

Introduction

Lisa Downing

I don't write a book so that it will be the final word; I write a book so that other books are possible, not necessarily written by me.

Michel Foucault, interview, 1971

The work of an intellectual is not to mould the political will of others; it is, through the analyses that he does in his own field, to re-examine evidence and assumptions, to shake up habitual ways of working and thinking, to dissipate conventional familiarities, to re-evaluate rules and institutions and to participate in the formation of a political will.

Michel Foucault, interview, 1989

Michel Foucault (1926–1984) considered himself a ‘historian of the present’.¹ By this, he meant that he intended his archeological and genealogical studies of institutions and phenomena, such as psychiatry, prisons, and criminality, to reveal, via analysis of the past conditions that produced them, a truth about our enduring relationship with them in the present. Foucault first used the term ‘history of the present’ in *Discipline and Punish* (1975), where he rhetorically asks why he is motivated to carry out a historical analysis of the carceral system: ‘Simply because I am interested in the past? No, if one means by that writing a history of the past in terms of the present. Yes, if one means writing the history of the present’.² Thus, a ‘history of the present’ is not anachronism, that is, the past viewed and distorted through the necessarily biased lens of the present; rather, as Foucault put it: ‘I set out from a problem expressed in the terms current today and I try to work out its genealogy. Genealogy means that I begin my analysis from a question posed in the present’.³

Given Foucault’s desire to write a history of the present, it bears asking in what ways, and to what extent, the concerns of *his* present speak, still today, to ours. The work of Foucault is much read, widely cited, and often misunderstood. In response to this state of affairs, this book aims to clarify, contextualize, and contribute to knowledge about Foucault in

a very specific way. Rather than offering either a conceptual introduction to Foucault's work for absolute beginners (for several works of this kind already exist), or yet a series of interventions aimed specifically at Foucault specialists, and contributing to the scholarly debates of a small group of initiates, *After Foucault* instead explores a range of Foucault's critical afterlives in an accessible and wide-ranging way, appealing to multiple readerships, contextualizing the place of his thought in current debates, and explaining the legacy with which Foucault leaves us today. While an array of disparate, disciplinary perspectives are brought together in the book, one contention underlies all the contributions: the ideas, concepts, and phenomena Foucault was working on in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s continue to speak to us today, some thirty-two years after his death.

Eight years ago, in the afterword to my *Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault*, I wrote:

If readers continue to be interested in Foucault – and all the signs suggest that this is the case – it is, perhaps, because these very tensions and internal contradictions make him one of the most relevant thinkers for our current age.⁴

The 'tensions and internal contradictions' to which I drew attention here are key features of the Foucauldian oeuvre and are, for many, a source of fascination that keeps us going back to Foucault. These include his ability to evoke, at the same time, a rejection of 'depth claims' and a paradoxical valorization of the transcendental or mystical voice of unreason exposed in the words of 'mad' writers. They recall his suspicion of the idea of the sovereign human self, on the one hand, and his propounding of 'self-stylization' as a project of ethics, on the other. And they point to his critique of the dominance of discourses about sexuality over techniques for producing bodily pleasures in the modern West, at the same time as his own multi-volume *History of Sexuality* cannot but also constitute an example of a 'discourse about sex'.

My 2008 'Afterword' reads, in hindsight, as a statement of the need, not so much for the book I was writing then, but rather for the current book. It signals the ongoing aptness of Foucault's thought for helping us to apprehend 'the political, ecological and ideological conditions in which we live' – conditions which are increasingly often marked by discourses of crisis, of conflict, of rupture, and of end times. In particular, our post-millennial condition seems marked precisely by this idea of 'after', encapsulated in the discourse of 'post-'. Yet being 'post' is never so simple as it may seem. We are allegedly 'post-human', yet we are troubled, in an

