

Can Foucault's analysis of power inform a radical politics?

ROSALEE DORFMAN

'There is an optimism that consists in saying that things couldn't be better'

(Foucault, 1990: 156).

This statement reflects Foucault's focus on the historical conflicts of power relations. His analysis radically diverges from traditional conceptions of power as an inherently oppressive force to be overthrown. In a revival of the legacy of Critical Theory, Foucault's theories produce practical radical politics. This paper initially explores Foucault's concept of power and how it differs from the traditional, top-down approach to radical politics. Foucault's theory of power not only provides an imperative tool to engage critically in politics, but also interrogates the discourse of what constitutes 'radical politics'. In effect, arguing that upholding a dominant conception of 'radical politics' subjugates alternative radical theories and practices. Although critics may consider this pessimistic, Foucault utilises such analysis for resistance in warring against dangerous forms of power. Moreover, Foucault's theories enable the proliferation of possible forms of radical politics.

Foucault's lack of a concrete alternative to the present induces some to consider his theories 'conservative' (Habermas, 1981), however I interpret his work as reviving Critical Theory's aim of informing radical politics. Foucault's theory of power not only provides an imperative tool to engage critically in politics, but also interrogates the discourse of 'radical politics'. This paper utilises Pugh's (2009) broad definition of radical politics as revealing 'root' problems and strategizing how to 'root out' problems, yet aims the analysis at power and resistance. First, this essay introduces Foucault's (1998) analysis of power. Second, I demonstrate how Foucault situates power, and differs from the traditional approach to radical politics, which focuses on sovereign power. Third, Foucault's analysis of power engaged in conflict against resistance illustrates its practical utility in proliferating the possibilities for radical politics. Finally, I employ his theory of power to critique the discursive process that produces radical politics, since this process implicitly subjugates alternative radical theories and practices.

1. Foucault's Theory of Power as a Practical Tool

This section explores Foucault's analysis of power and how it differs from other conceptualisations. In *History of Sexuality Vol. 1*, Foucault (1998: 94-95) explains the propositions known as his theory of power:

1. Power is not a possession; it is exercised unequally.
2. Power is embedded in the divisionary effects of relations, such as economic, scientific and sexual relations. Thus power is productive, and not necessarily negative.
3. Power is exercised through bottom-up discourse and the effects of divisions that run through the entire social body, not simply by an opposition between the rulers and the ruled.
4. Power relations are intentional, strategic and often unspoken.
5. 'Where there is power, there is resistance' and consequently resistance is always in relation to power, forming a complex network of relations.

Power is omnipresent as it comes from everywhere and is produced by a multiplicity of forces (Foucault, 1998). When forces exist, power is exerted (Philips, 1983; Foucault, 2003). Foucault (1972) aims his methods of deconstructing power and discourse to function practically as a box of tools. Hence, theory is practice (Foucault and Deleuze, 1972), an essential critical stance shared also by Adorno and Horkheimer (2010). In addition, Foucault's (1998) theory of power emerges from practices and their multiple effects. For example, the practice of psychoanalysis regulates the boundaries of acceptable sexuality not only through the hierarchical professional-client relationship, but also by internalising norms – what is dominantly seen, said and silenced – about sexuality.

2. *Situating and Rejecting Sovereign Power*

Foucault's (1998) analysis of power informs radical politics through rejecting 'repressive' sovereign power; power concentrated in the king, the State and its laws. Foucault's theory, emerging from *Discipline and Punish* (1991a), constructs sovereign power as an effect of multiple relations of force, contrasting with other radical and traditional politics. These relations are historically situated – they dominated during the pre-18th Century European *ancien regime* when the gaze of the people is directed upwards, for example onto the scaffold executing the condemned body (Foucault, 1991a). Moreover such top-down sovereign-judicial power relations were legitimised through the prevailing acceptance of sovereign rights or laws and the legal obligation to obey them (Foucault, 1980a; 2007). Lukes' (1974) radical theory of individual power/agency and Rawls' (1999) liberal belief in inalienable basic human rights assume that people have sovereign, innate rights that become compromised when they are subjects of the State. Foucault (2003; 1980b) argues the presumption of such natural rights obscures how multifaceted power relations manufacture rights, sovereignty and the individual. These relations are demonstrated in Foucault's (1991a) genealogy of the prison, where he describes the panoptic prison's central tinted-glassed tower as producing both 'absolute' sovereign and disciplinary power, which induces a self-regulation or internalisation of rules through the possibility of being seen and punished. Here the prisoner's sovereign rights/powers that Lukes and Rawls describe may 'exist', but since they produce no *effects*, Foucault (1991a) claims they are irrelevant and impractical, since they offer no means to analyse and counter sovereign and disciplinary power.

