

CONTEMPORARY EQUIPMENT:  
A DIAGNOSTIC

---

PAUL RABINOW  
GAYMON BENNETT

# CONTEMPORARY EQUIPMENT: A DIAGNOSTIC

---

INTRODUCTION	1
FROM A HISTORY OF THE PRESENT TO AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE CONTEMPORARY	2
PROBLEMATIZATION	3
EQUIPMENT	6
FORM 1: ANTIQUE EQUIPMENT	8
FORM 2: MODERN EQUIPMENT	10
FORM 3: CONTEMPORARY EQUIPMENT	12
PRACTICING DIAGNOSTICS	14
A DIAGNOSTIC OF EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS	17
FROM REGIMES TO MODES	17
EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS	19
TABLES, CATEGORIES, AND CONNECTIONS	20
EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS	24
APPENDIX OF CONCEPTS	60

# INTRODUCTION

In early May 2007, Rabinow called for “secession,” in Blumenberg’s sense of refusing predominant practices, concepts, and problems, where they prove unhelpful for work on the problematization at hand. Scientifically and ethically, relations among and between the life sciences, human sciences, and ethics need sustained re-thinking and re-working. Such labor cannot be conducted, it seemed to us, unless the adequacy of reigning habits, dispositions, and deliverables are vigorously contested. It was at that point of secession that a period of extremely intense conceptual work began, culminating several months later in the production of a diagnostic grid for re-thinking relations among the life sciences, human sciences, and ethics (<http://bios-technika.net/diagnostics-grid.html>). This diagnostic grid has remained in the background, functioning as a powerful conceptual tool for the practice of orientation, production, and verification.

What follows in the first section of this appendix should be read as a kind of “users-guide” to our human practices diagnostic. The diagnostic (see the second part of the appendix) is composed of four tables consisting of categories and conceptual distinctions. It is designed to aid inquiry, and, where appropriate and possible, the design and composition of equipment. The tables, categories, and distinctions are not representational. In fashioning them we did not suffer the conceit

often attributed to the functionalist projects of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century; we do not presume that our categories are comprehensive, and thereby adequate, if abstract, distillations of the real essence of things across comparative domains.

## DIAGNOSIS

*Diagnosis has two functions. The first is analytic. It functions to lay out tables of categories. That is to say, a diagnosis serves a critical function; it facilitates the work of decomposition of complex wholes in order to test the logic on the basis of which composition has taken place. In diagnosis, the work of decomposition cannot be an end-in-itself. Rather, analysis must be followed by recomposition. This synthetic work is the second function of a diagnosis.*

Cluster 1: Diagnosing Equipment: **Diagnosis, Affect, Truth Claim, Ethical Mode, Equipment**

Cluster 2: Critical position for Human Practices: **Diagnosis, Contemporary, History of the Present, Problematization, Remediation**

Cluster 3: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality: **Diagnosis, Salvation, Veridiction, Jurisdiction, Political Spirituality**

We designed the diagnostic to open up inquiry, not to close it down. It is our intent that the diagnostic facilitate both generative and formative capacities: generative by proliferating analytic distinctions and modularizing their relations, formative by providing a basis for the discrimination of significance and systematic variation. In its use it has functioned as a mode of veridiction. In the course of our inquiry we have assessed the strengths and limitations of the diagnostic by testing its tables, categories, and concepts against the objects and objectifications produced during the course of our inquiry.

## FROM A HISTORY OF THE PRESENT TO AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE CONTEMPORARY

The orientation to this diagnostic work began with a distinction between Foucault's history of the present and Rabinow's anthropology of the contemporary, two analytic modes which orient inquiry to problematizations in consonant and complementary ways, but which bear on different objects and are designed for different outcomes.

Foucault experimented throughout his life with developing methods of analysis adequate to diagnosing and conceptualizing problematizations in history. Although he never settled on a fixed or definitive method, his consistent, if not unique goal, was to contribute to a history of the present. In that project, a certain understanding of the past would provide a means of showing the contingency of the present and thereby contribute to making a more open future. Although we have frequently been blocked by the entrenchment of prior practices, it is an orienting supposition of our work that the life sciences generally, and synthetic biology specifically, is in a zone of transition and instability. It follows that techniques for demonstrating contingency and for opening up possibilities, such as the history of the present allows, are not the principal aim and necessity. Rather, analytic modes are needed for giving form to under-determined and emergent relations, and for specifying the significance of these relations.

What is the contemporary? The ordinary English language meaning of the term "the contemporary" is: "existing or occurring at, or dating from, the same period of time as something or somebody else." But there is the second meaning

of “distinctively modern in style” as in “a variety of favorite contemporary styles.”

<sup>1</sup> The first use has no historical connotations, only temporal ones; Cicero was the contemporary of Caesar just as Thelonious Monk was the contemporary of John Coltrane or Gerhard Richter is the contemporary of Gerhard Schroeder.

## CONTEMPORARY

*Just as one can take up the “modern” as an ethos and not a period, one can take it up as a moving ratio. In that perspective, tradition and modernity are not opposed but paired: “tradition is a moving image of the past, opposed not to modernity but to alienation.” One can take up the contemporary as a “moving ratio of modernity, moving through the recent past and the near future in a (non-linear) space that gauges modernity as an ethos already becoming historical.”*

Cluster 1: Modes of Collaboration: Contemporary, Collaboration, Venue, Reconstruction, Equipment

Cluster 2: Critical Position for Human Practices: Contemporary, History of the Present, Problematization, Remediation, Diagnosis

Cluster 3: Contemporary Mode of Anthropology: Contemporary, Anthropology, Mode, Problem, Equipment

Cluster 4: Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: Contemporary, Apparatus, Pathway, History of the Present, Ramify

The second meaning, however, does carry an historical connotation and a curious one that can be used to both equate and differentiate the contemporary from the modern. It is that marking that is pertinent to the project at hand. Just as one can take up the “modern” as an ethos and not a period, one can take it up as a moving ratio. In that perspective, tradition and modernity are not opposed but paired: “tradition is a moving image of the past, opposed not to modernity but to alienation.” <sup>2</sup> To quote Rabinow: “The contemporary is a moving ratio of modernity, moving through the recent past and near future in a (non-linear) space that gauges modernity as an ethos already becoming historical.” <sup>3</sup>

The anthropology of the contemporary seeks to develop methods, practices, and forms of inquiry and narration coherent and co-operable with understandings of the mode (or modes) taken by anthropos as figure and an assemblage today. <sup>4</sup>

## PROBLEMATIZATION

A problematization, Michel Foucault writes, “does not mean the representation of a pre-existent object nor the creation through discourse of an object that did not exist. It is the ensemble of discursive and non-discursive

practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc).”<sup>5</sup> The reason that problematizations are problematic, not surprisingly, is that, something prior “must have happened to introduce uncertainty, a loss of familiarity; that loss, that uncertainty is the result of difficulties in our previous way of understanding, acting, relating.”<sup>6</sup>

The primary task of the analyst is not to proceed directly toward intervention and repair of the situation’s discordancy, as one could imagine those in the pragmatist traditions advocating, but rather to pause, reflect, and put forth a diagnosis of “what makes these responses simultaneously possible.”<sup>7</sup> For Foucault, the specific diacritic of thought is not uniquely in this act of diagnosis but additionally in the attempt to achieve a modal change from seeing a situation not only as “a given” but equally as “a question.” Such a modal shift seeks to accomplish a number of things. First it asserts that not only are there always multiple constraints at work in any historically troubled situation, but that multiple responses exist as well. Foucault underscores this condition of heterogeneous, if constrained, contingency -- “this transformation of an ensemble of difficulties into problems to which diverse solutions are proposed.” – in order to propose a particular style of inquiry. The act of thinking is an act of modal transformation from the constative to the subjunctive: from the singular to the multiple, from the necessary to the contingent.

A problematization then refers to both a kind of general historical formation as well as a nexus of responses to that formation. The diverse but not entirely disparate responses, it follows, eventually form (an increasingly

## PROBLEMATIZATION

*A problematization “is the ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc).” We are attempting to provide a problematization of the near future. In this position the challenge is not to make the present seem contingent, but to remediate current blockages and opportunities by conceptualizing the near future as a series of problems in relationship to which possible solutions become available to thought.*

Cluster I: Critical position for Human Practices:  
Problematization, Diagnosis, Contemporary, History  
of the Present, Remediation

significant) aspect of the problematization. Foucault is characterizing a historical space of conditioned contingency that emerges in relation to (and then forms a feed back situation with) a more general state of affairs, one that is real enough, but neither fixed nor static. Thus, the domain of problematization is constituted by and through economic conditions, scientific knowledge, political actors, and other related vectors. What is distinctive is Foucault's identification of the problematic state of affairs (the dynamic of the process of a specific type of problem description, characterization and reworking), as simultaneously the object, the site, and ultimately the substance, of thinking.

Foucault's concept of problematization is broad but not unlimited in scope. It is not as general as John Dewey's 'discordance.' Rather, Foucault's term requires that the situation in question contain institutionally legitimated

## PROBLEM

*A problem is composed of conceptual and practical poles. On the conceptual side a problem involves the work of transforming breakdowns, difficulties, discordancy, etc. into material (questions, objects, sites of inquiry, etc.) for thought. On the practical side a problem involves the formulation, design, and facilitation of possible courses of action that have been opened up and made available as solutions.*

Cluster 1: Determining Situations of Inquiry:  
Problem, Indetermination, Discordancy, Rectification, Reconstruction

claims to truth or one or another type of sanctioned seriousness, "serious speech acts". Without the presence of serious speech acts there is no problematization in the strict sense of the term (although obviously there could be any number and type of problems).

Foucault designed his concept for archaeological and genealogical work in a history of the present that aims to demonstrate or present contingency. For an anthropology of the contemporary concerned with emergent assemblages, developing a method or critical concepts, to demonstrate their contingency makes no sense. By definition, emergent assemblages are contingent. Consequently, the challenge is to design and invent modes of experimentation and verification with modified forms of critical analysis. We are orienting ourselves differently than Foucault. In the present one can look back or look forward. Foucault provided the lineaments of a problematization understood as historical phenomena involving blockages, problems, and diverse solutions. In the history of the present the question of

what it is that is being problematized is approached by specifying the ways in which a range of solutions can be traced back to a set of prior problematizations as responses to those problematizations. For example, taken up in a History of the Present two of the figures addressed in our work—biopower and human dignity—could be analyzed as responses to prior problematizations and not as sites of problematization themselves.

