CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

Introduction
Romanticism and the Bio-aesthetics of the Military Literary World

Although Romanticism has long been understood as a reaction to the political conflict of the French Revolution, it has only been more recently that Romantic texts have been read in close relation to the era's wars.[1] British Romanticism is now widely regarded as a body of writing that was deeply troubled by news of distant military violence and suffering.[2] Britons lived during what Mary Favret defines as a modern wartime, the experience of those 'living through but not in a war'.[3] This wartime experience was, therefore, primarily formed by the circulation of information within Britain's daily journalism that reported on wars fought in distant locations. Each day brought fresh news of the conflicts that profoundly shaped the emotional life of the nation, whether through shared celebrations of victory, commiseration of defeat or, more commonly, the apprehensive or at times simply tedious activity of waiting for further clarity or confirmation of events. Romantic Britain was subject to what Dominick LaCapra describes as a 'structural trauma', in which war's absent or remote violence came to be felt as an anxious disturbance of national history.[4]

But, despite giving rise to a modern culture of war spectatorship, Romantic writing was nonetheless thoroughly entangled with the

[1] See Gillian Russell, *The Theatres of War: Performance, Politics and Society, 1793–1815* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); Philip Shaw, *Waterloo and the Romantic Imagination* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Simon Bainbridge, *British Poetry and the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Mary A. Favret, *War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern Wartime* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Neil Ramsey, *The Military Memoir and Romantic Literary Culture, 1780–1835* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011); Jeffrey N. Cox, *Romanticism in the Shadow of War: Literary Culture in the Napoleonic War Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); and Lily Gurton-Wachter, *Watchwords: Romanticism and the Poetics of Attention* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016).

[2] Favret, *War at a Distance*, 52; Jan Mieszkowski, *Watching War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

[3] Favret, *War at a Distance*, 9.

[4] Favret, *War at a Distance*, 161.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

logistical and strategic requirements of conflicts that formed the first total wars of history.[5] In his wide-ranging analysis of war and its media technologies, Paul Virilio has argued that to wage war it is as vital to master and control perceptual fields as it is to conquer on fields of battle.[6] To fully understand Romantic literature as a body of wartime writing therefore means that we must pay attention to the vast military republic of letters that also formed in these years. The period from the 1760s to the 1830s gave rise to a wealth of books on modern military thought, from drill manuals to works of military history, strategy, policy and discipline, with an associated network of military authors, booksellers, publishers, journals and even a nascent imaginative war literature of military memoirs and novels.[7] One correspondent in *The British Military Library; or Journal* (1798–1800) responded to this outpouring of material by declaring that 'the æra of military literature' had taken hold of Britain.[8] Overturning long-established classical traditions of military thought, this material was critical to the formation of a modern security state with the capacity to mobilise its population for war. It formed a body of writing that enabled a nation to undertake, in the words of the military author Jacques Antoine-Hippolyte, Comte de Guibert, 'conquests upon itself' through its prescriptions for the regulation of behaviours, habits, perceptions, bodies and actions that could militarise the very fabrics of daily life.[9]

If a central focus of Romantic studies has been the 'symbiotic relationship' that formed in the period between literature and science (whether the natural or social sciences), there has nonetheless been almost no concern

[5] On the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars as total wars, see David A. Bell, *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Modern Warfare* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007).

[6] Paul Virilio, *War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception*, trans. Patrick Camiller (London: Verso, 1989).

[7] For historical research into this material, see Ira D. Gruber, *Books and the British Army in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Caroline Press, 2010); Donald E. Graves, *'Reading Maketh a Full Man': British Military Literature in the Napoleonic Wars: An Annotated Bibliography of the Titles Published by the London Firm of Egerton, 1782–1832* (Godmanchester: Ken Trotman Publishing, 2007); Mark Danley, 'Military Writings and the Theory and Practice of Strategy in the Eighteenth-Century British Army' (PhD diss., Kansas State University, 2001); and John Houlding, *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715–95* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).

[8] 'Letter to the Editor', *British Military Library; or Journal*, vol. 1, revised ed. (1802): 67.