Foucault's theory (1991a) contrasts with theorists such as Marx and Engels (1998) who reify power as a tangible possession by viewing it as a commodity analogous with labour and capital. Charlton (2006: 222) summarises this sovereign power dichotomy as 'those with power control; those without power lack control'. This starkly contrasts Foucault's (1998) bottom-up notion of power producing individual and social bodies, which requires the existence of some freedoms. Charlton (2006) and Heartfield (2009) rely on a Socialist conception of power relations ordered by class rule, which produces uncompromising economic oppression – leaving the only solution to be a revolution and utopian Socialist State. Not only does Foucault's (2003) later work reject these hegemonic conceptions of sovereign power, but he also rejects how socialism and other ideologies of 'radical politics' perpetuate the same power relations of domination over individuals and population (biopower) as the capitalist State.

The State consists in the codification of a whole number of power relations which render its functioning possible...Revolution is a different type of codification of the same relations. (Foucault, 1980a: 122).

Critics (Davis, 2007) believe the idea that power relations permeate both the State and revolutionary movements is a pessimistic outlook. However Foucault's (1980a: 121) analysis expands radical philosophy and practice beyond sovereign-judicial rights and prohibitions – 'we need to cut off the King's head: in political theory that has still to be done'. We must understand power not simply as repressive, but productive and inextricable from discontinuous conflict with other forces, such as resistance (Foucault, 1998). Foucault's complex notion of power relying on some freedom to operate debunks the freedom/oppression dialectic that Hegel, Marx and Engels (1998), Davis (2007) and others ascribe to.

Foucault's theory/practice of power expands radical politics beyond the reductionist sovereign dichotomy of obedience, or revolt against, the King, the State or its laws (Foucault, 2007). Resistance to power requires analysis at the point where it produces effects, which is often at the most fundamental units of society, i.e. the family (Foucault, 1980b). Instead of blaming the upper classes for 'inherently' oppressing others through ideology and sovereign power, like Marx and Engels (1998) advocated, Foucault's (1998) analysis locates power where exclusion and domination became strategically and economically useful to the bourgeoisie. For example, the European medicalisation and psychoanalysis rendered the sexual body an object of scientific knowledge and power (power/knowledge) and discourse. This process produced the Malthusian couple as 'normal' and other forms of sexuality (i.e. paedophilia, homosexuality) as 'abnormal,' which hid its function to police the population's reproduction of the labour force. Foucault's analysis of how power relations are (dis)continually embedded in discourse and scientific knowledges not only extends radical politics beyond sovereignty, dialectics and class reductionism, but also provides insight into the means to fight processes of subjugation.

3. Analysing Power to Navigate Conflict and Resistance

The political act of analysing and rendering power visible is a potential weapon for war against dominant power relations. Foucault (2003) conceives of politics as a continuation of war. He claims his writing should be used

politically, 'like surgeon's knives, Molotov cocktails, or galleries in a mine, and, like fireworks, to be carbonized' (Foucault, in Murray, 2002). This statement shows Foucault's analyses can be utilised in conjunction with radical politics to reveal where power exists in order to strategically combat it. Power is inextricably linked to the forces of resistance in a constant battle (Foucault, 1998). Power is potentially dangerous (Foucault, 1983). Political power and systems of power function to re-inscribe unequal relations, which reproduce war 'in social institutions, in economic inequalities, in language, in the bodies themselves of each and every one of us' (Foucault, 1980b: 90). Philips (1993) problematises this construct as a normative belief that force relations are *endemic* to humans and that war *always* transfers into politics. However, rather than revealing a 'human nature', Foucault's (2003) analysis of power informs radical politics through highlighting conflicts silenced by so-called 'peace', discourse and power/knowledge relations. His analytical tools, as Molotov cocktails, are strategically 'aimed at revealing and undermining power where it is most invisible and insidious' (Foucault, 1972). Thus Foucault's (1983; 1998) radical politics advocates for tactical resistance and hyper- and pessimistic activism to determine and combat dangerous power relations.