By contrast, we are attempting to provide a diagnostic that is oriented to the near future. In this position the challenge is not to make the present seem contingent, but, situating ourselves among contemporary blockages and opportunities, the challenge is to reformulate these blockages and opportunities as problems so as to make available a range of possible solutions. In an anthropology of the contemporary the question of what is being problematized is approached by identifying the ways in which formerly stable figures and their elements are becoming recombined and reconfigured such that a present challenge is to diagnose nascent figures, equipment, and assemblages. In our approach these nascent figures are not epochal, that is to say they are not simply replacing prior figures. Rather, they share elements of existing figures in the process of recombination and reconfiguration, such that a primary task is to identify the relations among and between figures and their elements, and to identify pathways of transformation as distinctive forms are taking shape. In sum, problematization taken up as a task of an anthropology of the contemporary rather than a history of the present, is not to trace current figures back to prior problematizations, but to remediate current blockages and opportunities by conceptualizing the near future as a series of problems in relationship to which possible solutions become available to thought.

## EQUIPMENT

Equipment, though conceptual in design and formulation, is pragmatic in use. Defined abstractly equipment is a set of truth claims, affects, and ethical orientations designed and combined into a practice.<sup>8</sup> Equipment, which has historically taken different forms, enables practical responses to changing conditions brought about by specific problems, events, and general reconfigurations.<sup>9</sup>



Equipment is a term (word+ concept + referent) that, by definition, does not retain a constant meaning. Such variation is a source of its richness and flexibility. Mapping and analyzing its distributions would be the kind of work a much more extended genealogy would have to undertake; how to undertake such an enterprise within the anthropology of the contemporary as opposed to the history of the present is, currently, largely unexplored, lacking the requisite navigational concepts and methods.

Equipment takes different forms in the contemporary. This variability stems from the fact that: the contemporary is neither a unified epoch nor a culture and consequently there is no reason to expect there would be a single form within it; as well as to the fact that scholarly work in the history of the present have shown that there are multiple facets to even a settled problematization and thus multiple solutions requiring diverse equipment.

The challenge of constructing a diagnostic of contemporary equipment is three-fold: (a) to provide a tool-kit of concepts that enable one to conduct inquiries into the contemporary world in its actuality; (b) to conduct those inquiries in a manner such that those concepts and those inquiries function so as to make the relations (connections and disjunctions) between logos and ethos apparent, and available, to oneself and to others. That is to say, to make those relations part of the inquiry itself as well as part of a way of life. (c) To take into account the pathos encountered and engendered by such an undertaking, and to find a place for it within the form under construction. In our technical vocabulary, these challenges consist in designing and synthesizing a form which

## EQUIPMENT

*Equipment, though conceptual in design and formulation, is pragmatic in use. Defined abstractly equipment is a set of truth claims, affects and ethical orientations designed and composed into a practice. Equipment, which has historically taken different forms, enables practical responses to changing conditions brought about by specific problems, events and general reconfigurations. Today there is a rather inchoate, if insistent, demand for new equipment to reconfigure and reconstruct the relations between and among the life sciences, the human sciences, and diverse citizenries both national and global.*

Cluster 1: Modes of Collaboration: Equipment, Contemporary, Collaboration, Venue, Reconstruction

Cluster 2: Contemporary Mode of Anthropology: Equipment, Contemporary, Anthropology, Mode, Problem

Cluster 3: Diagnosing Equipment: Equipment, Diagnosis, Affect, Truth Claim, Ethical Mode

can maintain a constantly available level of generality. Such forms must be able to function effectively to reconstruct specific problems while being plausibly applicable to a range of analogous problems. That is, the challenge is to compose a form of equipment that will be able to function as an equipmental platform.

The briefest of reminders of what general forms equipment has taken in the ancient and modern configurations – taken up from a contemporary problem-space – will help distinguish contemporary forms. These reminders will be useful, in part, by providing indications of a certain continuity of terms, elements, and problems across equipmental forms, as well as a certain discontinuity of metrics, modes, and objects.

## FORM 1: ANTIQUE EQUIPMENT

The guiding hypothesis of Foucault's lectures during 1981-2 at the Collège de France, *L'Herméneutique du sujet* was that in antiquity the challenge to "know thyself" had been inextricably coupled with another Delphic command to take "care of the self."<sup>10</sup> The twinned imperatives had made sense for as long as the goal of thinking had been linked to "a good life," or a "flourishing existence." Thus, for millennia, while truth-seeking was an essential part of a life well-led, it was not an autonomous goal or practice, nor was it disconnected from ethical work of the subject on himself and others. Rather the purpose of equipment and its precondition was to contribute to a thriving existence both individual and communal. It was within that context that the problem of how to transform logos into ethos made sense. Remarkably, today the problem of the relations of science, ethics, and a thriving existence seem once again to be under-going a process of a re-problematization.

There existed in antiquity a corpus of arts and techniques essential to the care of the self. Much of Foucault's inquiry in the 1981-2 lectures focused on this corpus, these practices, these exercises, constituent of, and essential to, self-formation and care.

"The test of one self as a thinking subject, who acts and thinks accordingly, who has as his goal, a certain transformation of the subject such that there is a self-constitution as an ethical subject of truth."<sup>11</sup>

The challenge was to develop forms of exercises of thought whose goal was to connect thought to ethos.<sup>12</sup>

In the late antique world there existed a range of equipment developed in order to aid those engaged in these exercises. The key equipment that was required to take care of the self, to aid it in its confrontations with the external world, or most generally to accomplish the complex task of facing the future, was “*un équipement de discours vraies.*”<sup>13</sup> An arsenal, if you will, of *logoi*. The Greek word for these ‘*discours vraies*,’ is *paraskeue*, which the French translate as *équipement*. As the name suggests, this equipment was designed to achieve a practical end. These ‘true discourses,’ these ‘*logoi*’ were neither abstractions nor, as we say today, ‘merely discursive.’ They had their own materiality, their own concreteness, and consistency.

What was at stake in the use of this equipment was not primarily a quest for truth about the world or the self. Rather, the practice consisted in means of assimilating these true discourses as aids in confronting and coping with external events and internal passions. The challenge was not just to learn these maxims, often banal in themselves, but to make them an embodied dimension of one’s existence. The purpose of equipment was to have them ready at hand when they were needed. True discourses were equipment to the extent they had been assimilated thoroughly, made to function as rational principles of action: «*fait du logos enseigné, appris, répété, assimilé, la forme spontanée du sujet agissant.*» Learning these maxims was not hard, accomplishing the goal of making these *logoi* a principle of action, of self-mastery, of a flourishing existence, was a life-long process.

## MODE

*Mode indicates a way of doing something, the form in which something exists, and the form’s temporality. The mode in which you think through a problem specifies objectives of thought, limits and the position from which one thinks.*

Cluster 1: Contemporary Mode of Anthropology: Mode, Contemporary, Anthropology, Problem, Equipment

## FORM 2: MODERN EQUIPMENT

Many other forms of equipment were no doubt developed in the ensuing centuries, especially in the Christian monasteries, and later more broadly in the wake of the Reformation. It was at the dawn of what is referred to as modern times, however, that a vastly powerful and comprehensive set of power relations,

### FORM

*Given that diagnosis and inquiry are internal to a problematic situation the challenge of form giving is to determine, bring together and compose relevant elements, in such a way that care and thought become both a practice and an outcome. Thus the work of form giving becomes an ethical part of inquiry.*

Cluster 1: Cases in the Human Sciences: Form, Design, Case, Theme, Venue

truth claims, modes of life, and their interfaces began to be given shape. That formation has been referred to most famously by Michel Foucault as the regime of bio-power. We argue that the regime of bio-power became the bio-political and expanded into ever-increasing spheres of life once its rulers and its specialists started experimenting with equipment.

In French Modern, Norms and Forms of the Social Environment, Rabinow traced some of the dimensions of how modern urban planning had

gradually developed over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Urban planning had started with the rational reform of physical space but had gradually included more and more elements into its purview. By the time such planning had become a socialist project during the 1930s it was proud of having expanded its scope from city planning – *un plan de ville* – to planning that included all those elements (spatial, social, psychological, architectural, hygienic, etc.,) that contributed to shaping an individual life – *un plan de vie*. The goal of planning was social and individual health as well as a well-policed order, as the expression goes. By 1942, the French “*Plan d’Équipement National*,” defined *équipement* as everything that was not a “*don gratuit*” (“a gratuitous gift”) of the soil, subsoil or climate. It is the work of each day and the country as a whole.”<sup>15</sup>

A tool chest of logoi had been assembled gradually, and eventually (partially) put into practice by the State. Further, social technologies had been

invented to oblige individuals to have these rational aids ready at hand on all occasions; or, failing that, at least to have social specialists nearby who could bring the corrective benefits of these technologies (and their 'discours vraies') to bear with the shortest possible delay.<sup>16</sup>

While the core of welfare technologies continued to be developed after the Second World War in Europe and in certain Communist countries, around the ever-expanding domain of the social, in the United States a different problem-space and object domain was gradually emerging.

## ONTOLOGY

*Ontology is the study of things of the world and how they are turned into objects. The task for an anthropology of the contemporary is to examine interactions between what there is, what is brought into the world and how the practices of understanding are an essential component of ontology.*

Cluster 1: Fieldwork in theology: [Ontology](#), [Assemblage](#), [Problem](#), [Analysis](#), [Synthesis](#), [Theology](#)

Through the 1960s concerns arose regarding the capacity of the developing medical and biological sciences to provide adequate means of analysis for understanding and coping with the ethical and ontological consequences of their own advances. A small number of leading scientists took the initiative to invite philosophers and theologians to think about ways in which research might be moving in the direction of transforming or even destroying human life.<sup>17</sup> Out

of these and other political encounters, by the middle of the 1970s a new kind of specialist, the 'bio-ethicist,' had appeared alongside the life scientist as someone authorized to offer serious truth claims about the relation of science and society. The bio-ethicists were assigned the task of elaborating principles according to which "good" science could be discerned from "bad" science. Such discernment was intended to provide an ordering and regulating function, assuring that science would contribute to a healthy society and would guard against pathological practices.