all-too-human way, by the ills of our age; we are immersed in neoliberal values and systems, and yet we often tend to understand our discontent in individualistic terms and to seek respite from it via the very consumerist pursuits neoliberalism encourages (so-called ‘post-feminism’ in particular epitomizes this trend); we are in an era of ‘post-truth’ politics, yet (therefore) in truly desperate need of the skills of apprehending *in whose interests* lies are being told. Foucault, in all his difficult, rich, debunking-yet-still-oddly-idealistic, complexity is relevant, then, precisely because we are living in profoundly contradictory times, in times in which surface and depth are often perceived as interchangeable, and in which the notion that something is over – is ‘post-’ – may be used to exculpate those who benefit from getting us to avert our eyes from still-operational ideologies and phenomena. Just as Foucault’s histories of the present involved identifying or ‘diagnosing’ a contemporary phenomenon or problematic, and then tracing its emergence in order to destabilize or disturb the commonplace apprehension of it,⁶ so we may look back to Foucault and his methods to re-view our troubled world through fresh eyes.

The Foucault Industry

This book is not the first to consider how Foucault’s writing and thought have gone on to shape ways of approaching the search for knowledge in the disciplines and in the world. Jonathan Arac’s 1988 collection, entitled, along similar lines to the current work, *After Foucault: Humanistic Knowledge, Postmodern Challenges*,⁷ reflects on possible applications of Foucault’s work for a number of fields and disciplines, most notably philology, history, psychoanalysis, and feminism. Published only four years after Foucault’s death, and emerging from a conference that took place three years prior to publication, the book’s reflection on how Foucault’s ‘history’ speaks to ‘the present’ evokes, inevitably, largely the same ‘present’ as that in which Foucault himself was working. Its disciplinary focus also very much reflects the fashions of the 1980s in the humanities disciplines, making it a historical work in its own right now, a product of its own (and of Foucault’s) time. Therefore, while Arac’s book is a valuable contribution to Foucault studies, which contains some significant essays, it is time for a work that brings some of the concerns raised therein bang up to date. More recently, Sophie Fuggle, Yari Lanci, and Martina Tazzioli’s *Foucault and the History of Our Present* (2014)⁸ reads Foucault as a practitioner of ‘radical journalism’, observing the present from a position of ‘dislocation from the space where we are’.⁹ The book sets out to examine

contemporary questions of governmentality, subjectivity, and politics, from a Foucauldian perspective. While this agenda superficially resembles that of the current work, Fuggle et al.'s book is aimed at a specialist readership, and the co-authored introduction to the collection is densely, and at times opaquely, written.¹⁰

Other existing works focus on how Foucault's legacy influences a specific field, with numerous titles appearing particularly in the field of history and historiography. Examples include Robert S. Leventhal's collection *Reading After Foucault* (1994),¹¹ which focuses specifically on a Foucauldian reading of German history in the period 1750–1830, and John Neubauer's edited book of 1999, *Cultural History After Foucault*,¹² the aim of which is to examine how Foucault's work casts new light on the cultural historical scholarship of Antiquity, the Renaissance, and the nineteenth century. Several works on politics after Foucault also exist. Richard Marsden's *The Nature of Capital: Marx After Foucault* (1999)¹³ attempts to challenge the critical orthodoxy that Foucault and Marx are incompatible intellectual and political bedfellows by re-reading them both, retroactively, through the philosophy of critical realism. Michael Clifford's *Political Genealogy After Foucault: Savage Identities* (2001)¹⁴ uses the figures of the 'noble savage' and the 'savage noble' to carry out a genealogical analysis of the political subject of modernity. More recently, Magnus Hörnqvist's 2010 work, *Risk, Power and the State: After Foucault*,¹⁵ assesses the strengths – and weaknesses – of Foucault's models of governmentality, discourse analysis, and critique of Deleuzianism for understanding the workings of contemporary state power.