[9] Jacques Antoine Hippolyte, Comte de Guibert, *A General Essay on Tactics. With an Introductory Discourse upon the Present State of Politics and the Military Science in Europe. To which is Prefixed a Plan of a Work, Entitled, The Political and Military System of France. Translated from the French of M. Guibert. By an Officer* (London: printed for J. Millan, opposite the Admiralty, Whitehall, 1781), xii.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

with the era's military science.[10] This neglect of military thought is surprising given that war, empire, science and literature were fundamentally entangled in this era. Naval voyages and military campaigns not only attracted enormous public attention but also played a prominent role in the production of knowledge.[11] Moreover, military science was widely considered to be of immense significance, the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* proposing that the study of war was not only 'the most necessary and useful of all the sciences', but the most complex and difficult to master.[12] Yet the limited concern with the cultural status of this body of thought speaks to a continuing uncertainty surrounding the very idea that it is possible to fully conceptualise a coherent military science. A long tradition of Western thought has insisted that truth belongs to the realm of peace, not the brutality and chaos of war.[13] For cultural theorists of war such as Elaine Scarry, Hannah Arendt and Simone Weil, violence renders us speechless and so represents the antithesis of language, thought and rationality.[14] Language is debased by war, rendered into a tissue of lies that hover above and beyond physical bodies and the traumatic pain of combat. The peculiar difficulty in conceptualising military thought was compounded with the rise of a modern military science and the simultaneous appearance of a separate civilian sphere at the end of the eighteenth century, the term civilian first coming into its modern usage in the 1790s.[15] War's status as a field of knowledge was left uncertain and fragmented, war seemingly remaining entirely aesthetic, absolute or sublime.[16]

[10] John Holmes and Sharon Ruston, eds, *The Routledge Research Companion to Nineteenth-Century British Literature and Science* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 9.

[11] *The Routledge Research Companion*, 4.

[12] *Encyclopaedia Britannica; Or, a Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Miscellaneous Literature on a Plan Entirely New*, 18 vols (Dublin: printed by James Moore, 1790–98), XVIII, 703. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, www.gale.com/intl/primary-sources/eighteenth-century-collections-online, accessed 15 April 2022.

[13] See Tarak Barkawi and Shane Brighton, 'Powers of War: Fighting, Knowledge, and Critique', *International Political Sociology* 5, no. 2 (2011): 126–43; Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 173.

[14] Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Hannah Arendt, *On Violence* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1970); Simone Weil, '*The Iliad*, or the Poem of Force', *Chicago Review* 18, no. 2 (1965): 5–30.

[15] The term 'civilian' formerly referred to an expert in civil as opposed to ecclesiastical law, see Bell, *The First Total War*, 11.

[16] On how war has been defined in relation to the aesthetic, see Nick Mansfield, 'Destroyer and Bearer of Worlds: The Aesthetic Doubleness of War', in *Tracing War in British Enlightenment and Romantic Culture*, ed. Neil Ramsey and Gillian Russell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 188–203. See also Favret, *War at a Distance*, 40–43.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

Arendt proposes that modern political and cultural theory has largely abandoned any serious consideration of war or military thought, leaving its analysis to be undertaken by mere military 'technicians' whose knowledge of war is inseparable from its practice.[17]

This book argues that Romantic-era military literature is worthy of attention as more than a simply technical body of writing. Military thought influenced Romantic cultural life as extensively as nearly any of the other proto-scientific disciplines that formed in this period because it was pivotal to the violence that defined Romantic wartime culture. An anxiogenic age beset by the fear and alarm of imminent invasion and revolutionary upheaval, Britain in the Romantic period may have remained distant from war, but the nation nonetheless lived under the shadow of war's perpetual threats and enduring obligations for national service. Jerome Christensen reminds us that for all British Romanticism was distant from war, it was also shaped by the far-reaching demands of national wartime mobilisation, meaning that Romantic literature 'was written under the threat of imminent invasion, during the state's emergency suspension of dailiness, amidst the din of official exhortations to unity, and in the face of brutal and systematic repression'.[18] Research into the rise of Britain's fiscal-military state reveals how the nation's extensive wartime military bureaucracy, administration and propaganda constituted a veritable revolution of social and political life almost as far reaching in its implications as the revolution in France.[19] For Michel Foucault, military disciplinary practices were foundational to a new, disciplinary society that found its 'full blossoming' at the time of the Napoleonic Wars.[20] This was a time when Jane Austen delighted in the military policy of Captain Charles Pasley, while William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge were branded alongside Pasley as amongst the nation's leading military authors.[21] Radicals from William