From the first, efforts to bring together experts from the biological, human, and philosophical disciplines to address innovations in the biological sciences faced a central practical problem: the development of methodological practices and forms adequate to the task of precisely defining and effectively responding to challenges and opportunities. In our terms, they faced the

challenge of designing and implementing new equipment.

In retrospect, we can see that these efforts remained in a modern equipmental mode. In the first place, bio-ethical equipment was still being guided by the standards and objects of the social. Although bio-ethics appealed to such ethical figures as “the autonomous subject,” “the person,” and “marginalized communities,” these ethical figures were taken up within the narrative of science and society. In the second place, bio-ethical equipment attempted to make visible critical limits within the sciences themselves. Thus, bio-ethical equipment was modern given its object (the social) and given its mode of operation (reform).

An important example of the early development of such equipment is the work of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The National Commission was tasked with developing practices appropriate to the protection of human subjects of research. It needed to respond to public outrage over the Tuskegee and Willowbrook experiments. And it needed to be adequate to the task of preventing the abuse of research subjects in the future. In sum, the National Commission was faced with the task of developing equipment appropriate to particular kinds of problems under particular circumstances and addressing those problems in particular kinds of ways.

The form these practices took was guided by the following considerations: a serious speech act (human beings are subjects whose autonomy must be respected), an affect (outrage at the abuse of such infamous research projects as the Tuskegee experiments), and an ethical mode (human subjects must be protected from such abuse in future through the guarantee of their free and informed consent).<sup>18</sup>

### FORM 3: CONTEMPORARY EQUIPMENT

These bio-ethical objects appeared to function well as regulatory guardians of the objects of bio-power: the population (taken up as the community) and the body (taken up as the person). However, in the 1990s this set of arrangements became increasingly problematic. Advances in molecular and developmental genetics (viz. the Human Genome Project, somatic cell nuclear transfer, and human embryonic stem cell research) excited the fear that the life sciences not

only put bodies and populations at risk, but human nature and even humanity itself. The human had been introduced as a solution; but now it has become a problem. In a discursive and regulatory flood, bio-ethicists advanced the concept of human dignity as a bulwark against the danger of dehumanization. The attempt to reform the bio-ethical by bringing a humanitarian equipmental apparatus into this problem-space began to produce a new figure.

With advances in molecular and developmental genetics, the figure of the dignified human began to displace and reconfigure the social.<sup>19</sup> Thus, a number

of specific events originally anchored in the apparatus of bio-ethics functioned as vectors to bring elements of the figure of human dignity into shared spaces with the figure of biopower. This meant, among other things, that assemblages of power relations, truth claims, ethical issues, and affective zones were partially recomposed. This process of recomposition resulted in modulation, disarticulation, and reconfiguration of previously stabilized interfaces and connections, ethical issues, and zones of affect.

In short, the figure of human dignity gradually became a trading zone within which discourses and practices associated with the development of medical and biological sciences began to be reassembled such that the objects, discourses, and practices of bio-power were connected to and put in tension with the objects, discourses, and practices of human dignity. Heterogeneous truth claims were being made about what figure of anthropos was at stake, which specialists were authorized to distinguish true and false, and what might be the art of governance appropriate to the situation. Unwittingly, within this zone of turbulence other problem-spaces that would prove to be beyond the metrics of bio-power or human dignity both veridictionally and jurisdictionally began to be given form.

Today, which truth claims, ethical modes, and affects are appropriate to

## TRUTH CLAIM

*The term truth-claim designates that subset of speech acts that count as true and false within a given equipmental form. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's mode of veridiction qualify as truth claims*

Cluster 1: Becoming a friend of thinking: Truth claim, Subjectivation, Parrhesia, Parastema, Philosophy

Cluster 2: Diagnosing Equipment: Truth Claim, Equipment, Diagnosis, Affect, Ethical Mode



such a turbulent zone is far from clear. However, given that the contemporary is neither a unified epoch nor a culture, any new forms of equipment will likely be variable and flexible. There is no reason to expect a single form to coalesce as the dominant figure. Quite the opposite, the complex interfaces, interferences, and synergies of multiple figures and multiple equipment are ontologically the way things are and the ethical challenge is to find forms to the turbulent complexity of anthropos today.

## PRACTICING DIAGNOSTICS

Our approach is in the line of the construction of “ideal-types” proposed by Max Weber a century ago. We are fully aware that in the “real world” these divisions are not so neat and compartmentalized. The function of the ideal-type, after all, is to highlight distinctions so as to enable inquiry into the specifics of existing cases. At the same time, of course, these ideal types have been constructed from materials drawn from pre-existing efforts and examples. Hence there can appear to be a slippage between the ideal typical function of producing an analysis and a description of existing configurations. Further, in the case that most immediately concerns us, our own work on synthetic biology, we are engaged both in a projective thought-experiment, a *Gedankenbild*, to use another of Weber’s pertinent expressions, and the initial attempts to make this construction operative. Hence our task is both analytic and observational as well as being synthetic and participatory. We hope to keep these moments clear in our presentation while realizing that empirical reality is never so stable, clear, or neat.

We proceeded with an informed awareness that there is a still rather inchoate, if insistent, demand for new equipment to reconfigure and reconstruct the relations between and among the life sciences, the human sciences, and diverse citizenries both national and global. We began our work intending to produce a diagnosis of a new “problematization” or “diagram” or “rationality” taking shape in the world in relation to which new equipment might be designed and put into operation. Although the contours of what seemed to be emerging were vague, we had a strong sense arising from a great deal of discussion, analysis, seminar



work, and reading, that whatever was taking shape could not be sufficiently characterized by reigning analytic doxa. Whatever the terms “biopower” and “biopolitics” might mean – and they are being used in a growing number of ways, most of which seemed to us misleading and misguided – those terms or concepts or brands are clearly not sufficient for understanding contemporary reality. Furthermore, as an additional support for our unease with how these terms were being used, we knew that Michel Foucault, who coined the terms, never had intended them to serve the undisciplined and heterogeneous uses to which they are currently being put. Foucault’s focus had been historical and conceptual and, at least in his later work, non-totalizing. Above all, concepts like “biopower” or “governmentality” had been conceived and put forth in a mode that was expressively capable of recursive rectification. Neither naming a unique meaning of Western or world history nor uncovering the nefarious workings of “governmentality” everywhere meets the criteria of recursive rectification.

We oriented our efforts toward diagnosing what we took to be an emergent assemblage, approached from the vantage point of two stable apparatuses. The two apparatuses we designated “biopower” and “human dignity”; the assemblage we initially referred to as “the vital.” Our aim was to characterize zones, such as bio-security and bio-ethics, in which elements of the two apparatuses were being recombined in the formation of a third. We resisted the familiar proposals that these apparatuses were either epochs, or reducible to one another. Rather, we understood them as consisting of quite specific, if heterogeneous elements, such as objects and practices, elements in flux and in

## ASSEMBLAGE

*A nascent organizational form that attempts to identify and associate elements from diverse domains (e.g. law, technology, government, media, science, spatial arrangements, etc.), in response to events that signal the insufficiency and discordancy of previous apparatuses in relation to emergent problems. The first challenge is to diagnose the situation so as to demarcate a relational field from an under-determined problem space. Given the demarcation of a relational field and the increased determination of a problem space, the second challenge is to specify and select the type of objects that will count. In doing this a third challenge presents itself: veridictional and jurisdictional criteria*

Cluster 1: Fieldwork in theology: **Assemblage, Problem, Analysis, Ontology, Synthesis, Theology**

the course of re-assemblage. Once we actually began sustained conceptual work, after multiple delays and blockages, however, we concluded that it was currently premature to diagnose a new “problematization” or “diagram” or “rationality.” First, it became clear that what each of these terms means is far from clear. Second, we came to think that while major changes in diverse empirical domains

## APPARATUS

*Apparatuses are stabilized forms composed of heterogeneous objects that bring multiple aspects of domains together and set them to work in a regulated functional manner. Apparatuses are long standing, long enduring specific responses to particular dimensions of larger problematizations.*

Cluster 1: Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: Apparatus, Pathway, History of the Present, Ramify, Contemporary

were unquestionably underway, it was not at all obvious that they had taken anything like a general and definitive form. Furthermore, we concluded that it was conceptually hazardous to assume that they ever would. Having reached an impasse, we decided to change strategies by shifting registers.

At first, we decided to move from characterizing a general diagram or rationality to attempting to distinguish the contours of the problematization to which that general diagram was presumably responding. Even there,

however, after two semesters’ travail with multiple empirical projects laid out and discussed, it gradually began to seem likely that even the task of attempting to distinguish and characterize the parameters of an emergent problematization in anything like a comprehensive manner was premature. Unlike the question of what problematization comes “after” biopower, however, the challenge of specifying the vectors and contours of an emergent problem-space remains, in our view, a valid one. Consequently, we decided to return to the concrete: our site of inquiry and the actual practices being elaborated.

This correction of our course proved to be serendipitous providing the means of rectification that we lacked. It led us to conclude that what we needed was a diagnostic of equipment. Said another way, and to borrow Weber’s formulation, we shifted our attention from the attempt to characterize the “actual interconnections of things,” to an attempt to distinguish “the conceptual interconnections of problems” with the hope that we would be “opening up significant new points of view.” Such points of view, we came to think, would be

significant to the degree that we could transform these perspectives into actual practices. The production of actual practices, after all, is what equipment, as we understand it, is all about.

## A DIAGNOSTIC OF EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS

In 2007, during a period of intense work, we formulated a diagnostic of equipmental platforms. The diagnostic, which we describe in the remaining sections of this appendix, can be found online in an interactive form: <http://bios-technika.net/diagnostics.html>. A diagnostic, as an analytic and synthetic device, is initially used to decompose figures and their equipmental counterparts. Such analysis facilitates testing and experimentation with the externalities and critical limitations of figures and equipment. This testing and experimentation can be followed by the recompositional work of developing new equipmental platforms for work on emerging figures, i.e. design and synthesis.