Rejecting liberal reformist strategies, Foucault (2003), Deleuze and Guattari (1987), Mouffe (2009), and others seek to engender a radical shift in politics through highlighting its antagonisms and strategizing means to attack the State and other forms of power. This contrasts sharply with Habermas's (1989) assertion that rational communication is the means to collectively improve problems. Foucault's theory, on the other hand, undermines the emphasis on sovereign power implicit in Habermas's theory by suggesting that power negatively distorts the consensus process necessary for rational communication.. Demonstrating the multiplicity of power relations, Foucault (1980b: 99) questions if power were only negative 'do you really think that one would be brought to obey it?' But why would people *not* obey negative or productive forms of power (Philips, 1983)? This critique validly problematises Foucault's normative assumption of resistance.

Despite Foucault's analysis of politics as war between interchanging forces of power and resistance, critics (Philips, 1983; Davis, 2007) question what space Foucault provides for resistance when we can never be outside of power. Yet Foucault conceives of these two concepts as relying on each other to exist. This provokes the question, why should resistance be separated from power or have clear-cut borders? Resistance can become power and visa versa. Foucault's radical politics focuses on the *effects* of warring forces rather than simply categorising them. Philips (1983) claims Foucault problematically denies the possibility of liberation from systems of control (similarly to Weber's 'iron cage' concept). Foucault's analysis of power does not dictate 'libratory solutions to onerous social and political problems' (Davis, 2007: 299). Rather he provides the mode of critique from which solutions and forms of resistance can be built. He emphasises that radical critique should first emanate from individuals, who may form a collective force against power: "'we" must not be previous to the question; it can only be the result – and the necessarily temporary result – of the question as it is posed in the new terms in which one formulates it' (Foucault, 1991d: 385).

Foucault's (2003) critical analysis of power appears to indicate its inherent polemical use to fight against the effects of power, yet later he claims we should 'never engage in polemics' (2007: 4; 1991d). This contradiction indicates Foucault's changing self-positioning and the different implications for how to engage in radical politics. Should we 'take sides' in this battle and 'other' the enemy or simply provide the tools with which to critique and speak about politics as war? Foucault (2007; 1991d) takes the latter approach in his later work, concluding, as Skinner (2008; 1998) does, that the role of intellectual/radical thinker should be to provide the political means to improve society rather than to engage with polemics or prescribe solutions.

By providing the tools for critique, the intellectual/radical thinker expands the possibilities for tactical resistance and radical politics. Yet it is unclear where resistance should be targeted at or how it should be differentiated from power (Philips, 1983). Foucault's aim for resistance changes throughout his work. For example, in *Madness and Civilization* (2001) Foucault's critique is clearly fixated on forces that repress resistance – Reason 'represses' and is shaped by madness and unreason. Fifteen years later, in *History of Sexuality* (1998), he constructs power and resistance as more fluid: spread over time and space; visible in bodies, groups and conducts.

I felt a bit like a sperm whale that breaks the surface of the water, makes a little splash, and lets you believe...wants you to believe that down there where it can't be seen, down there where it is neither seen nor monitored by anyone, it is following a deep, coherent, and premeditated trajectory. (Foucault, 2003: 4)

