

**TRAINING THE HUMAN ANIMAL:
BIOPOLITICS AND ANTHROPOTECHNICS**

CARLOS ERNESTO NOGUERA-RAMÍREZ

cnoguera@pedagogica.edu.com | Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
Grupo de Historia de la práctica Pedagógica en Colombia-GHPP, Colombia

DORA LILIA MARÍN-DÍAZ

dllmarind@pedagogica.edu.co | Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Grupo de Historia de la práctica
Pedagógica en Colombia-GHPP, Colombia

ABSTRACT

This article presents a reflection about the training process, the culture of the human animal. Based on analyses by Nietzsche, Foucault and Sloterdijk, we argue that the recognition of humans as a technical animal was the basis for modern government art. It analyzes the demographic policy of the dawn of modernity that was one of the first biopolitical operations, the result being the overproduction of biological humans and the subsequent emergence of a set of disciplinary anthropotechnics for its government. The unforeseen surplus of this technique operation was the essential requirement for the configuration of the rationality of liberal government with its liberal anthropotechnics and with them the mass production of sovereign human beings: mobile and flexible identities that self-produce, through the *Operation of techniques that can choose according to their own needs and desires*.

KEY WORDS

Government; Conduction; Training; Individualization; Learning.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 110-131

Training the Human Animal: Biopolitics and Anthropotechnics

Carlos Ernesto Noguera-Ramírez | Dora Lilia Marín-Díaz

PRELUDE. THE CULTURE AS TRAINING AND SELECTION

In his *Report to an Academy* (short story by Kafka written in 1917) (Kafka, 1971) Red Peter, an ape, or we should say, a former ape, emphatically shows us the meaning of training, repetitions and the difficult learning process necessary for his transformation into becoming a human. Even though it is a short and particular story, Kafka's story about his old ape-hood life points out clearly the conditions of humanization: firstly, Red Peter said it was about finding a way out. He had been injured and captured while he drank by the shore of a river of the Gold Coast. In a cage and loaded to be sold to some trainer in Hamburg, Red Peter soon concludes that he has to find a way to be able to live. It was not about an escaping, or seeking freedom. In his *Report to an Academy* he clarifies:

As an ape, perhaps, I knew that, and I have met men who yearn for it. By for my part I desired such freedom neither then nor now. In passing: may I say that all too often men are betrayed by the word freedom. And as freedom is counted among the most sublime feeling, so the corresponding disillusionment can be also sublime (Kafka, 1971, p. 285)



He did not want freedom, only a way out, and that was possible thanks to a little reassurance that preserved him from any attempt of escape, otherwise, it would have ended in him being recaptured or killed. That initial tranquillity let Red Peter observe and imitate the men that looked at him with great curiosity: he easily managed to spit, then smoke a pipe, but he had great difficulty with the liquor bottle. Many failed attempts until one day, in one of the parties he approached, he grasped a liquor bottle that some sailor accidentally left in front of his cage, and with the astonished eyes of those present, he skilfully uncorked it, put it into his lips “and without hesitating, without twisting my lips, like a drinker from way back, with rolling eyes and gurgling throat, really and truly emptied the bottle; threw it away, no longer like someone in despair, but like an artist” with a human voice, he called out “Hello” leaping into the human community, although it was only after some months that he was able to pronounce a word again. He had found a way out. Once he disembarked in Hamburg, he quickly opted for the *music-hall* instead of the zoo: “And so learned things, gentlemen. Ah, one learns when one has to; one learns when one needs a way out; one learns at all costs. One stands over oneself with a whip; one flays oneself at the slightest opposition” (Kafka, 1971, p. 289).

That learning, that imitation, that training, that repetition is permanent, continued, that way out that Red Peter found is what Nietzsche calls culture, culture meaning training and selection. Culture is the prehistoric activity of men, in Nietzsche’s “Morality of custom”, which precedes in universal history (Deleuze, 1986), is the generic activity (generating):

... the actual labour of man on himself during the longest epoch of the human race, his whole prehistoric labour, is explained and justified on a grand scale, in spite of the hardness, tyranny, stupidity and idiocy it also contained, by this fact: with the help of the morality of custom and the social straitjacket, man was *made* truly predictable. (Nietzsche, 1994, p. 36)

Deleuze tells us in his Nietzschean reading (1986) that any historical law is arbitrary, but what is not arbitrary, what is prehistoric and generic, is the law of obeying the laws and the conscious culture, precisely, in creating habits to force men to obey the laws, and in the end, to train them (and this is an aspect that any pedagogue can’t forget... Although some contemporary “pedagogues” believe, maybe in a romantic or Rousseauian way, that obedi-



ence is unworthy of the human). The human was the result of a long process of training, of shaping the wild and indomitable. And that was only possible through creating a conscience, which means to raise an animal who is able to make promises, an animal with will memorize, and that mnemonics was perhaps the most terrible and sinister of the human prehistory:

When man decided he had to make a memory for himself, it never happened without blood, torments and sacrifices: the most horrifying sacrifices and forfeits (the sacrifice of the first-born belongs here), the most disgusting mutilations (for example, castration), the cruellest rituals of all religious cults (and all religions are, at their most fundamental, systems of cruelty)—all this has its origin in that particular instinct which discovered that pain was the most powerful aid to mnemonics. (Nietzsche, 1994, p. 38)

The creation of that memory was not, then, a memory of the past, a memory footprint (animals have that memory); it is about a new memory in the history of the earth: a willingness memory, a memory that points to the future, it is a memory of words, the ability to promise, to keep the word even in adversity. In this way, mnemonics allows men to take responsibility and converts him in the only animal able to make promises, the only animal with a conscience. And that uncanny ability, the exotic plant on the earth, can only be cultivated for millennia and not exactly in a smooth and gentle way, but only with martyrdoms, sacrifices, and cruelty.

That hard and prehistoric crop, as the painful, dedicated, constant, cruel work that Red Peter charged himself, produced the most mature fruit of his tree: the sovereign individual, the autonomous individual, situated beyond the morality of custom (Nietzsche, 1984). This is the individual that we can recognize in ancient Greek culture: not the man who obeys the law, but an individual legislator who is defined by the power over himself, over destiny, over law; in that way, it is about the freedom, the irresponsibility because he does not have to answer and he does not have someone who answers. It is no longer a debtor: the responsibility-debt, created as an effect of the prehistoric culture, disappears, because he now participates in the right of the gentlemen, of the owners: “The morality of customs, the spirit of the laws, produces the man emancipated from the law” (Deleuze, 1986, p. 137). And that is what Nietzsche calls the moment of culture from the post-historic point of view.



There was another moment of culture: the historical. Culture (generating force, the activity of the pre-history) was captured by reactive forces: the history was like the degeneration of culture, its own denaturalization. Thus, over the generic activity social organizations, associations, communities (races, towns, classes, churches, States) were incorporated that acted and act as parasites. It is about the reactive forces that they take, that occupy a generative activity with the purpose of building collectivities or herds (Deleuze, 1986). From the sovereign individual of the post-historic, we went on to the domesticated man, the gregarious animal, docile, sick, and mediocre: “Training procedures are used but in order to turn a man into a gregarious, docile and domesticated animal. Training procedures are used but in order to break the strong, to sort out the weak, the suffering or the slaves.” (Deleuze, 1986, p. 139).

The main problem of this moment of historical culture is that the responsibility-debt lost its natural active character that contributes to the liberation of humans and becomes unpayable. In the domesticated human, the pain is internalized and the responsibility becomes culpability. Christianity as a culture, as an activity of formation, under the pretence of rescuing humanity, intensified its debt and made it unpayable because god himself has offered himself in sacrifice to pay the debt of humanity. In turn, the State and its law (rights and duties), with its police in the classic sense, with its public instruction, tries to train a good subject and a citizen for its own benefit, for the growth of its forces and resources.

To some ears, Nietzsche’s style will sound, no doubt, grotesque, excessive, but also biologist, prejudiced, undemocratic and even delirious. Fortunately, his thoughts are still alive (in spite of) and today, in the politically-correct age of “light” culture, this actualization is for the work of an eccentric character (considered by many as racist, pro-aristocratic, a right-wing ideologist, proto-Nazi, publicist, etc.) (Castro-Gómez, 2012): we are referring to Peter Sloterdijk. This contemporary German philosopher, whose work is part of the Nietzschean tradition—and in line with other thinkers like Heidegger and Foucault—, updates the essential of Nietzsche through the concept of “anthropotechnics”.

Despite some criticism, Sloterdijk’s language is less vehement, but very provocative. His interpretation and updating of Nietzsche took him to produce a type of “general theory of the exercise” based on the idea that man is a living being emerged from repetition, exercise, training. Equally, his approximations to the biology and anthropology and his distance of the per-

spectives “culturalists” are clearly perceived in the use of concepts like “immunity system” that help to understand the human life and its purpose. About the biological [the author said]:

In the course of man’s mental and socio-cultural evolution, two complementary systems have developed for the pre-emptive processing of injuries: firstly the socio-immunological methods, especially legal and solidaristic ones, but also the military ones by which people resolve their confrontations with distant and foreign aggressors and insulting or harmful neighbours; and secondly the symbolic or psycho-immunological practices on which humans have always relied to cope—with varying success—with their vulnerability through fate, including mortality, in the form of imaginary anticipations and mental armour. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 23-24)