## FROM REGIMES TO MODES

Our diagnostic work took initial orientation from, but functions differently than, an analysis of regimes of veridiction and regimes of jurisdiction first articulated by Michel Foucault in 1978.<sup>20</sup> Regimes of veridiction and regimes of jurisdiction, on our reading, are diagnostic categories that distinguish the connections between ways of dividing up true and false and ways of governing oneself and others. Foucault suggested that the effort to grasp these “ensembles of practices,” these “fragments of reality that induce such particular effects in the real as the distinction between true and false implicit in the ways men ‘direct,’ ‘govern,’ and ‘conducted’ themselves and others,” were defining themes of his work. The challenge, as he articulated it, was to analyze the history of the connection between these regimes in view of the fact that the knowledge one needs to take up such analysis is inevitably produced by the very history of the regimes under consideration. The analytic question thus becomes modal: “How can one analyze the connection between ways of distinguishing true and false

and ways of governing oneself and others?”<sup>21</sup>

Foucault indicated that the function and purpose of his analytic question was, in the end, more than critical. It was designed to facilitate the opening up of spaces of inventiveness. That is to say, analysis of regimes of veridiction and jurisdiction and the connections between them, constitutes,

*The search for a new foundation for each of these practices, in itself and relative to the other, the will to discover a different way of governing oneself through a different way of dividing up true and false—this is what I would call ‘political spirituality.’<sup>22</sup>*

An analysis of regimes of veridiction and jurisdiction and their forms and connections provides a means to test the critical limits of truth and governance, so as to question these critical limits. The work of the analytic is oriented to politics as the question of truth and governance.

Diagnostics, as we are devising it, has a related but different orientation. In the first place, the difference in orientation entails a shift from the political and governance to the ontology and ethics of figures and equipment. Such a shift facilitates both the testing and experimentation with the critical limits and appropriateness of given figures to given equipmental platforms, as well as the recomposition of these figures and platforms.

In the second place, we shift from regimes to modes. Rather than regimes of veridiction and regimes of jurisdiction, our diagnostic attends to the mode of veridiction and mode of jurisdiction at work in contemporary figures. Foucault’s analysis was conducted as a history of the present. The ensemble of veridictional and jurisdictional practices he examined were more or less stable and coherent. The archive of materials consisted in long established systems of interactions; his inquiry, after all, may have been animated by contemporary concerns, but concentrated on historical materials.

## VERIDICTION

*The term veridiction distinguishes the ways in which the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. The work of diagnosis entails determining the extent to which previous authorized speech acts are adequate to the contemporary problem.*

Cluster 1: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality:  
Veridiction, Salvation, Diagnosis, Jurisdiction, Political Spirituality

By contrast mode of veridiction and mode of jurisdiction are diagnostic categories that distinguish ways of dividing up true and false in contemporary figures, and ways of ordering interventionary practices in contemporary types of equipment. Mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, within a given figure, speech acts are taken to count in the register of true and false, as well as the ways in which such speech acts are produced and authorized. Similarly, mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the ways in which within a given equipmental type a specified range of activities is discriminated as appropriate and subsequently ordered, i.e. organized in relation to one another. The kinds of activities the mode of jurisdiction discriminates and orders are those that appropriately govern the object of a given figure. A mode of jurisdiction thus must be made to cohere and cooperate with a particular set of standards laid out according to a mode of veridiction, and vice versa.

A mode of veridiction and a mode of jurisdiction in a diagnostic functions to test the legitimate limits and appropriateness of the interface between truth and ontology on the one hand and ethical practices on the other. Given the pragmatic challenge of designing and synthesizing new equipmental platforms for work on emerging figures, attention to and analysis of these two modes is particularly crucial.

## EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS

If our diagnostic is oriented by attention to modes of veridiction and modes of jurisdiction, it is oriented to equipmental platforms. Equipmental platforms are characterized by a constantly available generality. Platforms are designed to function effectively in the reconstruction of specific problems, while

### JURISDICTION

*Modes of jurisdiction determine and govern those activities taken to be coherent and co-operable. The diagnostic challenge is to determine how much adjustment of existing jurisdictional modes is required in order to govern the objects constituted within a given relational field.*

Cluster 1: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality:  
Jurisdiction, Diagnosis, Salvation, Veridiction, Political Spirituality

being plausibly applicable to a range of analogous problems.

An equipmental platform can be distinguished from equipmental activities and from specific instances of equipment. An equipmental platform discriminates appropriate (i.e. coherent and co-operable) equipmental activities and functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities it distinguishes and organizes are those activities that govern objects within a given contemporary figure. These activities taken as an integrated series are instantiated as specific instances of equipment. Put briefly, equipmental platforms function as the basis for the organization of the activities of specific equipment.

Equipmental platforms function in relation to contemporary figures in two important ways. First, platforms contribute to the determination of a problem within a broad field of problematization. Second, platforms contribute to the specification and design of possible solutions to this problem. Equipmental platforms, in short, function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization into concrete problems such that these problems can be taken up as a set of possible solutions.

## TABLES, CATEGORIES, AND CONNECTIONS

The diagnostic consists of four tables, each of which is composed of categories that are made into series by connections among conceptual elements.

### I. TABLES

Two different types of tables are included in the diagnostic. The first type, which consists of only one table, provides a diagnostic of contemporary figures. The second type, which consists of three tables, provides a diagnostic of equipmental types. What is the relation between these two types of figures in this diagnostic? In this diagnostic a contemporary figure worked over for a pragmatic purpose in a problem-space is an equipmental type.

The table of contemporary figures is designed to provide the categorical distinctions needed to address the question: what, in the contemporary, is being

problematized? We have selected three contemporary figures: the figure of Biopower, the figure of Human Dignity, and the figure of Synthetic Anthropos.

These figures do not have a single defining or summary diacritic. A common error is to identify one element, make it the defining diacritic, and come to believe that these figures are epochal or totalizing. Rather, each figure consists of a series. Diagnostically speaking, the series is composed of integral and integrating categories. That is to say, the synthesis of the categories that make up a series is a figure.

The table of equipmental types is designed to provide the categorical distinctions needed to address three interrelated questions. The first concerns the question: what does equipment consist of? The second concerns the question: how is equipment composed? The third concerns the question: what is equipment used for? The tables of equipmental figures themselves thus form a series.

The equipmental types are connected to but can be distinguished from the contemporary figures. A contemporary figure worked over for a pragmatic purpose in a problem-space—i.e. made equipmental—is an equipmental figure. The figure of biopower made equipmental is biopolitical equipment. The figure of human dignity made equipmental is human rights equipment. The figure of synthetic anthropos made equipmental is Human Practices equipment.

As with contemporary figures, equipmental types are analytically composed of series. Equipmental types thus do not have a single defining or summary diacritic. Analytically speaking, the series is composed of integral and integrating categories. That is to say the consolidation of the categories that make up a series is a type.

## 2. CATEGORIES

Analytically, each of the figures and types is composed of a series, which in turn are composed of integral and integrated categories. The categories in the diagnostic have been selected for their discriminatory power. Further, they provide heuristic utility, aiding the work of composing new equipment as well as orienting inquiry.



The categories are designed to be recombinatorial. That is to say, the categories that make up each series can be recombined in any number of different ways, although such recombination would likely result in the production or identification of figures other than those elaborated here. In addition, inquiry into empirical cases, which this diagnostic is designed to facilitate, may well suggest other recombinations.

The series of which the contemporary figures are composed consist of four categories: (1) Mode of Veridiction, (2) Metric (relational field), (3) Mode of Ontology, and (4) Object (relation). Equipmental types consist of the series: (1) Mode of *Ethike*, (2) Serious Speech Act, and (3) Affect. Equipmental composition diagnostically consists of the series: (1) Mode of Composition, (2) Specialist, and (3) Venue. Equipmental platforms consist of the series: (1) Mode of Jurisdiction, (2) Method, and (3) Purpose.

### 3. CONNECTIONS

The connections among the categories in the table consist of both horizontal and vertical sequences. In the narrative portion of the diagnostic, the sequences by which we explain the relations among categories have been selected and traversed that serve to define and stabilize the categories, their relations, and their significance within series. However, in principle, any number of other sequences and combinations of connections could be selected and followed.



The reconstructive challenge at the heart of the diagnostic is to design equipment capable of contributing to the form of the near future, scientifically and ethically, by both multiplying potentials as well as discerning which possibilities need to be picked out and actualized. Our diagnostic is designed to aid work on this challenge. Its status is something like an equipmental platform, though we would not be so presumptive as to give it that status. However, like an equipmental platform, the diagnostic facilitates the work of discriminating how to appropriately relate modes of veridiction and jurisdiction so as to make it more rather than less likely that a particularly outcome can be realized. To this end, the diagnostic functions as “a pragmatic means of transforming aspects



(e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization into concrete problems such that these problems can be taken up as a set of possible solutions.”

It bears repeating that the figures, categories, and equipmental platforms presented in the diagnostic are in no way to be taken as epochal indicators. There have been other figures and other equipmental platforms in the past, there are others in the present, and without doubt there will be others in the future. The three figures, their equipmental correlates, and salient features have been selected from among other possible candidates. Moreover, other diagnostics of contemporary equipmental platforms could and probably should be designed and synthesized. It is our hope therefore, dear reader, that our current diagnostic will facilitate further compositional work on contemporary equipment.