This reflection demonstrates a radical rupture in his analysis intertwining power and resistance, they are not constant or directed at a singular entity. *Security, Territory and Population* (Foucault, 2007) demonstrates how power (or biopower) and the State's conduct and the production of the body and population, is inseparable from how individuals and civil society serve as mechanisms to oppose those forces, through what he coins counter-conduct. Furthermore, Foucault supports Deleuze and Guattari's notion of resistance, through non-fascist (2009) and nomadic (1987) thinking, being at war with the mechanisms in which the State and fascism are internalised and expressed in interpersonal relationships (Foucault, 1991c; 2009). Yet again we confront the problem of differentiating between fascist/non-fascist, conduct/counter-conduct and nomadic/State forces. However Deleuze, Guattari and Foucault argue it is not a matter of distinguishing the concepts, but revealing their effects. Nevertheless, Foucault's analysis seems to imply that power is somehow negative/bad and resistance is positive/good, otherwise why would people subvert power? Thus critics (Davis, 2007; Philip, 1983) locate resistance as a site of conflict and tension in Foucault's radical politics, yet this does not necessarily conflict with his analytical tool of power, which leaves concrete strategies of resistance to emerge from the critique.

4. Rethinking 'Radical Politics'

This section demonstrates how Foucault's revolutionary tool of power can not only inform radical politics, but also question how the discourse of 'radical politics' conditions which authors, thoughts and actions come to be known as 'radical'. Firstly, there is no 'true' radical politics; academic authors, who implicitly constrain the discourse,

construct the definition. Pugh's (2009) broad definition of radical politics – uncovering 'root' problems and constructing solutions – is represented by theorists such as Giddens (1994), in his attempt to construct a 'radical' 'third way' that embraces both conservative and socialist politics. Finkelstein (2009) contributes a more left-wing approach to the discourse: to be radical, one must believe things are radically wrong with the world. But who defines what is 'wrong' or a 'root' problem or solution? Foucault interrogates the way in which these discourses construct and constrain what constitutes 'radical' politics through highlighting the conflicts within the process of defining and legitimising what comes to be considered as 'true'. In *What is an Author?* (1991b) he interrogates the function of the author to legitimise statements and police discourses. The author-function authorises the speaker or writer to exercise disciplinary power to validate knowledge. Thus one function of Pugh, Giddens and Finkelstein is to validate the 'true' definition of radical politics through their academic authority. Foucault (1991b: 110) describes the author as a 'result of a complex operation which constructs a certain rational being that we call 'author''. Thus authors and statements of 'radical politics' are conditioned by the dominant constructs of rationality and reason, subjugating unreasonable and abnormal people (see Foucault 1991a; 2001).

Furthermore, Marx and Engels' (1998: 60) *Communist Manifesto* demonstrates a well-known 'true' statement of radical politics, since it 'involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.' As authors of the 'scientific' discourse defining 'radical', they call for a fight against all economic, capitalist oppression, which functions to exclude alternative definitions of what is radical. Foucault (1991b) reveals how the word 'Marx' describes the function – Marxism or Communist Revolution – which categorises the person (Marx) as a statement of ideology. Author's names have a classificatory function to narrate discourse and hierarchically order things (Foucault, 1991b). For example, it classifies the *Communist Manifesto* or Nietzsche's published works as testaments of radical politics, but would discard a shopping list as apolitical. Critiquing the divisionary function of discourse, Foucault (1980b: 85) asks,

What types of knowledge do you want to disqualify in the very instant of your demand:
'Is it a science'? Which experiences and knowledges do you 'diminish' when you say I
am someone conducting a scientific discourse and I am a scientist?

Authors and scientists' claim to knowledge and power devalues others as 'abnormal', disqualifies their claims to define radical politics, and restricts the possibilities of what radical politics could be. Foucault's analysis of sovereign and disciplinary power exercised through the author-function provides an impetus to resist definitions, borders and 'scientific' categorisations of what we know to be radical politics. Rather than providing concrete 'solutions', he sought to provide the methodological weapons for resistance against subjugation of particular knowledges (Tremain, 2005).

5. *Subjugated Knowledges as Radical Politics*

To expand radical politics or rid it of its borders, Foucault bases his historical analysis of power on genealogies of knowledges subjugated in the name of science and progress. Genealogies are histories of the present (Foucault,

1991a). Critiquing power can incite radical politics in the form of an insurrection of subjugated knowledges, defined as ‘blocks of historical knowledges that were present in the functional and systematic ensembles, but were masked’ (Foucault, 2003: 7). Genealogies, as histories of the present (Foucault, 1991a), can proliferate notions of radical politics through demonstrating the conflicts in the process of defining what radical politics is. Therefore understanding and destabilising the scientific hierarchy of knowledges constitutes a form of resistance (Foucault, 1980b). Subjugated knowledges can be considered radical since their ‘validity is not dependent on the approval of the established regimes of thought’ (Foucault, 1980b: 81). Foucault’s genealogies of the mad (2001), imprisoned (1991a), and sexually deviant (1998), show how ‘abnormal’ people’s knowledges have been systematically subjugated, silenced and rendered ‘irrational’ by ‘totalitarian’ theories, such as psychoanalysis.