[17] Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution* (London: Penguin, 1965), 19.
[18] Jerome Christensen, 'The Detection of the Romantic Conspiracy in Britain', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 95 (1996): 603–27, 603.
[19] Anthony Page, *Britain and the Seventy Years War, 1744–1815: Enlightenment, Revolution and Empire* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 98; John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688–1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); Yuval N. Harari, *The Ultimate Experience: Battlefield Revelations and the Making of Modern War Culture, 1450–2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 180–81.
[20] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1991), 217.
[21] Timothy Fulford, 'Sighing for a Soldier: Jane Austen and Military Pride and Prejudice', *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 57, no. 2 (2002): 153–78; John Stoddard, letter to Charles Pasley, 1 September 1811, cited in 'Introduction' to Charles Pasley, *The Military Policy and Institutions of the British Empire*, ed. and intro. B. R. Ward, 5th ed. (London: W. Clawes and Sons, 1914), 10.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

Cobbett to Percy Bysshe Shelley were, conversely, united by their antipathy towards military disciplinary practices such as flogging and pressgangs.[22] Post-Waterloo Romantic culture was hardly free of its entanglements with militarised conflict, as is evident in Shelley's response to Peterloo or Lord Byron's involvement with the Greek War of Independence (1821–32).

Notwithstanding the demands of war, there has been little consideration of how such military elements permeated Romantic cultural life. This is in striking distinction to studies of early modern literature that have demonstrated a detailed understanding of the extensive associations between the era's military books and its drama and poetry.[23] Gert Geoffrey Langsam observes that the discourses on war originating in early modern military books extended into 'every conceivable literary form of the day'.[24] In stark contrast, Robert Gordon has observed that Ian Watt's foundational *The Rise of the Novel* documents the emergence of modern literature as a demilitarisation of society or a veritable 'civilian revolution' that displaced an earlier culture concerned with martial conflict, Gordon concluding '[it] was in the eighteenth century that fictional man, like social man, abandoned the sword'.[25] Romanticism is epistemologically distant from war because it is, fundamentally, a civilian body of writing. Given that the definition of the civilian dates from the 1790s, one of the defining characteristics of Romanticism is surely that it constitutes the first body of writing to be produced by authors who could conceptualise themselves as civilians. At the same time, however, a new and distinct body of military writing also acquired its modern form. This was a body of work formed out of military technical, professional, disciplinary and, notably, a fictional knowledge of war that assumed the task of documenting, interpreting and representing war for the modern nation. The demilitarisation of society or the civilian revolution that Watt documents went hand in hand with the 'militarisation' of war by the state's military apparatus and an emergent military science.[26] Encompassing hundreds of titles, this body of modern war writing admittedly constituted an enormous range of topics and

[22] Paul Foot, *Red Shelley* (London: Bookmarks, 1984), 57.
[23] For an overview of these studies, see Patricia Cahill, *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
[24] Gert Geoffrey Langsam, *Martial Books and Tudor Verse* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1951), 1.
[25] Robert C. Gordon, *Arms and the Imagination: Essays on War, Politics, and Anglophone Culture* (Lanham: Hamilton Books, 2009). Despite his focus on the civilian, Watt was himself a veteran whose wartime service profoundly affected his literary criticism, see Marina MacKay, *Ian Watt: The Novel and the Wartime Critic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
[26] As David Bell argues, militarism is dependent upon this separation of the military from a civilian sphere that is in need of being remilitarised, Bell, *The First Total War*, 11–12.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

approaches. Yet however much a 'military literary world' was composed of a diverse and distinct body of writing, it nonetheless emerged at the same moment and in parallel with its civilian wartime counterpart.[27] As Nick Mansfield has proposed, war cannot be fixed into a stable identity but can only be thought through 'aporetic entanglements' with its 'others', however that other of war is conceived.[28] This book proposes that the military thought of the Romantic era has just such a set of 'aporetic entanglements' with the broader wartime culture that we know as Romanticism.