CONTEMPORARY EQUIPMENT:  
A DIAGNOSTIC

---

EQUIPMENTAL  
PLATFORMS

<b>CONTEMPORARY FIGURES: WHAT IS BEING PROBLEMATIZED?</b>				
<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>MODE OF VERIDICTION</b>	<b>METRIC (RELATIONAL FIELD)</b>	<b>MODE OF ONTOLOGY</b>	<b>OBJECT (RELATION)</b>
<b>BIOPOWER</b>	<b>Logos</b> (verification)	<b>Normalization</b>	<b>Probabilistic</b> (series)	<b>Population-Bodies</b>
<b>HUMAN DIGNITY</b>	<b>Nomos</b> (declamation)	<b>Dignity</b>	<b>Archonic</b> (being)	<b>Humanity-Human</b>
<b>SYNTHETIC ANTHROPOS</b>	<b>Ethos</b> (reconstruction)	<b>Flourishing</b>	<b>Emergent</b> (assemblages)	<b>Forms-Pathways</b>

<b>EQUIPMENTAL MODULES: WHAT DOES EQUIPMENT CONSIST OF?</b>			
<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF ETHIKĒ</b>	<b>SERIOUS SPEECH ACT</b>	<b>AFFECT</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Prudential</b>	<b>Verified Reduction</b>	<b>Disinterest</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Vigilance</b>	<b>Authorized Testimony</b>	<b>Commitment</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Vigorous Insistence</b>	<b>Warranted Assertion</b>	<b>Assurance</b>

<b>EQUIPMENTAL COMPOSITION: HOW IS EQUIPMENT COMPOSED?</b>			
<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF COMPOSITION</b>	<b>SPECIALIST</b>	<b>VENUE</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Social Technocrats</b>	<b>Governmental</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Redressing</b>	<b>Humanitarian Technocrats</b>	<b>Rights Based NGOs</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Leveraging (T,T,R)</b>	<b>Second Order Participant</b>	<b>Agile Assemblages</b>

<b>EQUIPMENTAL PLATFORMS: WHAT IS EQUIPMENT USED FOR?</b>			
<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF JURISDICTION</b>	<b>METHOD</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Regulation</b>	<b>Modulation</b>	<b>Security</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Protection</b>	<b>Emergency Intervention</b>	<b>Restoration</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Remediation</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<b>Resourceful solutions</b>

A **contemporary figure** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series: Mode of veridiction, Metric (relational field), Mode of Ontology, Object (relation):

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>MODE OF VERIDICTION</b>	<b>METRIC (RELATIONAL FIELD)</b>	<b>MODE OF ONTOLOGY</b>	<b>OBJECT (RELATION)</b>
<b>BIOPOWER</b>	<b>Logos</b> (verification)	<b>Normalization</b>	<b>Probabilistic</b> (series)	<b>Population-Bodies</b>
<b>HUMAN DIGNITY</b>	<b>Nomos</b> (declamation)	<b>Dignity</b>	<b>Archonic</b> (being)	<b>Humanity-Human</b>
<b>SYNTHETIC ANTHROPOS</b>	<b>Ethos</b> (reconstruction)	<b>Flourishing</b>	<b>Emergent</b> (assemblages)	<b>Forms-Pathways</b>

- **What is the Mode of Veridiction in a contemporary figure?**
- The **mode of veridiction** in a contemporary figure distinguishes the ways in which, within a given figure, the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. Of these authorized speech acts only those will qualify as part of the figure which can be made to operate in a given relational field according to a specific **metric**.
- **What is a Metric (Relational Field) in a contemporary figure?**
- A **metric** in a contemporary figure designates the standard by which serious speech acts are ordered. By so doing, the metric specifies and associates aspects of things as elements and allows those elements to be displayed and coordinated as a relational field. A given relational field is characterized by a defined mode of ontology.
- **What is a Mode of Ontology in a contemporary figure?**

- A **mode of ontology** in a contemporary figure characterizes the way in which elements in a relational field exist and are taken up. The mode of ontology interfaces elements so as to be connectable in order to constitute a single object. Given that the mode of ontology characterizes a relational field, it follows that the **objects** in a figure of contemporary ontology must be taken up as **relations**.
- **What is an Object in a contemporary figure?**
- An **object** in a contemporary figure is fashioned, in part, by the reworking of things and elements. Fashioning consists of association, coordination, and connection. The operation of fashioning homogenizes elements otherwise of heterogeneous scale and quality. The object can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series. That is to say, it functions within the series as an anchor point thereby consolidating the series as a figure.

The **figure of biopower** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series: *Logos* (verification), Normalization, Probabilistic (series), Population-Body:

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>MODE OF VERIDICTION</b>	<b>METRIC (RELATIONAL FIELD)</b>	<b>MODE OF ONTOLOGY</b>	<b>OBJECT (RELATION)</b>
<b>BIOPOWER</b>	<i>Logos</i> (verification)	<b>Normalization</b>	<b>Probabilistic</b> (series)	<b>Population-Body</b>

- **What is *Logos* (Verification) as a mode of veridiction in the figure of biopower?**
- ***Logos* (verification)** as a mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, within the figure of biopower, the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. This mode of veridiction only permits those speech acts to be taken seriously which can be verified through the reduction of particulars to calculable regularities or patterns. Within the figure of biopower such calculable regularities and patterns constitute *logoi*.

Verification means both “to substantiate” that is, to make into cases (this is the hermeneutic side of verification) and to “prove the truth of something,” (this is the positivist side). Within the figure of biopower, *logoi* take form as the human sciences. The human sciences expand through an ever-accumulating collection of facts and an ever-receding attempt to ground this collection of facts in a definitive manner. The way in which serious speech acts are produced involves incessant movement between an attempt to verify on the one hand truth claims through facts, and on the other hand generalization or theory. Thus, the human sciences generate systematic verification through the reduction of particulars to calculable regularities or patterns. Of such authorized speech acts only those will qualify as part of the figure of biopower which can be made to operate according to a **metric of normalization**.

- **What is Normalization as a metric in the figure of biopower?**
- **Normalization** as a metric in the figure of biopower designates the standard by which **verifications** are ordered. The term norm is normative: it designates a project to order aspects of things according to regular distributions. Norms constitute the grounds for normalization. The standard by which things are distributed in a regular fashion is a **metric**. As a metric, normalization designates what type of things is to be taken seriously, i.e. social facts. Normalization specifies aspects of social facts as elements. The elements that normalization as a metric specifies are those that can be brought into a field and normed. The term normed designates the way in which elements are associated, displayed, and coordinated as a relational field. This relational field is characterized by a defined mode of ontology: **probabilistic**.
- **What is Probabilistic as a mode of ontology in a figure of biopower?**
- A **Probabilistic** mode of ontology in a figure of biopower characterizes the way in which elements in a relational field of normalization exist and are distributed. A probabilistic mode is neither geometric nor arithmetic; rather it requires a type of logic that is capable of characterizing a series and the likelihood of that series unfolding in a particular manner. That is to say, the kind of element that counts in a probabilistic mode of ontology is a series. A probabilistic mode of ontology interfaces elements so as to be connectable into a single object. The kind of interfaces required within a probabilistic mode of ontology is the ones that can be fit into a series. Elements can only take on their significance for the figure of biopower (i.e. become an object) when

placed within a series (i.e. a probabilistic relation). For example, the meaning of an individual suicide takes on its social meaning only when placed in a series. A probabilistic series as an ontological mode is appropriate to the generation of calculable regularities characteristic of verification as a mode of veridiction. Given that probabilistic series characterize a relational field, it follows that the **objects** in a figure of biopower must be taken up as **relations**. The object (relation) of concern in the figure of biopower is **population-body**.

- **What is Population-Body as an object in the figure of biopower?**
- **Population-body** as an object in a figure of biopower is fashioned, in part, by the reworking of distributed elements. Fashioning, consisting of association, coordination, and connection, homogenizes elements otherwise of heterogeneous scale and quality (i.e. populations and bodies). The object population-body can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series that makes up the figure of biopower. That is to say, the object population-body functions within the series as an anchor point thereby consolidating the series as the figure of biopower.

The **figure of human dignity** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series: *Nomos* (declamation), Dignity, Archonic (being), Humanity-Human:

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>MODE OF VERIDICTION</b>	<b>METRIC (RELATIONAL FIELD)</b>	<b>MODE OF ONTOLOGY</b>	<b>OBJECT (RELATION)</b>
<b>HUMAN DIGNITY</b>	<b>Nomos</b> (declamation)	<b>Dignity</b>	<b>Archonic</b> (being)	<b>Humanity-Human</b>

- **What is Nomos (Declamation) as a mode of veridiction in the figure of human dignity?**



- **Nomos (declamation)** as a mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, in the figure of human dignity speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declaims the status of *anthropos* as dignified. This serious speech act is not established by any *logos*. Only those serious speech acts will qualify as part of the figure of human dignity which can be made to operate in a **relational field** according to the **metric of dignity**.
- **What is Dignity as a metric in a figure of human dignity?**
- **Dignity** as a metric in the figure of human dignity designates the standard by which **declamations** are ordered. As a metric, dignity specifies those aspects of things that count as elements, and are taken seriously. The elements that dignity as a metric specifies are incommensurability, incomparability, autonomy, and inalterability. The elements specified can then be associated, displayed, and coordinated as a relational field. This relational field is characterized by a defined mode of ontology: the **archonic**.
- **What is the Archonic as an ontological mode in the figure of human dignity?**
- **The archonic** as an ontological mode in the figure of human dignity characterizes the way in which essential, incomparable, and inalterable elements in a field of dignity exist and are taken up. The elements that count in an archonic mode of ontology are beings. Dignity in an archonic mode of ontology brings these elements into a relational field so as to constitute them as a single object. Elements only take on their significance for the figure of human dignity (i.e. become an object) when constituted as an archonic being. Given that the mode of ontology characterizes a relational field, it follows that the **object** in a figure of human dignity must be taken up as a **relation**. The object in the figure of human dignity is **humanity-human**.
- **What is Humanity-Human as an object in a figure of human dignity?**
- **Humanity-human** as an object is fashioned, in part, by the reworking of things and elements Fashioning consists of association, coordination, and connection. The operation of fashioning homogenizes elements otherwise of heterogeneous scale and quality (i.e. the human and humanity). Humanity-human can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series that constitutes the figure of human dignity. That is to say, it functions within

the series as an anchor point, thereby consolidating the series as the figure of human dignity.