In some fields and sub-disciplines, then, Foucauldian thought has become axiomatic, and the number of recent publications charting and evaluating his influence attests to this. In addition to history and politics, the related interdisciplinary fields of gender studies, sexuality studies, and queer theory are notable inheritors of Foucauldian ideas. And it is these fields of enquiry that have most meaningfully imported a Foucauldian methodology, more or less wholesale, into their epistemology and hermeneutics. Judith Butler, often (and not unproblematically) considered one of the principal inaugurators of gender studies and 'queer',¹⁶ employs recognizably Foucauldian methods throughout her oeuvre on gender, bodies, and sex.¹⁷ Butler's notions of performativity and drag, developed most fully in *Gender Trouble* (1990), build on Foucauldian insights from the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1976) which hold that sexual desire is not natural or deeply individual, but rather produced in and through discourse, and is both social and political. (Butler develops Foucault's

analysis of sexuality to include also gender identity and gender performance.) Similarly, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's influential *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990),¹⁸ published in the same year as *Gender Trouble*, builds on Foucauldian ideas about the relationship of knowledge to power to explore the meanings of 'closetedness', of knowing and not-knowing, in the sphere of sexual identity. She argues that, from the nineteenth century onwards, Western discourse has organized knowledge along binary lines, that can be understood as mapping on to the assumed heterosexual/homosexual dyad (where the former term is unmarked and positive and the latter othered and subordinated). More recently, Lynne Huffer's monograph, *Mad for Foucault* (2010),¹⁹ has re-envisioned queer's inheritance of Foucault by paying attention to Foucauldian texts other than the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*, in particular his early writings on madness, in order to show that the queer insights Foucault offers us for understanding the world are both sprinkled throughout his oeuvre and are, indeed at the heart of his entire life's project in all its disparate glory.

The existence of a not insignificant number of titles on varying aspects of Foucault's afterlives, then, corroborates the strength of his enduring relevance beyond his lived moment. Yet, what none of these titles quite does, and what precisely motivates the writers of the present book, is, first, to offer clarification of key concepts from Foucault's oeuvre that persist in shaping our understanding of the world; second, to contextualize Foucault's texts and thought in a range of both traditional and emergent academic fields; and, third and finally, to carry out a series of readings after Foucault. In this way, by attending to these three distinct but connected concerns in one book, *After Foucault* does not stop at elaborating the ongoing usefulness of the Foucauldian 'toolbox', but goes on to deploy it in a series of timely, innovative, and heuristic ways.

After Foucault

The division of the book into three parts is underpinned by its three aims, as stated earlier: clarifying, contextualizing, and carrying out readings.

Accordingly, the chapters in Part I, 'Going After Foucault', analyse what is particular to, or at the heart of, a series of key Foucauldian concepts. (They 'go after' the substance of these concepts.) These are notions that, despite first appearing in works by Foucault between the 1960s and the 1980s, continue to animate critical debates today. Beginning with the central question of thinking of history differently, the opening chapter by Robert Gillett shows how 'genealogy', developed in the work of Friedrich

Nietzsche, and providing a distinct alternative in the nineteenth century to the contemporaneous and competing Hegelian model of dialectics, inspired Foucault precisely because it offers an account of history that foregrounds the place of power relations and discontinuity in historical processes.²⁰ Gillett demonstrates how this concept, that animated Foucault's late work, continues to be productive for thinking about narratives of identity in our epoch. By showing how genealogical thought is key to queer thinking and politics, Gillett argues that understanding genealogy fully offers insight also into understanding the ongoing political necessity of queer. He therefore suggests strongly that, contrary to some recent claims, we are very far from being 'post-queer'.²¹