Examining the cultural significance of military writing in Romantic-era Britain, this study is founded on Jacques Rancière's theorisation of indisciplinarity.[29] Adopting a radically new approach to the spectacular politics of modernity, Rancière has insisted that rather than unmask spectacle by revealing its basis in suffering we must seek to understand how politics is itself aesthetic. This means examining how politics operates through an underlying 'distribution of the sensible' concerned with questions of who can and cannot speak with authority. Rancière has thus enacted what Gabriel Rockhill terms a 'Copernican revolution' in approaches to the politics of aesthetics because he refuses to see politics and aesthetics as separate categories.[30] All politics is aesthetic because all politics is intrinsically concerned with questions of how we can see and understand the world.[31] Rancière broadens our idea of literature from fiction to the operation of the sensible within any and all fields of knowledge.[32] He advances an idea of a 'poetics of knowledge' that is concerned with untangling the literary effects by which a science is able to develop itself as a science, with finding beneath the formation of a science the operation of writing and its quests for signification and meaning.[33] He directs attention to a 'new regime of writing' and its formulation of a 'symptomology of society' that

[27] Houlding, *Fit for Service*, 168.
[28] Nick Mansfield, *Theorizing War: From Hobbes to Badiou* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 98. For an account of modern literature's aporetic relationship with war, see Sean Gaston, *Derrida, Literature and War: Absence and the Chance of Meeting* (London: Continuum, 2009).
[29] Jacques Rancière, 'Jacques Rancière and Indisciplinarity', interview by Marie-Aude Baronian and Mireille Rosello, trans. Gregory Elliot, *Art and Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods* 2, no. 1 (2008), n.p.
[30] Gabriel Rockhill, *Radical History and the Politics of Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 163.
[31] Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, trans. Julie Rose (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 57–58.
[32] Rancière, 'Jacques Rancière and Indisciplinarity', 5.
[33] Jacques Rancière, *The Names of History: On the Poetics of Knowledge*, trans. Hassan Melehy, with a foreword by Hayden White (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 8.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

underpinned the human sciences as much as imaginative literary texts in the Romantic age.[34]

Rancière distances his thought from Walter Benjamin's earlier theorisation of the 'aestheticization of politics', which, for Benjamin, was inextricably linked to war.[35] Nonetheless, not only does Rancière carry forward Benjamin's earlier concerns with modern media by elaborating the a priori forms of aesthetics, but there are also innumerable ways that Rancière's understanding of the aesthetics of politics circles back to concerns with war, strategy and what he terms the 'war machine' of disciplinary thought.[36] He has proposed with regards to the aesthetics of Romanticism that 'the conditions for the creation of this new art world were first and foremost political – and even military'.[37] Developing much further Foucault's analysis of modern disciplinary societies, Rancière insists that discipline must be understood as encompassing more than simply the exercise and coercion of bodies because discipline also conditions the language and knowledge that surrounds bodies.[38] For Rancière, indisciplinary thought means looking past disciplinary boundaries of knowledge to rethink the 'context of the war' by which bodies are made to conform to discourse.[39] Hence, while this study is deeply informed by Foucault's analysis of military disciplinary practices and their foundational role in the dawning of a disciplinary society during the Romantic era, it also follows Rancière's efforts to read the aesthetic and political alongside one another in order to explore in more detail the full flourishing of military power as a vast discourse concerned with the force and power of life. This study offers a history or poetics of knowledge that examines how military thought developed out of the massive expansion of print of the latter half of the eighteenth century.[40] In the

[34] Jacques Rancière, 'The Politics of Literature', *SubStance* 33, no. 1 (2004): 10–24, 18; Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible,* trans. and intro. Gabriel Rockhill, with an afterword by Slavoj Žižek (London: Continuum, 2004), 33.

[35] Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics*, 13.

[36] Jacques Rancière, 'Thinking between Disciplines: An Aesthetics of Knowledge', trans. Jon Roffe, *Parrhesia* 1 (2006): 1–12, 7.