The **figure of synthetic anthropos** taken up in a mode of synthetic analysis consists of the series: *Ethos* (reconstruction), Flourishing, Emergent (assemblage), Forms-Pathways:

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>MODE OF VERIDICATION</b>	<b>METRIC (RELATIONAL FIELD)</b>	<b>MODE OF ONTOLOGY</b>	<b>OBJECT (RELATION)</b>
<b>SYNTHETIC ANTHROPOS</b>	<i>Ethos</i> (reconstruction)	<b>Flourishing</b>	<b>Emergent</b> (assemblages)	<b>Forms-Pathways</b>

- **What is *Ethos* (reconstruction) as a mode of veridiction in the figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- ***Ethos* (reconstruction)** as a mode of veridiction distinguishes the ways in which, within the figure of synthetic anthropos, the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are authorized and produced. The speech acts that can be authorized as true and false in reconstruction as a mode of veridiction are those assertions that can be put to the test in experimental and pragmatic situations and subsequently can be reused in reworked form. These experimental and pragmatic situations are more than just laboratory parameters per se. Rather; they contribute to and are conditioned by an *ethos*. As such, although technical virtuosity and prowess are significant capacities within this mode of veridiction, such capacities only enter fully into the play of true and false when they contribute to and are conditioned by an *ethos*. Reconstruction as a mode of veridiction acknowledges that thinking takes place not only within a problem-space in which knowledge of the problem-space depends not only on prior experimental and pragmatic conditions and results, but equally on an orientation to the near future. *Ethos* (reconstruction) as a mode of veridiction functions to provide determinations for an

indeterminate and unsatisfactory situation in more than technical or declamatory terms. Rather, only those authorized speech acts will qualify as part of the figure of synthetic anthropos which can be made to operate according to a **metric of flourishing**.

- **What is Flourishing as a metric in the figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- **Flourishing** as a metric in the figure of synthetic anthropos designates the standard by which reconstructive speech acts are ordered. This standard operates within a reconstructed situation. Consequently, the standard can be specified although it is neither universalistic nor relativist. Flourishing as a metric thus designates which things count as real and of concern in the figure of synthetic anthropos. As a metric it specifies those aspects of things as elements that are amenable to and in need of reconstruction. These elements are not characterized by a pre-given and fixed form but are themselves products of previous reconstructions. Once elements are specified, they can then be associated, displayed, and coordinated as a relational field. In sum, as a metric, flourishing brings elements into relation with one another and indicates how they should be associated. How these connections are made depends on the mode of ontology. Within the figure of synthetic anthropos the **mode of ontology** is **emergence**.
- **What is Emergence as a mode of ontology in the figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- **Emergence** as a mode of ontology in the figure of synthetic anthropos characterizes the way in which elements in a relational field of flourishing exist and are assembled. The elements that qualify in an emergent mode of ontology are those that can be made into assemblages. Emergence as a mode of ontology brings elements into adjacency and interfaces them so that they can be assembled into a single object. Elements take on their significance for the figure of synthetic anthropos (i.e. become an object) when made to be an operative part of an assemblage. The significance of such an assembled object cannot be reduced to its constitutive elements and relations. Emergence characterizes a mode of the real in which previous arrangements are necessary but not determinative. Given that emergence characterizes a relational field of flourishing, it follows that the assembled **objects** in a figure of synthetic anthropos are brought together and reconstructed as the **relation forms-pathways**.

- **What is Forms-Pathways as an object in a figure of synthetic anthropos?**
- **Forms-pathways** as an object is fashioned, in part, through the reworking of things and elements. Fashioning, consisting of association, coordination, and connection, homogenizes elements previously of heterogeneous scale and quality (i.e. forms and pathways). The first reworked element is a connective one—a pathway. Pathways are synthesized and integrated into different forms. Forms are the second reworked element. Forms-pathways as a single object relation can then function as an integral and integrating part of the overall series that constitutes the figure of synthetic anthropos. That is to say, it functions within the series as an anchor point thereby consolidating the series as a figure of synthetic anthropos.

A **contemporary figure** worked over for a pragmatic purpose in a problem-space is: An **equipmental figure**.

- The figure of **biopower** made equipmental is **biopolitical** equipment.
- The figure of **human dignity** made equipmental is **human rights** equipment.
- The figure of **synthetic anthropos** made equipmental is **human practices** equipment.

**Equipment** is composed analytically of the modules:  
 Mode of *Ethikē*, Serious Speech Act, Affect.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF ETHIKĒ</b>	<b>SERIOUS SPEECH ACT</b>	<b>AFFECT</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Prudential</b>	<b>Verified Reduction</b>	<b>Disinterest</b>

<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Vigilance</b>	<b>Authorized Testimony</b>	<b>Commitment</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Vigorous Insistence</b>	<b>Warranted Assertion</b>	<b>Assurance</b>

- **What is a Mode of *Ethikē* as an equipmental module?**
- A **mode of *ethikē*** as a module distinguishes the way in which, within a given equipmental figure, practices are taken up as ethical. Those practices qualify as *ethical* which can be made to operate on an axis of better and worse. How does a given mode of *ethikē* qualify as a **module** in a given equipmental figure? It qualifies as an equipmental module when it can be made to operate on an axis of better and worse relative to a metric, i.e. the standards that order the contemporary figure from which an equipmental figure is made. That is to say, a given mode of *ethikē* will qualify as an equipmental module once it is calibrated according to a specific metric of a contemporary figure. Recall, that in a contemporary figure the metric orders a mode of veridiction and is characterized by a mode of ontology. Given this alignment between the metric and a mode of *ethikē*, the question of what qualifies as a claim in the register of true and false within an equipmental figure, i.e. a serious speech act, must always be adjusted to a mode of *ethikē*. In the modularization of equipment, prior to equipmental composition, the mode of veridiction and the mode of ontology function as relay points between a mode of *ethikē* and a **serious speech act**.
- **What is a Serious Speech act as an equipmental module?**
- A **serious speech act** as a module designates that subset of speech acts that count as true and false in an equipmental figure. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's mode of veridiction and that meet the requirements of a given figure's mode of ontology, qualify as equipmental modules. Just as the mode of *ethikē* must be made to operate with a given figure's **metric** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as qualified serious speech acts must be made to cohere with a mode of veridiction and meet the requirements of a **mode of ontology** to qualify as an equipmental module, equipment also consists of

affective modules that must also be made to cohere with a given figure's **mode of veridiction** in order to qualify.

- **What is Affect an equipmental module?**
- **Affect** as a module in an equipmental figure characterizes the way in which a **relational field** is maintained such that a specific type of disposition can be generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in a relational field only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's **mode of veridiction** qualify as equipmental modules. Affect coheres with a mode of veridiction when it functions in a relational field such that other dispositions will be less likely to disrupt production the kind of serious speech acts and modes of *ethikē* appropriate to work in and on a given figure. Recall that a given figure's mode of veridiction and mode of ontology serve as the relay points between a mode of *ethikē* and serious speech acts. Given the relations between affect, relational field, and mode of veridiction, of those affects that qualify only those will count that can be made to coalesce with an equipmental figure's mode of *ethikē* and serious speech acts. Those affects which count, operate to bolster and stabilize a disposition to a modular mode of *ethikē* and modular serious speech acts. As such affect is integral to equipmental composition.

The **figure of biopower** made equipmental is **biopolitical equipment**.

**Biopolitical equipment** is composed analytically of the modules:  
Prudential, Verified Reduction, Disinterest.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF ETHIKĒ</b>	<b>SERIOUS SPEECH ACT</b>	<b>AFFECT</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Prudential</b>	<b>Verified Reduction</b>	<b>Disinterest</b>

- **What is Prudential as a module in biopolitical equipment?**
- **Prudential**, as mode of *ethikē* distinguishes the way in which, in biopolitical equipment, practices are taken up as ethical. The metric of normalization in the figure of biopower orients and directs practice toward an ever-receding future such that the present can always be improved by small incremental steps. Concomitantly and definitionally a final and fixed state is never achieved. As such, those practices will be taken to be ethical that are ordered so as to contribute to the normalization of populations-bodies through constant observation and inflection. A prudential mode of *ethikē* operates in a way that includes but cannot be reduced to a direct means-ends calculus. Rather, prudence calibrates practice along an axis of better and worse relative to the metric of normalization. Biopolitical equipment thus involves optimization, but optimization should not be confused with prudence because within this mode of *ethikē* optimization can function as a means but not as an end. In the contemporary figure of biopower the field of normalization structures a specific mode of veridiction—*logos* (verification)—and is characterized by a specific mode of ontology—probabilistic (series). Therefore, in biopolitical equipment the question of what qualifies as a claim in the register of true and false, i.e. a serious speech act, must always be accounted for in evaluations about how prudential a given judgment or action is. In biopolitical equipment verification as a mode of veridiction functions as a relay point between normalization and probabilistic series. In a homologous manner, the mode of veridiction will also function as a relay between a prudential mode and **verified reduction** as a type of serious speech act.
- **What is Verified Reduction as a module in biopolitical equipment?**
- **Verified reduction** as a module in biopolitical equipment designates that class of speech acts that qualify as true and false in the human sciences. Within this class of authorized serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with *logos* (verification) as a mode of veridiction and meet the requirements of probabilistic series as the mode of ontology qualify as equipmental modules. Just as a prudential *ethikē* must be made to operate with **normalization** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as verified reduction must be made to cohere with **verification** and meet the requirements of a **probabilistic series** to qualify as an equipmental module,

biopolitical equipment also consists of an affect module—disinterest—generated in a relational field that must also be made to cohere with **logos (verification)** in order to qualify.

- **What is disinterest as a module in biopolitical equipment?**
- **Disinterest** as a module characterizes the way in which a field of normalization is maintained such that a specific type of disposition is generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in this relational field only those that can be made to cohere with **verification** as a mode of veridiction qualify as an equipmental module. Disinterest coheres with this mode of veridiction when it serves to function in the relational field such that other dispositions will be less likely to disrupt production of the *logoi* and prudential *ethikē* needed to work in and on a field of normalization. For this reason, an affect of disinterest contributes to the authorization of speech acts and maintenance of relational fields. Recall that verification and probabilistic series serve as the relay points between a prudential *ethikē* and verified reductions. Thus, in biopolitical equipment, those dispositions are privileged that can be made to coalesce with a prudential *ethikē* and verified reductions. Disinterest operates to bolster and stabilize a disposition to a prudential *ethikē* and verified reductions as modules that count in biopolitical equipment.