In their chapter on Foucault's multiple theorizations of subjectivity, Monica Greco and Martin Savransky contend that Foucault's work constitutes 'a veritable event in the history of modern thought', such that thinking about subjectivity after Foucault always, inevitably, involves thinking it *with* and *through* him. This is the nature, they suggest, of inheritance. Looking at the models of the self offered by Foucault enables them to plot two historical/philosophical ways of thinking: first of the self in relation to, and as revelatory of, truth, and second of the self as aligned with the question, not of what one *is*, but of what one might *become*. Following the second model, they offer a reading of Foucault's later work on the ethical care for the self as an interrogatory gesture, opening up for contemporary and later readers the question of what kinds of relationship we may build between subjectivity, truth, and freedom. The problematic nature of freedom and selfhood is picked up again in Nicholas Gane's chapter on Foucault's controversial and much-debated lectures and texts on neoliberalism. Gane focuses on Foucault's 1978–1979 lectures at the Collège de France, published in English as *The Birth of Biopolitics* in 2008, which are notable both for being one of Foucault's rare historical analyses of twentieth-century phenomena, and for having been delivered in France at the very time that the pro-free market ideology of neoliberalism was taking hold in Margaret Thatcher's United Kingdom and Ronald Reagan's United States. Rather than seeking to answer unequivocally the oft-posed question of whether Foucault's approach to neoliberalism was approbatory or condemnatory, Gane instead takes the eminently Foucauldian position of tracing the genealogy of neoliberalism back through Austrian and American economic philosophical traditions, in order to show up the logic and contradictions inherent to, and subtending, neoliberal philosophy. In the context of the recent financial crisis, and ongoing global economic uncertainty, the task of seeking a deeper and fuller understanding of where

neoliberalism comes from, and what it aims toward, via the genealogical method, appears not only salient, but urgent.

The final chapter in Part I focusses on Foucault's concept of biopower and biopolitics, the system by which the organization and governance of human populations as living individuals and groups are arrived at. After situating biopower in Foucault's oeuvre, as one of several modes of power he chose to investigate (along with sovereign power and disciplinary power), the authors, Kay Peggs and Barry Smart, explore an implication of biopower that Foucault himself raised, but did not pursue in any great depth: the question of the instrumentalization by human beings of non-human animals. Peggs and Smart show how Foucault's work is a central tool for thinking about the form of power that operates in battery farms and scientific laboratories, and for raising ethical questions about human–non-human power relations and the largely unchallenged bigotry of speciesism. The chapters in Part I, then, offer critical insights into some of Foucault's most intriguing ideas, enabling readers with an interest in Foucault to get to grips with the particularity of his theory and the flavour of his legacy, and, in each case, linking a key concept to phenomena, events, and debates that are relevant to the contemporary world.

The chapters in Part II, entitled 'Coming After Foucault', attend to the chronological and influential senses of 'after'. In particular, they examine the influence of Foucault's writings on a range of the disciplinary/discursive fields (in the academy and in political movements), where his ideas have permeated, sometimes in ways that are implicit, partial, or not apparent from outside the discipline in question.

In the first chapter of this part of the book, Simon During explores Foucault's impact on the sphere of literary theory. He charts Foucault's uneven reception in the Anglophone world and isolates an element in Foucault's writing about literature – a concern with the mystical and the sacred – that may have placed him at odds with what During identifies as the secular, identitarian, and liberatory underpinnings of critical theory of the late twentieth century. During argues that, where Foucault *has* been taken up for literary criticism, the texts that have been mined are those that examine institutions and power, not those that explore the transcendental voice of 'mad' writers. It is, then, this earlier, oft-ignored element of Foucault's corpus that During envisages as the potential inspiration for a 'secular criticism-to-come, willing to risk attaching itself to literature's metaphysical and mystical capacities'. During's monograph, *Foucault and Literature* (1992),²² is one of the few extant, full-length works about Foucault's own literary criticism and on the uses of Foucault *for*

literary criticism. In his chapter of *After Foucault*, he brings the insights in this key text up to date for the twenty-first century. In somewhat similar vein, Lynne Huffer's chapter on Foucault and queer theory, much like her ground-breaking monograph *Mad for Foucault*, discussed earlier in this Introduction, takes as its starting point the fact that, while the idea of Foucault as a progenitor of queer is widely accepted, only certain parts of Foucault's corpus tend to be credited with being properly queer (namely *The History of Sexuality*). Reading Foucault through queer theorist Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's work on love, Huffer suggests that attending to a genealogy of love in Foucault may offer a new perspective on how he contributes to the history of queer. This suggestion comes in tandem with an observation that very recent texts of queer theory are marked by a move away from Foucault's hermeneutics of suspicion, and in the direction of an affective or 'new materialist' turn. This broad 'turn', which has impacted critical theory in recent years, aims to relativize the post-structuralist focus on language (or discourse understood as language + power) with a consideration of embodied experiences of, in Huffer's words, 'sensation, matter, and affect'.