[37] Jacques Rancière, 'Aesthetics and Politics Revisited: An Interview with Jacques Rancière', interview by Gavin Arnall, Laura Gandolfi and Enea Zaramella, *Critical Inquiry* 38 (Winter 2012).

[38] Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement and Philosophy*, trans. Julie Rose (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 29.

[39] Rancière, 'Thinking between Disciplines', 8.

[40] On the history of knowledge, see Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad, Erling Sandmo, Anna Nilsson Hammar and Kari Nordberg, 'The History of Knowledge and the Circulation of Knowledge: An Introduction', in *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge*, ed. Johan Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar and Kari

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

context of this study, an indisciplinary approach means seeing how, in the modern era, a new kind of military writing attained a privileged status for articulating what we can know and say about war.

The central argument of this book is that military writing was deeply informed by an elementary feature of Romantic wartime: the intensification of military disciplinary regimes in line with the period's embryonic biopolitical thought.[41] Biopolitics has received considerable attention from a large and growing body of cultural theory as one of the most incisive ways of conceptualising modern power, but the concept has not been extensively examined in relation to Romantic culture.[42] The precise meaning of biopolitics is widely debated and there is little settled agreement beyond the obvious reference to the role of 'life' in modern political power and government. While the term can be traced back to the early twentieth century, the word biopolitics was coined by Rudolph Kjellén to refer to vitalist ideas of the state (Kjellén, not coincidentally, also coined the term geopolitics), the modern usage of the term is indebted to the work of Foucault.[43] Foucault argues that biopolitics first emerged as a response of government to the demographic explosions of the eighteenth century.[44] Where disciplines targeted the individual bodies of workers, prisoners or patients, thus developing as an anatamo-politics of the body, biopolitics developed as a means for acquiring power and knowledge over entire populations. Biopolitics arose from new conceptions of the population as a living entity, governed by its own laws and regularities, and so complements

Nordberg (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018), 9–33. For a general overview of the growth of print and its impact upon fields of knowledge in this era, see Clifford Siskin and William Warner, eds, *This Is Enlightenment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

[41] On the role of life in Romantic aesthetics, see Denise Gigante, *Life: Organic Form and Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). See also Catherine Gallagher, *The Body Economic: Life, Death, and Sensation in Political Economy and the Victorian Novel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); and Maureen McLane, *Romanticism and the Human Sciences: Poetry, Population, and the Discourse of the Species* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[42] For an overview, see Alastair Hunt and Matthias Rudolf, eds, *Romanticism and Biopolitics*, *Romantic Circles Praxis Series* (December 2012), www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/biopolitics. For studies addressing aspects of Romanticism and biopolitics, see Ron Broglio, *Beasts of Burden: Biopolitics, Labor, and Animal Life in British Romanticism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2017); Sara Guyer, *Reading with John Clare: Biopoetics, Sovereignty, Romanticism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015); Georgina Green, *The Majesty of the People: Popular Sovereignty and the Role of the Writer in the 1790s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); and Robert Mitchell, *Infectious Liberty: Biopolitics between Romanticism and Liberalism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2021).

[43] Roberto Esposito, *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, trans. Timothy Campbell (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 16.

[44] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Penguin Books, 1981), 140–45.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

earlier disciplinary practices by targeting the collective life of the population. Taken in its entirety, however, a modern biopower encompasses these two poles of life, which it co-ordinates by imposing a series of norms that can align individual behaviour with the biological needs of the collective.[45] Biopower targets life in its totality, from the individual through to the collective. Reflecting on these developments, Giorgio Agamben goes so far as to propose that the modern world can be defined by the failure of all 'historical tasks' for humanity so that only life, the animality or biological existence of the human, is able to still hold meaning and significance.[46] Life is coming to be the most important and elementary source of modern power.