In this perspective, the human being is a *homo immunologicus* that in the face of danger and surplus of life, builds a symbolic armour; he’s the man who struggles with himself on his own; for this reason, he can be characterized as a *homo eticus*, the *homo repetitivus*, the *homo artist*, the animal of training, of exercise. It is clear that the Nietzschean’s substrate of the culture (the crop) is humanity’s prehistory. And like Nietzsche (and Foucault), Sloterdijk’s perspectives are localized on the path of the quest for illustration, for Kantian critique, from there his idea of a *co-immunism* (not communism) that is none other than a new immunological system in which the self and the foreign are not separate, where the victory of the self does not imply the defeat of the foreign, where humanity would act or would operate as a *superorganism* and no longer as an aggregate organism. But that will only be possible through some anthropogenics that have to be obeyed for those who want to live adopting some exercises and habits for the survival of the community.

Certainly, the *co-immunism* is unlikely, that is why it is worth as a wager and as a challenge for an exploration of the highest summits of humanity. We do not know about the future, but we can desire higher summits to climb. However, every system produces surpluses or remains that are unpredictable. As well as the prehistoric culture directed to create a memory in the animal that forgot, it led however to a fruit as the individual sovereign, the historical culture has borne fruit: that is to say, the excess of an unexpected effect, a kind of mutilation. The historical culture of training in the form of State and church, intended to produce a disciplined animal, produced, in addition, the



high bourgeois culture (Sloterdijk, 2012). The disciplinary wager of a self-regulated individual for the benefit of the State and the church produced the undesired effect of Rousseau, for example, and with it, the social contract and the revolution. The Rousseauian naturalism, its beliefs in the natural goodness and in the capacities of the human being is part of a new way of driving itself and the others that aspire a gentle government, without excesses, without direct external pressures: the full confidence in the gracious nature that only requires space, time and freedom to develop the primeval humanity withered for the civilization and its pretentious school (teaching). But this Proposed of freedom and nature was not, however, a renunciation to the crop, to the training. Nothing stranger to that government than the idea of “letting go” or of a wild abandonment. It is about a strange way of leading the government: hiding it or, even better, transferring it to the adult, from the professor to the “environment”, to nature. That was clearly understood by the pedagogues of the active school that pretended, against Rousseau’s posture, to return to the renovated school the natural “environment” of the childhood.

The liberal government not only came to diffuse and settle, but also produced a group of undifferentiated repetitions that are expressed in that *laissez-faire* contemporaneity: the renunciation of control under the idea of self-regulation of the organic and economic forces, specific to a neoliberal government. In other words, neoliberalism is the age of the *selfishness systems* (self-referential systems) that work for their own benefit, becoming non-functional in a broader way in the totality of the system. The so-called contemporary and the search for happiness and personal achievement. And it is located under the sign of the individual subject of an identity. Equally, it occurs with the idea of thinking the human as a permanent learner, as a businessman of his own human capital whose success or failure only depends on the quality of his elections and his abilities to leave his competitors offside.

INDIVIDUALIZATION AND LEARNING: SELFISHNESS SYSTEMS

The ideas of Comenius (1592-1670) are found in the center of the historical culture of training, the one that was conformed between the State and the church, with the purpose of producing a disciplined animal. In the work of this Moravian are condensed many of the ideas that help the construction



of the “*typographaeum vivum*, [the school] a living typesetting apparatus that would populate the world with masterpieces of human print. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 540). The 17th century was testimony to the emergence of a universal education project, the *pampaedeia* and with it, a machine of human orthopedics: the modern school. A workshop where the education of all should take place; that linked the disciplinary technique (associate to the monitoring and punishment) with the *telos* of the human perfection, and its purpose was to guarantee the collective production of the individual differential.

If in the time of Comenius, the human model was in the image and likeness of god, in such a way that mass production was of the highest possible level of individuals, from the 20th century training of human beings to practice with new machines and in some cases with no more gods than the individuals themselves. Before, as now, the technical project not only made humans from its raw material, but also became the product of their own production. Decipherment of itself, production of itself, knowledge of itself that helps the systematic confection of a way of being human defined for the demands of its model: man himself. Humans that after centuries of anthropotechnics became configured of itself and of the humanity.

The modern concern for the human formation was articulated around the question for the exercises, the behaviors, the routines, the habits that are driven by individuals to achieve a particular way or not. Even though this concern seems to be closer to the monastic medieval practice, or to the sportive and dietetics of the last century, it is important to recognize that in the total of collective or individual activities that humans practice in different moments of their history, the present exercise is perceived as a key element of the most diverse ways of practice life. That *askesis*, the exercise that leads the shaping of life through repeated and regulated activities, becomes the axis that characterizes human life and those are based on the emergence of that specific modern power and contemporary that Foucault calls Bio-power.