In her chapter on Foucault, race, and racism, Rey Chow charts some of the criticisms levelled at Foucault with regard to race – particularly the common accusation that he is guilty of Eurocentrism. She then goes on to reject such easy accusations in favour of a more nuanced reading of Foucault's writing on race to show what it might bring to a critical apprehension of race and racism. She argues that a careful reading of Foucault allows for an understanding of racialization as, not simply a matter of prejudice based on perceived skin colour, but rather as aligned with 'state institutions, social practices, and individual conscience productions that continue to be galvanized by Christian techniques of power'. Ending on a note of warning, Chow suggests that, at the time of writing, in 2016, Muslims have come to wear the mantle of 'racialized other', with Islam consistently associated with the terror against which (Western) 'society must be defended'.

Part II closes with Emma A. Foster's consideration of ecology and environmentalism, fields that are seldom considered in works about Foucault, but that have nevertheless been influenced in recent years by Foucauldian insights. Foster shows how Foucault's thought is pertinent for the field in terms of the challenge it poses to simple or singular definitions both of 'Nature' and of the human subject who interacts with it. A Foucauldian analysis, fully aware of the workings of discursive power, allows for problematization of the notion of the 'good ecosubject', who is often

constructed along ‘racialized, gendered and heteronormative lines’. Given the intensifying focus on ecological concerns in politics and international relations, and the recent turn in literary and cultural studies towards ecocriticism, Foster’s chapter provides both a crucial survey of existing uses of Foucault for the field and an analysis of the import of resisting the normativity inherent in some assumptions underlying ecocritique.

Part III, ‘Reading After Foucault’, addresses the question of how our readings of texts and visual culture, of cultural products, and of social phenomena have changed, or may be inflected, as a result of Foucault’s intellectual legacy. This part of the book opens with a chapter by Tim Dean, who interrogates what is understood in the twenty-first century by ‘sex’, how this differs from ‘sexuality’, and how a close reading of Foucault may help us to make sense of both. Using examples from contemporary culture, including recent campaigns about sexual assault on US university campuses, Dean argues that Foucault offers a necessary corrective to ‘US myths of individualism’, by offering an account of (sexual) ‘power as relational’. Further, he wonders what would need to be done to wrest ‘sex’ away from ‘sexuality’, that is, away from the discursive province of the medical and psy sciences, and to reframe it, as Foucault would have wished, on the side of aesthetics.

Jacques Khalip, in his chapter on Foucauldian ethics, also opens with a focus on aesthetics. Khalip uses an auto-fictional literary text (Hervé Guibert’s *To the Friend Who Did Not Save My Life*, 1990) and a photographic artwork (Robert Mapplethorpe’s *Fist Fuck/Double*, 1978), alongside Foucault’s essays and interviews, to argue that ethics, for Foucault, must not be understood either as straightforward care for others, nor as material self-interest. Rather, he argues that Foucault propounds ‘a care for the self that rejects narcissistic claims about defending the future well-being of one’s own “life”’. Engaging with recent work in antisocial queer theory, by names such as Lee Edelman,²³ Khalip posits that Foucauldian ethics takes us beyond the horizons of personal aims and ambitions to suggest an almost post-human commitment to detachment. In short, Khalip reads against the grain to reveal a cruel and depersonalized Foucauldian ethics that stands in stark contradistinction to the more commonly recognizable one that asks ‘but couldn’t everyone’s life become a work of art?’²⁴ Also drawing on semi-auto/biographical fiction as a starting point, Oliver Davis’s chapter on the ‘queer pharmatopia’ examines Mathieu Lindon’s novel, *Learning What Love Means* (2011), which depicts the life of a group of young students and philosophers, including a fictionalized version of the author, who frequented the apartment of the charismatic figure of ‘Michel’

(the novel's representative of Foucault) in the 1960s, and partook of recreational drugs. Via discussion of the fictional work, Davis undertakes a Foucauldian critique of the contemporary medicalized discourse of drug addiction, and the pathologization of the practice particularly when carried out by gay men (referencing the contemporary 'epidemic' – or 'moral panic', depending on one's position – of 'chemsex', or uninhibited sexual activity, enhanced by the influence of drugs, often in a party setting). Davis examines the extent to which Foucault's recreational drug use can be understood, less as a pathological practice, and more as a creative 'practice of the self'.