**The figure of human dignity made equipmental is human rights equipment.**

**Human rights equipment** is composed analytically of the modules: Vigilance, Authorized Testimony, Commitment.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF ETHIKĒ</b>	<b>SERIOUS SPEECH ACT</b>	<b>AFFECT</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Vigilance</b>	<b>Authorized Testimony</b>	<b>Commitment</b>

- **What is Vigilance as a module in human rights equipment?**



- **Vigilance** as an equipmental module distinguishes the way in which, within human rights equipment, practices are taken up as ethical. Given that dignity as the metric of the figure of human dignity is archonic, and therefore cannot be produced, modified, or improved (but can be ignored, transgressed, or violated), equipment that coheres and co-operates with it requires a distinctive mode of *ethikē*. **Vigilance** as a mode of *ethikē* appropriate to dignity is animated by a universal moral essence. However, this mode always operates in a particular and changing present, in which, consequently, human rights equipment is made to function in a mode of continual alertness, scanning for threats and generating an increasing number of cases that count as violations of rights. Vigilance calibrates practice in universal terms always in tension with specific cases relative to the metric of dignity. The metric of dignity, recall, structures a specific mode of veridiction—*nomos* (declamation). Therefore, in human rights equipment that which counts as a claim in the register of true and false, i.e. declamation, stems from a vigilant mode of *ethikē* in which threats and violations are identified. In human rights equipment, declamation as a mode of veridiction functions as a relay point between dignity and an archonic being. In a homologous manner declamation functions as a relay point between a vigilant mode and **authorized testimony**.
- **What is Authorized Testimony as a module in human rights equipment?**
- **Authorized testimony** as a module in human rights equipment designates that class of speech acts that qualify as true and false in human rights equipment. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with *nomos* (declamation) as a mode of veridiction and which meet the requirements of archonic being as the mode of ontology qualify as equipmental modules for human rights. Just as a vigilant *ethikē* must be made to cohere with **dignity** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as authorized testimony must be made to cohere with **declamation** and meet the requirements of **archonic being** to qualify as an equipmental module, human rights equipment also consists of an affect module—commitment—generated in a relational field that must be made to cohere with **declamation** in order to qualify.
- **What is Commitment as a module in human rights equipment?**
- **Commitment** as a module in human rights equipment characterizes the way in which a field of dignity is maintained such that a specific type of disposition is

generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in this relational field only those that can be made to cohere with **declamation** as a mode of veridiction qualify as an equipmental module. Commitment coheres with declamation when it functions in a relational field such that violations of dignity are likely to be identified and such that those whose task it is to identify violations maintain the appropriate vigilance. For this reason, an affect of commitment contributes to the authorization of speech acts and the maintenance of relational fields. Recall, that declamation and archonic being serve as relay points between a vigilant *ethikē* and authorized testimony. Thus, in human rights equipment an affect of commitment is required that not only can be made to cohere with a disposition to a vigilant mode of *ethikē* and authorized testimony, but that also operates to bolster and sustain a vigilant *ethikē* and the production of authorized testimony.

**The figure of synthetic anthropos made equipmental is human practices equipment.**

**Human practices equipment**

is composed analytically of the modules:

Vigorous insistence, Warranted Assertions, Assurance.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF ETHIKĒ</b>	<b>SERIOUS SPEECH ACT</b>	<b>AFFECT</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Vigorous Insistence</b>	<b>Warranted Assertion</b>	<b>Assurance</b>

- **What is Vigorous Insistence as a module in human practices equipment?**
- **Vigorous insistence** as a mode of *ethikē* distinguishes how human practices equipment is put into use in a relational field of flourishing through constant attention and interventions into problems that are held to be significant, real-world, and remediable in the near future. A mode of vigorous

insistence orients and directs human practices equipment toward the near future such that indeterminate and unstable situations can be remediated. Vigorous insistence thus shares an elective affinity with the relational field characteristic of the figure of **synthetic anthropos**, flourishing. A vigorously insistent mode of *ethikē* is appropriate to human practices equipment not because it optimizes means-ends relationships. Rather, vigorous insistence pragmatically favors and encourages practices according to an axis of helpful and unhelpful relative to the metric of flourishing. Human practices equipment involves utility, but should not be confused with optimization or standardization as ends-in-themselves. The metric of flourishing, recall, structures a specific mode of veridiction—*ethos* (reconstruction) and is characterized by a specific mode of ontology—emergent assemblages. In this way, the metric flourishing functions as a relay point between a mode of vigorous insistence and **warranted assertion** as a type of serious speech act. Given the alignment of flourishing and vigorous insistence the question of what counts as a claim in the register of true and false, i.e. **warranted assertion**, is likely to be generated through a vigorous search for helpful solutions to the problems specified by a metric.

- **What is Warranted Assertion as a module in human practices equipment?**
- **Warranted assertion** designates that class of speech acts that are authorized to count as true and false in human practices equipment. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that contribute to and are capable of cohering with *ethos* (reconstruction) as a mode of veridiction and meeting the requirements of emergent assemblages as the mode of ontology, qualify as equipmental modules. Just as **vigorous insistence** as a mode of *ethikē* must be capable of contributing to **flourishing** in order to qualify as an equipmental module, and just as **warranted assertion** must contribute to **reconstruction** and **emergent assemblages** to qualify as an equipmental module, human practices equipment also consists of an affect module—**assurance**—generated in a relational field that must be made to contribute to reconstruction in order to qualify.
- **What is Assurance as a module in human practice equipment?**
- **Assurance** as a module in human practices equipment characterizes the way in which a field of **flourishing** is organized such that a specific type of

disposition is generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in this relational field only those that contribute to **reconstruction** as a mode of veridiction qualify as an equipmental module. Assurance contributes to this mode of veridiction when it bolsters the insistence that, given existing resources, solutions must be possible even when the path to them remains to be invented. For this reason among others an affect of assurance positions one to make warranted assertions and contributes to the maintenance of a relational field of flourishing. Human practices equipment is strengthened by passing through experimental testing. Recall that reconstruction and emergent assemblages serve as relay points between vigorous insistence as a mode of *ethikē* and warranted assertions as a privileged type of serious speech act. Thus, in human practices equipment an affect of assurance is encouraged in that it contributes to vigorous insistence and warranted assertions. Assurance operates to enable and favor an ethical disposition toward **vigorous insistence** and a resolve that **warranted assertions** can be devised. As such assurance is integral to the composition of human practices equipment.

The design of the interfaces of equipmental modules and their synthesis is **equipmental composition**.

**Equipmental composition** analytically consists of the series:  
Mode of Composition, Specialist, Venue.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF COMPOSITION</b>	<b>SPECIALIST</b>	<b>VENUE</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Social Technocrats</b>	<b>Governmental</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Redressing</b>	<b>Humanitarian Technocrats</b>	<b>Rights Based NGOs</b>

<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Leveraging (T,T,R)</b>	<b>Second Order Participant</b>	<b>Agile Assemblages</b>
------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------

- **What is an equipmental Mode of Composition?**
- An equipmental **Mode of Composition** distinguishes the way in which equipmental modules are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed in such a way as to synthesize them as equipmental platforms. The mode of composition is constituted by a set of design parameters. These design parameters can be distinguished as both upstream and downstream. The first set of upstream parameters is that the synthesized equipment must function according to the requirements of particular metric (relational field). The second set of upstream parameters concerns the requirement that the mode of composition must take into account the specific challenge of interfacing heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules (i.e. mode of *ethikē*, serious speech acts, affects), such that these heterogeneous modules can be made to function in an integrated way. Downstream parameters consist of the challenge of composing these modules in such a way that they will function in specific cases but simultaneously will be capable of spanning or covering a range of cases, conditions, and problems characteristic of a given figure and the available modules. That is, compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as platforms. Successful synthesis of design parameters requires a specific type of **specialist** with distinctive skill sets, authority, and access to resources.
- **What is a Specialist in equipmental composition?**
- A **specialist** in equipmental composition designates the type of individual who designs module interfaces such that disparate modules can be synthesized into a single set capable of functioning according to the requirements of a given figure and capable of managing specific cases. The challenge for the specialist is to interface the modules in such a way that the resulting composition functions as the basis for the organization of specific equipmental activities within a given relational field. Analytically, it is useful to think of these specialists as technocrats who can be distinguished from technicians, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies. Said another way, these specialists, who are charged with the task of invention, oversight,

and management, (but usually not with detailed implementation) can be called “technicians of general ideas.” Such invention, oversight, and management draw on, and, given its position within specific figures, has an elective affinity with, affect modules and modes of *ethikē*. Where do these specialists conduct their design resolutions? What is the **venue** within which composition occurs?

- **What is a Venue in equipmental composition?**
- A **venue** in equipmental composition characterizes the scene, site, or setting in which specialists work on design and synthesis. Such venues may have been already stabilized or institutionalized, they may coincide with the articulation of the practice itself, or they may emerge through the practice of equipmental composition. The venue is not a neutral scene in which specialists work, nor is it only the site within which a given mode of composition is advanced. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, when composition is successful, the venue facilitates rather than obstructs the design and synthesis of specific interfaces. Consequently, there are venues in which particular interfaces are more likely to be obstructed than facilitated. Once the equipment is successfully synthesized in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then, of course, it has to be put to use. The consideration of venue thus raises the question of how, where, and when the composed equipment actually will be used as an equipmental platform.

**Biopolitical equipment** is composed when the interfaces of biopolitical modules are designed and synthesized as equipment.

**Biopolitical equipmental composition** analytically consists of the series: Planning, Social Technocrats, Governmental.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF COMPOSITION</b>	<b>SPECIALIST</b>	<b>VENUE</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Social Technocrats</b>	<b>Governmental</b>

- **What is Planning as a mode of composition in biopolitical equipmental composition?**
- **Planning** distinguishes the way in which equipmental modules are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed and such that they can be synthesized into a biopolitical equipmental platform. In this mode of composition, the first set of upstream design parameter derives from the constraints of a field of normalization. That is to say, planning is a mode of composing equipmental modules such that the resulting equipment operates to distribute a set of elements in a relational field according to a specific **metric**. The second set of upstream parameters concerns the requirement that planning must take into account the specific challenge of adjusting the interfaces of heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules (i.e. prudential mode of *ethikē*, verified reductions, and disinterest), such that these heterogeneous modules can be made to function in an integrated way. Downstream parameters consist of the challenge of composing the modules in such a way that they will function effectively in specific cases of the normalization of populations-bodies but simultaneously will be capable of spanning or covering a range of cases, conditions, and problems characteristic of the figure of biopower and the qualified modules. That is, biopolitical compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as biopolitical platforms. A successful synthesis of these design parameters requires a specific type of specialist, i.e. a **social technocrat**, with a distinctive skill set, authority, and access to resources.
- **What is a Social Technocrat in a biopolitical equipmental composition?**
- A **social technocrat** in biopolitical equipmental composition designates the type of actor who designs module interfaces such that disparate modules can be synthesized into equipment that meets the requirements of the figure of biopower and is capable of managing specific cases. When population-body is taken up in a field of normalization as “society,” and when “society” is worked on in a biopolitical equipmental mode, it (i.e. “society”) becomes the “social.” Analytically, it is useful to think of specialists who compose biopolitical equipment as social *technocrats* who can be distinguished from social *technicians*, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies, while technicians are charged with the production of the **verified reductions** that constitute the elements in a **probabilistic**

**series.** Said another way, social technocrats, who are charged with the task of equipmental invention, oversight, and management within a biopolitical figure (but not the details of its technical implementation per se) can be called “technicians of general ideas.” The challenge for the social technocrat is to interface modules in such a way that the resulting composition functions as the basis for the organization of equipmental activities for normalization. Biopolitical invention, oversight, and management draw on, and have an elective affinity with, a prudential mode of *ethikē* and an affect of disinterest. What is the **venue** in which social technocrats come to their design resolutions? The venue of their work is **governmental**.