Before entering into that discussion, it is necessary to point out that in the repetition and in the regularity of the exercise is possible to recognize the “autoplastic rules of human shaping” (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 548), those who are in the center of constitution of modern life and that refer to the retroactive effect of every action and every movement on its own author. In this perspective, is possible to say that every action generates its author and, as the reflection acts in the person who reflects, the emotion does it in those



who experience it, the exercise in those who practice it, the work in the worker, etc. It isn't surprising that in the open field research about learning, emerged didactic reflections that brought the individual that learns as the center of the educative process (an active agent) and to the learning as its fundamental process.

If defining and establishing the 'I' was the purpose of the discipline in previous centuries, changing and transforming that 'I' for the action of individual itself began to be the purpose of learning during the 20th century. Such change is not a minor issue because it was fundamental in the consolidation of actual forms of government, those regulated for the competition in the economic and professional sphere. Learning is today an important strategy for the conduction of the individuals that consider themselves as autonomous agents and businessmen, *Freelancers*: individuals willing to transform and increase their capital to achieve the social and professional ascent, in a world ruled by a general market economy.

In other words, it is in that period that we call modernity that they organize, adjust and operate self-direction and individualization in a process that can be denominated as a constitution of educative societies (Noguera-Ramírez, 2012). It is a moment in which accommodating and adjusting practices occupied a central place in the pedagogy and, through those, techniques were implemented that focused the attention of the individual in his interests and needs as drivers of the actions that they have to operate on itself. Learning—as notion and practice—acquires then a central place referring to the necessity of having all the social and personal settings in order, that every individual, as a learning subject, acquires the necessary skills and abilities required for “learning to learn” and, as such, “lifelong learning”.

In this regard, it is important to point out that, even when school has an important place in the social education, its presence does not define the educative character in it, what implies, beyond the school, its walls, and practices, that every individual have the compromise and the obligation to keep learning in every aspect and throughout his lifetime. This was an issue pointed out by Comenius when he considered the world a big school—*panscolia*—in which individuals spent their life. He conceptualised the existence of many schools throughout life: prenatal, childhood, adolescence, youth, adulthood, old age, and death “school” (Comenius, in Noguera-Ramírez, 2012).

The displacement that happened between 17th and 19th centuries represents the step from instruction to learning, through education; this produc-

es an emphasis in the techniques destined to the own leading of the desires, of the needs and interests as a new way of producing a governed subject. In that process, individuals start to practice own techniques of those things that we associate with the constitution of a nationality and a free government. Education became the scenario for acquiring learning that enable individuals to conduct their own life, and that is why we can affirm that education is closer to the action of leading or conducting than to the action of instruction or teaching some things. Education focuses its action on the particular quality of learning and in the adaptation of an environment, where every individual has the possibility of developing and exercising those things that are considered proper of their nature.

In the beginning of the 20th century, alongside learning, they grant privilege and power to the use of the techniques of self-reflection and self-control that, centuries before, configured some forms of Christian pedagogy (Hunter, 1994). Pedagogic practices that, for Popkewitz (2008), rested on old driving tools, its purpose and its priority where not simple copies of the disciplinary practice, but the incorporation and updating of exercises and techniques of individualization for the production of self-government subjects; those were the sources of a pedagogical technology that enabled the appearance of

[...] Site of 'spiritual disciplines' (owners practice or relating to and Governing the self), embodied in the pastoral relation between teacher and student. [...] It is the 'game of the shepherd and the flock' of Christianity itself, with its characteristic joint monitoring and self-examination, obedience and self-regulation that it continues to provide the core of the moral school technology long after they were deleted their doctrinal support. (Hunter, 1994, p. 21)

This self-reflection assumes and conforms to the *selfishness* systems in which the pedagogical actions occupied an important place in the production and transformation of the experiences that individuals have of themselves and their constitution as modern subjects. In this regard, the scholar activities with boys, girls and adults that are purposed through informal groups (spiritual therapy, mental cure and religious), or even those divulged in books, videos and motivation conferences, self-help, personnel management, etc. are pedagogical practices (of conduction) that try to modify reflexive relations with the subjects, as they are part of some devices of subjectivities that produce the (so-called) "human person" (Larrosa, 1995).



In the perspective of “general ascetological theory”, it is possible to understand that the modern and contemporary individual is fundamentally exercitant-trainer that deals with the production of his talents and stimulates, from practical rituals, habits and customs that use the potential that he has inside and in which he recognized himself as potentially superior. This is the precept of human superiority that is at the center of modern concerns with the moral conduction and the construction of identity. So, the moral orientation of individual actions is configured as the sense axis in the production that the individual makes of it, as a subject that is able to respond for himself (Taylor, 2001).