Davis’s (2007: 303) critique – ‘the method is, in a sense, the madness’ – may be valid, because Foucault’s (2001) method elicits how madness has been degraded and internalised. Moreover his analytical tool of power has fought against the hegemonic dichotomies of reason/unreason (2001), normal/abnormal (2004), liberation/repression (1998). Since Foucault, this method has contributed to battling the sex/gender (Butler, 1990) and impairment/disability (Treiman, 2005) divisions through revealing knowledges which ‘radical’ identity politics subjugate. These authors analyse the reproduction of power in the on-going conflicts and systematic categorisations of people and knowledge within ‘radical’ feminist (Butler, 1990) and disability (Treiman, 2005) movements. Through such critique, they have expanded the practice of radical politics beyond identity divisions and towards resisting the multiple forms of power, unrestricted to sovereign power manifested in the State. Furthermore, a genealogical approach to analysing power can rethink and resist the process silencing alternative definitions and practices of radical politics.

Conclusions

Foucault’s theory of power and politics as a continuation of war marks a radical shift in critical theory/practice. This requires a rethinking of how the discourse and authors police and constrain what has come to be known as ‘radical politics’. As the most cited author in the field of Humanities (Thomas Reuters, 2007), Foucault has incited a ‘discursivity’ (Foucault, 1991b) expanding the borders and systematic categorisation of radical politics. Rather than providing a utopian vision for a ‘better’ future, Foucault equips radical politics with a tool to critique power in history and the present. Such an analysis provides the means to insurrect the knowledges espousing alternative formulations of ‘radical politics’ that have been subjugated by dominant discourses. Furthermore his tools enable strategic activism or counter-conduct to engage in war against dangerous power relations. This paper has demonstrated how Foucault revolutionises the concept of power through situating top-down sovereign relations as only one of the multiple forces constituting power. Foucault locates power at the point where it is produced in practice, rather than assuming innate human rights or uncompromising oppression. Such an analysis extends resistance beyond the dominant obedience/revolt dialectic and towards individual critique, such as non-fascist thinking (see Deleuze and Guattari, 2009) and collective, social activism (Foucault, 2007; 1983). However, critics question the implications of Foucault’s notion of resistance: does it inherently exist and where should it be directed,

if at all? Yet ambiguities about the 'nature' of resistance and his position in polemical discourse indicate how theories, practices and radical politics are constantly redefined by changing conflicts between power and resistance. Foucault's analytical tool can be directed at the political process defining and authoring 'radical politics' to interrogate their exclusionary functions. Further research could utilise Foucault's theory of power to interrogate why some (including this author) assume that 'radical politics' is 'better' than traditional modes. Foucault's analysis of power not only greatly informs radical politics and voices subjugated knowledges but also incites a multiplicity of theoretical and practical resistances.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADORNO, T. and HORKHEIMER, M. 2010. Towards a new Manifesto? *New Left Review* [online]. **65**(September/October), [Accessed 4 May 2011], pp. 33-61. Available from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/45288316/Adorno-and-Horkheimer-Dialogue>.

AMERICAN RADICALS: THE TRIALS OF NORMAN FINKELSTEIN. 2009. Documentary Film. David Ridgen and Nicolas Rossier. USA: Typecast Releasing; Mercury Media.

CHARLTON J. I. 2006. The Dimensions of Disability Oppression: An Overview. In: L.J. Davis, ed. *The Disability Studies Reader, 2nd Edition*. Routledge: London and New York, pp. 217- 227.