Theorists of biopolitics have insisted, however, that it is imperative to understand how the modern politics of life always risk reversion to racism, war and death.[47] If the Romantic era gave rise to a biopolitics that sought to administer the health and productivity of a living population, this was nonetheless matched with what Foucault terms a 'thanatopolitics' that sought to marshal the population for war.[48] In his classic study of military professional power, *The Soldier and the State*, Samuel Huntington adapted Harold Lasswell's work on the modern 'garrison state' to encapsulate how war has today come to be waged through ideals of military professionalism and national service by the 'managers of violence'.[49] This study takes such thought further, however, by examining how military professionalism has been implicated with the disciplinary management and control of bodies

[45] Thomas Lemke notes that Foucault does not consistently maintain this distinction between the terms biopolitics and biopower, after having first elaborated the difference in volume one of the *History of Sexuality*, and the two terms essentially become synonymous in his later work, Thomas Lemke, *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*, trans. Eric Frederick Trump (New York: New York University Press, 2011), 34. Rancière believes that Foucault's work must be understood as a theory of power, a biopower, but rejects the idea that there might also be a positive or emancipatory biopolitics, or politics based on an 'ontology of life'. See Jacques Rancière, *Dissenus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, ed. and trans. Steven Corcoran (London: Continuum, 2010), 93–94.

[46] Giorgio Agamben, *The Open: Man and Animal*, trans. Kevin Attell (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 75–77. Agamben is primarily concerned with twentieth-century totalitarianism, Foucault however finds the roots of that totalitarianism in the biopolitics that first formed in the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries, see Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 149–50.

[47] See Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 135–59; Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998); and Roberto Esposito, *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, trans. Timothy Campbell (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

[48] On the relationship between biopolitics and thanatopolitics, see Michel Foucault, 'The Political Technology of Individuals', in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1985. Volume 3*, ed. James D. Faubian, trans. Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1994), 416.

[49] Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-10044-1 — Romanticism and the Biopolitics of Modern War Writing
Neil Ramsey
Excerpt
More Information

and lives. The specialist knowledge of the professional soldier is inseparable from the forms of knowledge derived from military disciplinary power, as a new body of military literature transformed the mechanical approach of neo-classical military thought by cultivating quasi-medical concerns with the vitality of disciplinary subjects.[50] A new disciplinary regime began to conceptualise the disciplined subject in terms of what Foucault describes as the 'natural body', a biopolitical body of vital, living forces, a body informed by inner depths and potentials that resist the imposition of 'mechanical' authority.[51] While modern military thought undoubtedly encompasses many diverse topics, at its heart it shares a new-found set of mechanisms for developing the basis of all military power in the living body. No longer was war fought as the basic right of the sovereign, war was fought to protect and foster the purity, health and vitality of the nation, meaning that an increasingly professionalised military began to wage wars not simply as the managers of violence, but as the 'managers of life'.[52]

Cultural and media theorists such as Christoph Menke and Friedrich Kittler have insisted, however, that the natural body revealed by Foucault stands at the intersection of both new kinds of disciplinary practices and new forms of aesthetics that governed Romanticism.[53] As a growing number of studies have shown, it is far from a coincidence that biopolitics emerged at the same moment that an Aristotelian poetry of 'action' was superseded by a Romantic poetics grounded in the ordinary details of human life, a poetics 'dedicated to the repetition and reproduction of unadorned life'.[54] If Romantic aesthetics is underpinned by an organic model, a similar organicism was deeply implicated in the development of modern military thought. The eighteenth-century language of aesthetics paralleled the rise of a language of military discipline, Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten theorised the cultivation of aesthetic taste by likening the

[50] On the distinction between the study of professionalisation and disciplinarisation, see Jan Goldstein, 'Foucault among the Sociologists: The "Disciplines" and the History of the Professions', *History and Theory* 23, no. 2 (1984): 170–92.
[51] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 155. On a new conception of life in the modern era, see Davide Tarizzo, *Life: A Modern Invention*, trans. Mark William Epstein (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 3–5.
[52] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 137.
[53] Christoph Menke, *Force: A Fundamental Concept of Aesthetic Anthropology*, trans. Gerrit Jackson (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012); Friedrich Kittler, *The Truth of the Technological World: Essays on the Genealogy of Presence*, trans. Erik Butler (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2014), 1–17.
[54] Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Literature*, trans. Julie Rose (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011), 9–11. See also Hunt and Rudolf, eds, *Romanticism and Biopolitics*.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press & Assessment www.cambridge.org