The construction of the precepts that guide human actions determined the *telos* that directs the sense of the relation that the individual establishes with itself and with others in a process that is based on the construction of identity: “Let us define what it is and what is not important for us” (Taylor, 2001, p. 30). In other words, it is in the identity produced as a correlation of moral valuation (the ones we accepted as a guide behavior) where we define many of the actions that we are willing to do in ourselves to achieve objectives and individual and social goals. That “I”, that modern *self*, rather than being a previous *datum*, is the result of the actions directed to us, for ourselves and for others, in the process of constitution as individual subjects.

The process of identification promoted and nurtured for the compulsion of creating and modeling the autobiography, its ties, and nets to withstand the social changing conditions that express the complex technical line of individualization that produced man since his pre-history until today. The functional identification as an element that gives unity to the *self* and makes it possible to guide the individual and collective ways of life. The modern individualization can be described as that permanent process of constant identification, through which, in the last centuries, we have tried to consolidate a way of interiority that we denominated “I” (Beck, 2004).

In general terms, we can say that between the 18th and 19th centuries the configuration of rationality of the liberal government oriented the wide and massive diffusion of speeches and practices in the subject that act over it, which is recognized through an identity and its transformation, depends on its own action. In this context, the educational practices focus the attention of the professors in knowing more about the students and the attention of the students in knowing more about themselves, about their own interests, wishes, and needs. Those practices related to the knowledge of oneself began

to have increased acceptance and importance, it started to be a part of school life and other areas of the personal and social world. The individual learner is no longer the individual of the identity that is searching for the definitive self; on the contrary, he is a permanent exercitant, an *unfinished cosmopolitan* (Popkewitz, 2009) who, as a responsible agent, sole owner of his future, is related to the *selfishness* systems based on practices and speeches that made him an active subject, a subject of learning.

BIOPOLITICS AND ANTHROPOTECHNICS

Modernity, which could never be anything but radical, secularized and collectivized the practicing life by breaking the longstanding asceticisms out of their spiritual context and dissolving them in the fluid of modern societies of training, education and work. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 566).

The techniques of vigilance and control, associated to the monastic ways of life, jump to the stage of the political life in the period of the constitution of the administrative European States, between the 16th and 17th centuries. It was about a process of secularization of the pastoral power (Hunter, 1994), through its ascetic practices—linked to small communities in the Middle Ages—which entered into the social and collectivized world with the development of disciplinary practices; what radically transforms the ways of thinking and acting life of the majority of individuals that were part of the newly-formed administrative European States. It was not only about the entrance of an arsenal of techniques intended for the auto-production of the subject and the invocation of the improvement of life itself, but of the collectivization and non-spiritual group of exercises and techniques for the auto-production of a modern subject, a governmental subject.

The intensive call to an exercitant life made of modernity an age of techniques “transformed into a universally addressed and multifariously answered metanoetic imperative. Its transmitters were primarily the modern State and the corresponding school, at first, supported energetically by the clergy of all confessions”. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 574). The call for global fitness supposes one of the most radical transformations in human life, thanks to the constitution of different scenarios for the collective and individual



training. The way of life which associates and makes life and rules indistinguishable—as was the case of the *monastic communities*, its rule's life and its ideal common life *Koinos bios* (Agamben, 2013)—we went to the styles of *modern and contemporary life* in which the individual proclaims himself as a producer and sovereign of his own existence.

The wide diffusion of ways of exercising life was at the heart of political dispositions that were the key to demographic control of the population that lived in the administrative (or absolutist) State, and later the moderns. The production of exercitant subjects that are found in the center of form of bio-power—the anatomo-politics described by Foucault—and operate under the premise of bringing life to useful subjects for the needs of a powerful State, a mercantile and a fiscal State, that its foreign policy requires a dedicated and disciplined army and a diplomatic corps, and also an infrastructure and a sustained institutionalism for a body of workers that consider themselves as productive and independent and that were able to tribute the necessary taxes for the design of the economy and private property.

Those new subjects work for their own benefits, in function of the State and its institutions, it was about a relation that strengthens the individualization process and social relationships, that presupposes a changing of emphasis in the exercises of power: from sovereign forms to disciplinary, or better still, the privilege of techniques and strategies to the production of individuals and, thus, a power focused on life. A displacement that can be considered a governmentalization of the State (Foucault, 2006), because it is no longer about ruling over or leading a territory, it is about governing or driving the individuals that, from now on, are going to be considered the population.