DAVIES, L. J. 2007. Book Review: Shelley Tremain, ed. Foucault and the Government of Disability. *ESC: English Studies in Canada* [online] **33**(1-2), [Accessed 2 April 2011], pp. 298-304. Available from: http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/esc_english_studies_in_canada/v033/33.1-2.davis01.html.

DELEUZE, D. and GUATTARI, F. 2009. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum.

DELEUZE, G. and GUATTARI, F. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: The Athlone Press.

FOUCAULT, M. 1980a. Truth and Power. Interviewers: A. Fontana, P. Pasquino. In: Gordon, C., ed. *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*. New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 109-133.

FOUCAULT, M. 1980b. *Two Lectures*. In: Gordon, C., ed. *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*. New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 78–108.

FOUCAULT, M. 1983. On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress. In: H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, Second Edition With an Afterword by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 231-232.

FOUCAULT, M. 1990. Practicing Criticism. In: L.D. Kritzman. *Politics, philosophy, culture: interviews and other writings, 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge, pp. 152-158.

FOUCAULT, M. 1991a. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin.

FOUCAULT, M. 1991b. What Is an Author? In: P. Rabinow. *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin, pp. 101-122.

- FOUCAULT, M. 1991c. Governmentality. In: Eds. Burchell, G., Gordon, C., Miller, P. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, pp. 87–104.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1991d. Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations: An Interview with Michel Foucault. In: P. Rabinow. *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin, pp. 381-390.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1998. *The History of Sexuality Vol.1: The Will to Knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- FOUCAULT, M. 2001. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. London: Routledge.
- FOUCAULT, M. 2003. *Society Must Be Defended*. London: Penguin.
- FOUCAULT, M. 2004. *Abnormal: lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*. New York: Picador.
- FOUCAULT, M. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population: lectures at the College de France 1977-78*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- FOUCAULT, M. 2009. Preface. In: D. Deleuze and F. Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum, pp. xiii-xvi.
- FOUCAULT, M. and Deleuze, G. 1972. *Intellectuals and Power: a Conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze* [online]. [Accessed 2 April 2011]. Available from: <http://libcom.org/library/intellectuals-power-a-conversation-between-michel-foucault-and-gilles-deleuze>.
- GIDDENS, A. 1994. *Beyond left and right: the future of radical politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- HABERMAS, J. 1981. Modernity versus Postmodernity. *New German Critique* [online] **22**(winter), [Accessed 2 April 2011], pp. 3-14. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/pss/487859>.
- HABERMAS, J. 1989. *The theory of communicative action Vol.2, Lifeworld and system: a critique of functionalist reason*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- HEARTFIELD, J. 2009. Radicalism Against the Masses. In: J. Pugh, ed. 2009. *What is Radical Politics Today?* Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 45-51.
- LUKES, S. 1974. *Power: a radical view*. London: Macmillan.
- MARX, K. and ENGLES, F. 1998. *The Communist Manifesto: A Modern Edition*. London; New York: Verso.
- MOUFFE, C. 2009. The Importance of Engaging the State. In: J. Pugh, ed. 2009. *What is Radical Politics Today?* Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 230-237.

MURRAY, S. 2002. *Remembering Michel Foucault: A Review* [online]. [Accessed 2 April 2011]. Available from: <http://www.culturecartel.com/review.php?aid=1000344>.

PHILIPS, M. 1893. Foucault on Power: A Problem in Radical Translation? *Political Theory*. **11**(1), pp. 29-52.

PUGH, J., ed. 2009. *What is Radical Politics Today?* Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

RAWLS, J. 1999. *A Theory of Justice, revised edition*. Cambridge, MA USA: Belknap Press.

SKINNER, Q. 1998. *Liberty before Liberalism*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

SKINNER, Q. 2008. *Una Lecture: The Genealogy of Liberty*. Wheeler Hall, Berkeley: Townsend Centre for Humanities, 15.09. 2008. [Accessed 2 April 2011]. Available from: http://townsendcenter.berkeley.edu/webcast_Skinner.shtml.

THOMSON REUTERS, ISI Web of Science. 2007. The Most Cited Authors of Books in the Humanities. *Times Higher Education* [online]. 26 March 2009. Available from: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=405956§ioncode=26>.

TREMAIN, S., ed. 2005. *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.