Finally, Part III closes with my chapter on Foucault and true crime. This chapter considers the fact that much ink has been spilled in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries in the service of writing about true crime and criminals, both in popular and academic contexts. It also notes that Foucault's analysis of the criminal figure as an exceptional, 'abnormal' subject is a reference point for much writing of this kind. Yet, despite these facts, very little has been done to respond to Foucault's recommendation in *I Pierre Rivière...* (1973) that researchers should assemble and analyse dossiers around crimes in order to identify the dominant discursive conditions surrounding and producing them. My chapter attempts precisely to take Foucault up on this: it undertakes a Foucauldian reading of three texts produced around a twentieth-century British criminal case, that of the Moors Murders (the killings of a number of children, carried out by Myra Hindley and Ian Brady in the North of England in the 1960s). The texts in the dossier are a work of classic New-Journalism-inspired 'true crime', Emlyn Williams's *Beyond Belief* (1967), a book about the psychology of murder written by the killer Ian Brady, *The Gates of Janus* (2001), and *Myra, Beyond Saddleworth* (2012), a novel by Jean Rafferty that explores what might have happened had Myra Hindley not died in prison in 2002, but instead been released. The chapter reflects upon the place of genre writing in contributing to the non-normative and mythical subjectification of the criminal; it looks at the porousness of genre, since each book considered deviates in key ways from being mere reportage; and it asks, finally, why the figure of the 'abnormal' criminal fascinated Foucault and continues to fascinate contemporary Western readers quite so much. In some ways, then, Part III is the most obviously relevant section of the book for students and scholars of literary and cultural studies, as three of its chapters take texts that span fact and fiction – semi-autobiographical novels and works in the true crime genre – as their objects of Foucauldian enquiry. Others 'read' a phenomenon – sex in the case of Dean's chapter;

Introduction

II

ethics in Khalip's – with and through Foucauldian texts and concepts. By examining a given text, trend, or phenomenon in light of Foucauldian ideas, the chapters in Part III offer the reader blueprints for undertaking their own Foucauldian readings of literary and cultural products.

It is notable that some concepts and issues are discussed multiple times across the different chapters. Unsurprisingly, questions of power, history, and the self receive multiple treatments. But more strikingly, and in keeping with a work that brings the afterlives of Foucault up to the present day, questions of neoliberalism, community, and individuality; issues of ecological responsibility and animal welfare; debates about the sacred and the secular; and vexed questions of sexual identity – or queer dis-identification – recur in the context of several different analyses and discussions, pointing up areas of especial relevance to contemporary concerns. Throughout the book, the heterogeneity of both the Foucauldian corpus and potential approaches to it are preserved and foregrounded. Each of the authors takes his or her own analytical, political, and epistemological approach to the concepts, contexts, and texts he or she considers, and some of these stand in contradiction to, or disagreement with, each other. Contradictions are left deliberately unreconciled within the book, as they mark the precise multiplicity of resonances and possible interpretations that Foucault's work opens up, and that render it, as discussed throughout this introduction, so eminently *timely*.