State and church considered and promoted the practice that made the subjects constitute as a government subject: a source of enrichment and a strengthening that the State has the responsibility of its administration, through policy practices (Foucault, 2006). The political life associated with the production and the government of the individuals was expressed, among other things, in an alliance between the moral of the church and the growing “Reason of State” translated into the articulation of three key issues: mandate of reproduction and maternity over women, related to the exile of the midwives-witches and the submission in reproductive marital relations, defended and promoted first by the Catholic faith and then, also, by the Protestant faith (Badinter, 1981); and the identification and differentiation of childhood, what develops a legislation against the infanticide—con-

sidered since that moment as a crime, not only against humanity but also against the State (Ariès, 1962). The social correlates of this alliance generate a population growth that provided the State with unlimited sources of human material and that, paradoxically, leads to overpopulation; this, among other historical and social factors, impacted on the State organization and the Reason of State that produces it, bringing them to update: those were the conditions of the emergence of a rationality of liberal government and of a group of anthropotechnics associated with the production of humans that were adequate to it.

The emergence of a series of government problems for the multitude of people outside the system—those who were not part of the workforce or the military force—constituted one of the focuses of the policy practices that try to use the “prime matter” and through the institutions like school, the army, hospitals, workshops, etc., produce governable subjects; however, the impossibility of a complex regulation force to an important transformation in the strategies of behavior that continue linked to politics for the government of life, those that lead, for example, to the discussion about the social State and the production of speeches associated to the human rights (Foucault, 2007).

In other words, the over-production of human beings as a result of the biopolitics operation of the modernity found its answer in the anthropotechnics action of a disciplinary character that has as its purpose the production of humans by their *removal from the world*, not as the old ascetic’s style, but through institutions of confinement and insulation. This social biopolitics articulated a group of anthropotechnics that the educational institution was responsible for managing. At the same time that the school reduced the overload educational had the family also reduces the possibility of abandonment and death of unwanted and abandoned children. The school—with its techniques of confinement, monitoring, teaching and punishment—helped the functional formation of the family, but also, and overall, it was in charge of producing human beings: the school was responsible for the human raw material and transformed it into a beneficial subject, or at least into a someone who was safe in the society.

¹ The same one that is valid today and that is possible to be perceived in almost every speech of a religious denomination or in the State institutions in different parts of the western world, the same one that doesn’t allow intervention in the life of the born and unborn, terminally ill, etc.



This process read from in another perspective shows that the disciplinary anthropotechnics found in the techniques of individualization, associated to the identity, a key tool for its development. This individualization constituted one of the most economic emerging strategies of government of the last centuries: with it came the natural belief of the human as characterized by the possession of an identity and a particular interiority—internal depth—that would be the source of internal morality that guides the individual conduct (Taylor, 2001). In this regard, the process of governmentalization of the European States can be read in the key of emergence and used in the techniques of individualization that meant the introduction of group exercises of “conducting conduct” as an axis of the relationships that subjects establish with themselves and with others.

The implementation of an anthropotechnic disciplinary and individualistic arsenal that had as a purpose the strengthening of the State, left in the hands of the schools and teachers a group of proceedings that were looking to install in the youngest (infants and young people) the moral and ethical precepts of the Christian humanization. However, that mandate produced an unexpected surplus: the transformation of first and outside purpose—the one that oriented the implementation of the disciplinary anthropotechnics, between that the school practices—for a second and inside purpose. From the State and society as purposes, it went on to the individual and its inner as a purpose. The individualization turns the subject into the actual purpose of the promoted techniques and, in that sense, the inside was constituted in the objective of the actions that the individual made over it and over others. Perhaps the emergence of the notion *Bildung* (formation or self-training) in the German tradition is a good example of this movement. In this one, the purpose of any pedagogical process is expressed in terms of the differentiated and private construction of the individual interiority. Was then the rupture between the Reason of the State and the Reason of the School (Sloterdijk, 2012), that was evident in educative reforms that have been promoted for centuries, and that can be understood as an attempt to the reposition of the State as reason of the anthropotechnics.

The practices and discourses about the defense and protection of life acquired different emphasis and expanded its vocabulary and legalization in the two hundred years that followed, which led to focusing the attention on the necessity of recognizing particularities and individual needs, associated with an idea of individual nature. However, we cannot forget that it was in

the period of the absolutist State that emerged one of the first biopolitics operations—the democratic policy—and that this one gave way to the first forms of modern anthropotechnics: discipline. These last ones are owed to “the technical aspect, the mastering of the procedure that brings about the desired result in discrete, explicit and controlled steps”. (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 439) The disciplines are the anthropotechnics that enable not only the production of adequate and functional humans—workers, students, military masses that feed the government machinery and the institutions that become more and more necessary to govern the population—but also a series of educators committed to the fabrication of humans. Through school and other modern institutions that projected not only the citizen for new world but also the new world.

The belief in natural and particular needs of individuals, with anthropotechnics associated with their own production and conduction (education, for example) started to be defended as rights of a free subject which, to know more of itself, of its possibilities to defend his rights, to know more about himself, about his possibilities, and to achieve his full personal development, he needs freedom. The practices of production of free individuals, took some of the disciplinary techniques and articulated them to new purposes, in those where the way and the end were the individuals: that was the emergence and adjustment of the anthropotechnics that we can classify as liberals; those that did not stop developing until today as a security dispositive that emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries, and that only found possibilities of deployed in the 20th century, associated with the confirmation of free-market and free-competition economy.

