the attainment of an ideal form denied by nature or by fate, but with the need to keep up with standards which change rapidly, with the maintenance of its market value and with the elimination of an image that has outlived its usefulness or its charm, in order to replace it with a new public image in a single package with a new identity »<sup>xxv</sup>.

Modern man becomes, therefore, a victim of himself in a vicious and paradoxical circle glorifying autonomy, infinite freedom of choice, but basically and tacitly binding choice. This is the generation of a system - now without a domestic regulation policy - which delegates the responsibility to every individual to have a bright future and full of prestige, consuming the same body, becoming, that is, marketable goods, where the economic operation of power is a social exercise, surely dissymmetric, but diffuse, polycentric. The body suffers, so, a particular passage that goes from subjectification made by the political power - especially from the modern age - to the individualization referable to economic power, because the possession of economic means gives the opportunity to enter the sphere of “Who’s Who” of those who are able to accessorize their bodies - and the body of their children - with everything it takes to be candidates for perfection that, however, appears to be a relative and never absolute perfection. With regard to market needs by creating new entities, new members of that segment of society fully efficient in a situation where the economy stands as a matrix of parameters on which to base discrimination, which - in our contemporary world-is no longer determined by social or skin colour, but, by a global economic system, that - escaping from the political power itself - draws its legitimacy from itself. And the market strategies become the new places and non-places of biopower and bioeconomic devices that trap, and that are the symbols of an era in which adhering to the rule may mean primarily to respond promptly to global economic imperatives.

#### REFERENCES

- 
- i «Indeed I think that the panopticon can have a very wide application and this for the reasons that will soon manifested. In a word, I think that could be applied, without exception, in all buildings where a number of people must be kept under control in an area not too vast to be covered with or dominate other buildings. It matters little if the purpose of the building is different or even opposite: whether to punish the criminals, monitor the insane, reforming the vicious, isolate suspects, employ the idle, maintaining the poor, heal the sick, educate those who want to enter into various sectors of industry, or provide education to future generations: in a word, whether it deals with prison for life, in the chamber of death, or prison isolation before trial, or penitentiary, or house correction or workhouses, or factories, or asylums, or hospitals, or schools. It is obvious that, in all these examples, the purpose of the building will be more fully achieved if individuals are to be monitored as assiduously as possible under the eyes of people who should control them. Ideally, if this is the purpose to be achieved, requires that each individual was at any time in this condition. Being impossible all this, the best you can hope for is that at every moment, having reason to believe guarded, and not having the means to secure the contrary, believed to be ». J. Bentham, *The Panopticon*, Mondadori, Milano, 1983, pp. 36-37
- ii M. Foucault, *El poder, una bestia magnifica*, in O. Marzocca (a cura di), *Biopolitica e liberalismo*, Edizioni Medusa, Milano, 2001, p. 78
- iii M. Foucault, *Omnes et singulatim: Toward a Criticism of Political Reason*, in O. Marzocca (a cura di), *Biopolitica e liberalismo*, op. cit., p. 111
- iv Brossat A, *Les apories du “droit à la vie”*, in «*La rose de personne*», n. 3, 2008, p. 127
- v Arendt H., *The human condition*, University of Chicago Press, 1998
- vi Plato, *Tutte le opere*, trans by E. V. Maltese, *Libro V*, pag. 257
- vii Z. Bauman, *Living on Borrowed Time. Conversations with Citlali Rovinosa-Madrado*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2010, p. 158
- viii Bazzicalupo L., *Ambivalenza nell’immaginario e nella rappresentazione del corpo nei*

- dispositivi biopolitici, Relazione tenuta al II Convegno C.R.I.S.I.S., Teramo, 1-2 Marzo, 2012
- ix Z. Bauman, *Globalization. The Human Consequences*, trans by O. Pesce, Laterza, Roma-Bari, 2010, p. 59
- x Idem, p. 43
- xi Z. Bauman, *Consuming life*, trans by M. Cupellaro, Laterza, Roma-Bari, 2010, p. 75
- xii Z. Bauman, *Living on Borrowed Time. Conversations with Citlali Rovinoso-Madrado*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2010, p. 158
- xiii E. Fromm, *To have or to be?*, Harper e Row, New York, 1976, p. 40
- xiv Z. Bauman, *Consuming life*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2007, p. 157
- xv M. Castells, *Internet galaxy*, Oxford University press, 2001, p. 129; Idem, *The Rise of the Network Society*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1996 ; E. Susca, *Nuovi media, comunicazione, società*, Aras, Fano, 2007
- xvi Durkheim thinks that social facts exist before the same individual because «the collective life, such as mental life is made of representations, so it is likely that individual representations and social representations are in any way comparable. We will try to show that in fact one and the other have the same relationship with the respective substrate. But this approach, far from justifying the view that sociology reduces to a simple corollary of individual psychology, will, on the contrary, stressed the relative independence of these two worlds of these two sciences. [...] The representation is not a simple aspect of the state in which the item is nervous when cu occurs because when this was still not over and that the reports of the performances are of a different nature than that of underlying neural elements. [...] The company's set of individuals associated with the substrate. The system which, together they form and vary depending on their number, their arrangement on the surface of a territory, the nature and number of lines of communication, forms the basis cu which elevates the social life». É. Durkheim, *Individual and Collective Representation* (1898), in *Sociology and Philosophy*, Free Press, New York, 1974
- xvii Z. Bauman, *Liquid modernity*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 109-110
- xviii Bauman considers Claude Levi Strauss the greatest anthropologist of our time, for wich «the fundamental principle is that the concept of social structure does not refer to empirical reality, but the models built upon it. It is therefore clear difference between the two concepts are so close that they were often confused, namely those of social structure and social relations. Social relationships are the raw material used for the construction of models that make manifest the social structure. In no case, therefore, it can be identified as the set of social relationships observable in a given society. The investigations of the structure do not claim a sphere of its own, between the facts of companies; rather constitute a method capable of being applied to various problems ethnological, and resemble forms of structural analysis in use in different fields. The important thing is to know that what constitutes those models that are the peculiar object of structural analysis. The problem is not ethnological, but epistemological, since the definitions that follow are independent of the raw material of our research. We think, that, to merit the name of the structure, models should only meet four conditions. First, a structure has the character of a system. It consists of elements such that any modification of one of them involves a modification of all the others. Secondly, each model belongs to a group of transformations each of which corresponds to a model of the same family, so that the set of such transformations constitute a group of models. Thirdly, the properties indicated above allow to predict how the model will react, in case of modification of one of its elements. Finally, the model must be constructed such that its functioning can explain all the observed facts ». C. Lévi - Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale*, Librairie Plon, Paris, 1964, pp. 311-12
- <sup>xix</sup>xix Z. Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, op. cit., p. 112
- xx «The necessary union of politics and power is manifested both in the analysis of historical events of past centuries, and tracking the essence of political action, which should be marked by a methodological rigor, for example, that present in the six principles expounded by the neoclassical realist H. Morgenthau ».
- xxi Bauman Z., *Liquid life*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2005, p.86
- xxii Parsi V. E., *Interesse nazionale e globalizzazione*, Jaka Book, Milano, 1998
- xxiii De Nardi P., *Sociologia del limite*, Meltemi, Roma, p. 43, 1999
- xxiv Bauman Z., *Globalization. The human consequences*, Columbia University Press, 1998, p. 53
- xxv Bauman Z., *Living on borrowed time. Conversations with Citlali Roviroso - Madrazo*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2010, p. 127