Notes

- 1 For a thorough account of what Foucault means by this term, and where in his oeuvre he uses it, see David Garland, 'What Is a "History of the Present"? On Foucault's Genealogies and Their Critical Preconditions', *Punishment and Society*, 16:4, 2014, 365–384.
- 2 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. A. Sheridan, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991 [1975]), 31.
- 3 Lawrence D. Kritzman, 'Power and Sex: An Interview with Michel Foucault, in *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, ed. L. D. Kritzman (New York, NY: Routledge, 1988), 262.
- 4 Lisa Downing, *The Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 118.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 119.
- 6 Garland, 'What Is a "History of the Present"?', 368.
- 7 Jonathan Arac, *After Foucault: Humanistic Knowledge, Postmodern Challenges* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988).
- 8 Sophie Fuggle, Yari Lanci, and Martina Tazzioli, eds., *Foucault and the History of Our Present* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

- 9 Ibid., 1.
- 10 Additionally, many of the essays included in this work, while interesting in their own right, do not consider, as the editors claim, how Foucault's work impacts the *present*, so much as the (fairly) recent past (e.g. the chapter on Marxism by Alberto Toscano, 26–42). See my review of this work: Lisa Downing, 'Review: Sophie Fuggle, Yari Lanci and Martina Tazzioli (eds.), *Foucault and the History of Our Present*. Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015', *French Studies*, 70:4, 2016, www.fs.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2016/08/13/fs.knw202.full.pdf
- 11 Robert S. Leventhal, ed., *Reading After Foucault: Institutions, Disciplines and Technologies of the Self in Germany, 1750–1830* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1994).
- 12 John Neubauer, ed., *Cultural History After Foucault* (New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1999).
- 13 Richard Marsden, *The Nature of Capital: Marx After Foucault* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999).
- 14 Michael Clifford, *Political Genealogy After Foucault: Savage Identities* (London: Routledge, 2001).
- 15 Magnus Hörnqvist, *Risk, Power and the State: After Foucault* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2010).
- 16 First, since queer resists the narrative of origins and the myth of originators, it is always tricky to attribute such labels to names in the field. Second, it is worth being aware of the fact that the history of queer theory is susceptible to accusations of 'whitewashing'. The coining of the term 'queer' is often attributed to Teresa de Lauretis, yet others argue that the radical woman of colour, Gloria Anzaldúa, both coined 'queer' and carried out queer work before either de Lauretis or Butler. See *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, ed. Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa (Watertown, MA: Persephone Press, 1981).
- 17 From *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990), through *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (London: Routledge, 1993), to *Undoing Gender* (London: Routledge, 2004), Butler's works on sex, gender, and bodies are thoroughly underpinned by Foucauldian ideas of the importance of thinking sex through discourse (as suggested by the subtitle of *Bodies That Matter*).
- 18 Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990).
- 19 Lynne Huffer, *Mad for Foucault: Rethinking the Foundations of Queer Theory* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2010).
- 20 'Genealogy' is understood in Gillett's account, and also in Lynne Huffer's chapter in Section 2 of the book, as a critical reading practice as well as a way of understanding history. For Foucault, of course, who famously claimed 'I am fully aware that I have never written anything other than fictions', the two are not distinct undertakings, as less queer versions of historiography might hold. See Foucault, 'Interview with Lucille Finas', in *Michel Foucault: Power, Truth, Strategy*, ed. M. Morris and P. Patton (Sydney: Feral Publications, 1979), 79.

Introduction

13

- 21 For an exploration of the contention that the work of queer is done and we are 'post-queer', see David V. Ruffalo, *Post-Queer Politics* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009) and James Penney, *After Queer Theory: The Limits of Sexual Politics* (London: Pluto, 2014).
- 22 Simon During, *Foucault and Literature: Towards a Genealogy of Writing* (London: Routledge, 1992).
- 23 Lee Edelman's *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004) is often considered the foundational text of 'anti-social queer', a Lacanian- rather than Foucauldian-influenced branch of queer that argues that discourses of health, reproduction, 'The Child', and, indeed, the future itself, are heteronormative concepts that are mobilized to other the dissident queer subject. Such a subject would do well, Edelman suggests, to reject these discourses of futurity rather than to seek assimilation with their values.
- 24 Foucault, *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, ed. P. Rabinow, trans. R. Hurley et al. (New York, NY: New Press, 1997), 261.