In other words, the techniques oriented towards identification, inherent to disciplinary anthropotechnics, were articulated to the naturalist and liberal discourses that promoted knowledge of the own individual nature, as the attention to the particular interest understood in harmony with the acting and behavior of the population. The natural self-regulation of the social, economic and personal processes was an enunciation that framed how they started to manage the resources and the individual possibilities and, in that regard, it displaced the uses of regulation external techniques, according to the exercises and techniques of self-regulation oriented to construction of identities.

In the middle of this transformation, notions such as interests, desire, experiences and learning emerged in the pedagogical speeches and



were aligned with the traditions or pedagogical modern cultures—Francophone, Anglophone and German (Noguera-Ramírez, 2012)—, with the emergence of speeches about personal relationships, autonomy and self-management that is related to the definition of identities for themes of race, gender, nationality, and age, among others. The educational topics, of identity and the emotional development, have been configured as a fundamental issue for the recognition and the definition of the individual markers that allow one to accept and recognize the differences and, from there to guarantee the conduction for the own actions of the individuals (Marín-Díaz, 2015).

In the course of the 20th century, individualization was given its greatest expression and in that process the government strategies were completely oriented to the actions of an individual responsible for his own condition. The implementation of a group of liberal anthropotechnics leads to the production of many humans in charge of themselves. Subjects that have the ability to learn, transform and adapt and achieve what is necessary to what are now their unique goals: success and power. The imperative *metanoético* is the permanent transformation of the individual: it's not about a subject who can be defined in permanent identities, but a subject of mobile and flexible identities that auto-produces himself permanently, through the operation of techniques that he can choose depending on his needs and wishes.

In contemporary Western societies, the individual is the only responsible for his government and for the achievement of his dreams. He has to be in charge of his own production increasing the value of change in the market of human capital. In these advanced liberal societies (Rose & Miller, 1992) it is possible to recognize a group of techniques and programs, throughout which ways of self-government that act in the small details of individual life are promoted: recording techniques and calculation, work habits, development actions for professional skills, space design, etc.; those contemporary techniques or anthropotechnics act in the production of individual styles of life, but especially of human beings who are defined for the autonomy, responsibility and competition; all of these are values that constituted in resources, of intangible assets that make all of them leaders of themselves (Castro-Gómez, 2010).

CLOSE: INTERIORITY AND INDIVIDUALIZATION

The emergence of the individual busy conducting his own life, concerned with ‘himself’, and who has to operate a series of exercises upon himself to become human, is the tale of a long, painful and tragic process of domestication that managed to make the “blond beast”²—the one who wandered hungrily for goods and victories (Nietzsche, 1994)—a submissive and docile human for the social life. It is about the training and selection from a pre-historical activity of man to a process of domestication, which consists of training the larger predator ‘man’ and turn him into a gentle, civilized, pet. A transformation that was about marking the externality of the world, enclosing man in the city limits and in the social life, and bringing it to turn inward, to build an interiority, his inner life, like that other place where, in the future, he was destined to vagrancy, stalking, and hunting.

The emergence of the ‘selfconsciousness’, the ‘self’, the ‘soul’ is the emergence of the disease that he succumbed to, the beast-man under the pressure of the most terrible transformations that he had endured until then, a change that took him from the nomadic life to sedentary life and left him permanently enclosed in a sphere of society and peace. It was a process in which the animal-man trained himself: communities, social groups, cities, states, lifestyles that men themselves invented, and strongholds, through which the old free instincts were limited, the instincts of the wild man—hostility, love, pleasure de persecution, assault, change, destruction...

Nietzsche teaches us that this was how was produced what we call today interiority, self, consciousness. Men who, due to the lack of enemies and of external resistors have been locked into the oppressive regularity of manners, as Peter the Red, ended up finding themselves, that prey to go, to stalking it and trying to hunt it. Turning on itself, the self became more dense, and the human now had to work with himself full-time. A learning job was the declaration of war against the old instincts which until then his strength, his pleasure and fear inspired (Nietzsche, 1994) an action upon himself that caused him to ‘build’ a ‘find’ in himself, in his ‘inside’ the new guidelines for life that he proposed as collectively.

² Those beautiful, good, noble, and happy men that were described for Nietzsche, in his genealogy of morality.



With the necessary domestication for life with others began the construction of an interiority that even today must be described, delineated, known and conducted. It was time for the emergence of a process of individualization that took us from the creation of the first forms of a 'self' in Greek antiquity to more elaborate forms of self-identity in the course of modernity and found its extreme expression in the contemporary 'human capital'. An action demanded, from the start, setting different techniques and exercises of humanity production by its human, that were articulated with precepts, through which life was oriented with others (Marín-Díaz, 2015).

Overall, the process of individuation is the correlate of multiple and complex exercises of anthropotechnics systems that were organized in Western societies and produced particular ways of being governed and governable subjects. The modern way of ascetic life has the form of a non-religious asceticism, or "training and corresponds to a form of reality that requires the individuals, to wait like that, *fitness, fitness sans phrase*" (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 426). It is a non-spiritual form of exercise that allows different spaces and stages of individual and collective life, and that enables experimenting with various forms of construction of the individual as a subject of government.

This meant, among other things, that what was called the 'elevation' of life, a characteristic of medieval pastoral practices, became an imperative of life for all individuals: an imperative drive that marked our ways of being modern. Broadly speaking, we could say that what we call modernity would be nothing more than the time in which such ascetic practices were displayed in all Western societies, in the form of generalized discipline. The asceticism without spirituality allowed transformation of some European societies and that, between the 19th and 20th centuries, other societies in the world did the same. Sloterdijk suggests that this happened because

The people in this part of the world who, because of their head star practice, forced all other civilization on the planet to join in with the training systems they had introduced. The proof: among the outpaced nations, only those that knew how to implant a sufficient degree of didactic stress through a modern school system managed to leap forwards. This succeeded most where, as in Japan and China, an elaborated system of feudal conditionings facilitated the transition to modern disciplines (...) Asian tigers have regained ground,

and while modern European purse haughty frown at what he considered an imitation, new competitors from around the world have made the ancient principle of learning based on their success. (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 426)

In the lecture of the process of training and individualization and its articulation with complex systems exercise is evidence the group of historical, moral and anthropotechnics transformations that involved human domestication and the important role that education, in a strictly modern sense, occupied in them.

Today we are witnessing the construction of other societies, those in which the government of one and all has to do with lifelong learning; it seems that this need for a common life that led to human domestication, the construction of the interiority as an old anthropotechnics, has begun to disappear. At a time when the individual does not need more than himself to achieve success and happiness, the other appears as a dispensable element, in order to learn, is not necessary to teach or educate, it is an adaptive behavior whose innate and instinctive basis allows the agency (individual) to drive their behavior efficiently in a particular environment.

The age of learning is the moment of Western history in which the individual is required to act as an agent of his own behavior, as an individuality that has his own interests, individuality and powers to explore and exploit, to learn or develop skills, information to be processed or disposed of, choices which have to be made carefully if they want to be successful and happy—or at least happy because in the age of post-duty (Lipovetski, 1992) a certain hedonism becomes not only possible, but desirable as a great ideal of life.

REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, G. (2013). *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Forms-of-Life*. Stanford: Stanford University press.
- ARENDDT, H. (1996). *Entre el pasado y el futuro [Between past and the future]*. Barcelona: Editorial Península.
- ARIÈS, P. (1962). *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. New York: Vintage Books/Random House.



- BADINTER, E. (1981) *The myth of motherhood: An historical view of the maternal instinct*. London: Souvenir Press (E & A).
- BECK, U. (2004). *Poder y contrapoder en la era global: la nueva economía política mundial*. Madrid: Paidós Ibérica.
- CASTRO-GÓMEZ, S. (2010). *Historia de la gubernamentalidad. Razón de Estado, liberalismo y neoliberalismo en Michel Foucault*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre.
- DELEUZE, G. (1986). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. London: Continuum.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2006). *Seguridad, Territorio, Población*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2007). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- HUNTER, I. (1994). *Rethinking the School. Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- KAFKA, F. (1971). *The complete stories*. New York: Schocken Books Inc.
- LARROSA, J. (1995). *Tecnologías del yo y educación. Notas sobre la construcción y la mediación pedagógica de la experiencia de si*. In: Larrosa, J. (Ed.). *Escuela, poder y subjetivación*. Madrid: La Piqueta.
- LIPOVETSKI, G. (1992). *Le crepuscule du devoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- MARÍN-DÍAZ, D. (2015). *Autoajuda, educação e práticas de si. Genealogia de uma antropotécnica*. Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (1994). *On the genealogy of morality*. Cambridge University Press.
- NOGUERA-RAMÍREZ, C. (2012). *El gobierno pedagógico. Del arte de educar a las tradiciones pedagógicas*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, GHPP.
- POPKEWITZ, T. (2009). *Sociedade da Aprendizagem, cosmopolitismo, saúde pública, prevenção à criminalidade. Educação e realidade*, 34(2).
- ROSE, N.; MILLER, P. (1992). *Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government*. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 172-205.
- SLOTERDIJK, P. (2013). *You must change your life. On anthropotechnics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- TAYLOR, C. (2001). *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