- **What is Governmental as a venue in biopolitical equipmental composition?**
- A **governmental** venue characterizes where and how social technocrats work on the design and synthesis of biopolitical equipment. Such a venue is not a neutral scene in which social technocrats work. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, it facilitates rather than obstructs the construction of specific interfaces and their synthesis providing a venue appropriate to the work of planning. Social technocrats work with probabilistic series in fields of normalization. Such work requires a stable venue in which large amounts of material, produced and collected by social technicians, can be gathered, sorted, and distributed in an ongoing fashion. It follows that the composition of biopolitical equipment requires a venue in which long term stability and continuity are institutionalized. Once biopolitical equipment is successfully synthesized in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then, of course, it has to be put to use. Consideration of the specifics of governmental venues thus raises the question of how, where, and when the biopolitical equipmental platform actually will be used.

---

**Human rights equipment** is composed  
when interfaces of human rights modules  
are designed and synthesized as equipment.

**Human rights equipmental composition**  
analytically consists of the series:



## Redressing, Humanitarian Technocrats, and Rights-Based NGOs.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF COMPOSITION</b>	<b>SPECIALIST</b>	<b>VENUE</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Redressing</b>	<b>Humanitarian Technocrats</b>	<b>Rights Based NGOs</b>

- **What is Redressing as a mode of composition in human rights equipmental composition?**
- **Redressing** distinguishes the way in which modules that qualify for human rights equipment are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed and such that these interfaces can be synthesized into a human rights equipmental platform. Redress as a mode of composition entails the production of equipment capable of rectifying human rights violations in a timely fashion. A first set of upstream design parameter derives from the constraints of a relational field of dignity. That is to say, redressing is a mode of composing equipmental modules such that the resulting synthesis functions to acknowledge or recognize the presence of archonic dignity in the object (relation) humanity-human as a bearer of rights. The second set of upstream parameters concerns the requirement that redressing must take into account the specific challenge of designing and synthesizing the interfaces of heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules (i.e. vigilance as a mode of *ethikē*, authorized testimonies, and righteousness) in the figure of human rights, such that these heterogeneous modules can be made to function in an integrated way. Downstream parameters consist of the challenge of composing the modules in such a way that they will function effectively in specific instances of rights violation but simultaneously will be capable of identifying and addressing a range of instances, conditions, and problems characteristic of the figure of human dignity and qualified modules. That is, human rights compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as human rights platforms. Successful synthesis requires a specific type of specialist, i.e. a **humanitarian technocrat**, with a distinctive skill set, authority, and access to resources.

- **What is a Humanitarian Technocrat as a specialist in human rights equipmental composition?**
- A **humanitarian technocrat** in human rights equipmental composition designates the type of actor who designs interfaces such that disparate human rights modules can be synthesized into equipment consonant with human dignity and capable of rectifying specific instances of rights violations. When human dignity is made into human rights equipment, then objects in the relational field of dignity (i.e. the relation humanity-human) are rendered susceptible of being worked on in an equipmental mode. Those specialists authorized to oversee the composition of human rights equipment are humanitarian technocrats. Analytically, it is useful to think of specialists who compose human rights equipment as humanitarian *technocrats* who can be distinguished from humanitarian *technicians*, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies, while technicians are charged with the production of the authorized testimonies. Said another way, humanitarian technocrats, who are charged with the task of equipmental invention, oversight, and management within the figure of human rights (but not the details of its technical implementation per se) can be called “technicians of general ideas.” The challenge for the humanitarian technocrat is to interface modules in such a way that the resulting composition functions as the basis for the organization of activities that cohere with and operate in the name of the protection of human dignity. The invention, oversight, and management of human rights equipment draw on, and have an elective affinity with, a vigilant mode of *ethikē* and an affect of commitment. What is the **venue** in which humanitarian technocrats come to their design resolutions? The venue of their work is **rights-based NGOs**.
- **What is a Rights-Based NGO as a venue of human rights equipmental composition?**
- A **rights-based NGO** as a venue of human rights equipmental composition characterizes where and how humanitarian technocrats work on the design and synthesis of human rights equipment. Such a venue is not a neutral scene in which humanitarian technocrats work. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, when composition is successful it facilitates rather than obstructs the construction of specific interfaces by providing a venue favorable to redress. Humanitarian technocrats work in the relational field of dignity, by appeal to the worth of archonic beings. Such work requires a venue capable of fast-

paced processing of testimonies from the field and organization of emergency missions. It follows that the composition of human rights equipment requires a venue in which vigilance can be translated quickly into action and testimonies re-circulated as indications of human rights violations. Once human rights equipment is successfully synthesized in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then, of course, it has to be put to use. Consideration of the specifics of rights-based NGO venues thus raises the question of how, where, and when the human rights equipmental platform actually will be deployed.

**Human practices** equipment is composed when the interfaces of human practices modules are designed and synthesized as equipment.

**Human practices equipmental composition** analytically consists of the series:  
Leveraging, Second Order Participant, Agile Assemblage.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF COMPOSITION</b>	<b>SPECIALIST</b>	<b>VENUE</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Leveraging (T,T,R)</b>	<b>Second Order Participant</b>	<b>Agile Assemblages</b>

- **What is Leveraging as a mode of composition in human practices equipmental composition?**
- **Leveraging** as a mode of composition in human practices equipment distinguishes the way in which modules that qualify for human practices equipment are worked on such that their interfaces can be designed and such that they can be synthesized into an equipmental platform. Leveraging is a mode of composition that takes advantage of existing talent, technology, and resources, adjusts their interfaces such that the resulting connections should yield more potent solutions to real world problems than could have been the

case had these elements been taken up serially. Leveraging is distinctive in its attention to interfaces as a strategy for increasing capacities. A first set of upstream design parameters in this mode of composition is how to design module interfaces and synthesize them such that the resulting equipment is suited to harmonizing **forms and pathways** according a **metric of flourishing**. Thus, leveraging as a mode of composing human practices equipment should be distinguished from leveraging as a technique of maximizing forces or resources per se. The second set of upstream parameters consists of the challenge of adjusting the interfaces of heterogeneous elements that qualify as equipmental modules in the figure of human practices (i.e. vigorous insistence as a mode of *ethikē*, warranted assertions, and assurance), such that these heterogeneous modules are synthesized so as to function in ways that depends on, but cannot be reduced to, individual modules. In other words, the second set of upstream parameters consists of synthesizing modules such that the resulting assemblage is characterized by emergence. Downstream design parameters consist of designing and synthesizing human practices equipment in such a way as to maintain a constantly available level of generality. Modules must be composed in such a way that the resulting composition will function effectively to reconstruct significant problems, and is also plausibly applicable to a range of analogous problems. That is, human practices compositions must be designed and synthesized so that they will be able to function as human practices platforms. Successful leveraging requires a specific type of specialist, i.e. a **second order participant**, with a distinctive skill set, authority, and access to resources.

- **What is a Second Order Participant as a specialist in a human practices equipmental composition?**
- A **second order participant** as a specialist in human practices equipmental composition designates the type of actor who leverages pre-existing talent, technology, and resources, designs module interfaces such that these disparate modules can be synthesized into a reconstructed form. Human practices equipment reconstructs emergent forms-pathways through warranted assertions so that conditions of flourishing can be specified and so that forms-pathways can be remediated. Those specialists positioned and trained to accomplish such remediation are **second order participants**. Analytically, it is useful to think of specialists who leverage human practices equipment as second order *technocrats* who can be distinguished from second

order *technicians*, in the sense that technocrats are the managers of technicians and technologies, while technicians are charged with the production of the warranted assertions. Said another way, second order participants as technocrats, who are charged with the task of equipmental invention, oversight, and management within the figure of human practices (but not the details of its technical implementation per se) can be called “technicians of general ideas.” A challenge for the second order participant is to design interfaces in such a way that the resulting synthesis functions to facilitate activities that contribute to and are appropriate to emergence. The invention, oversight, and management of human practices equipment draw on, and have an elective affinity with, vigorous insistence as a mode of *ethikē* and an affect of assurance. What is the **venue** in which second order participants come to their design and synthesis resolutions? The venue of their composition is **agile assemblages**.

- **What is an Agile Assemblage as a venue of human practices equipmental composition?**
- An **agile assemblage** as a venue of human practices equipmental composition characterizes where and how second order participants work on the design and synthesis of human practices equipment. Unlike governmental venues that are already stabilized or institutionalized, and unlike rights-based NGOs that coincide with the articulation of human rights equipment itself, agile assemblages emerge through the practice of human practices equipmental composition. These assemblages privilege agility and eschew fixity. There are two reasons for this. The first reason is that these emergent assemblages are leveraged in relation to significant contemporary problems. The second reason is that these assemblages are explicitly designed not to become apparatuses.<sup>1</sup> That is to say, the *ethos* of leveraging human practices equipment is neither the construction of long-term governmental venues nor urgent rights-based organizations. Rather, these assemblages are designed to be quickly reassembled in relation to different problems once existing problems have been satisfactorily worked on. Second order participants work in the relational field of flourishing. Such work is encouraged by a venue that itself is emergent and open to reconstruction. It follows that the composition of human practices equipment favors a venue that is flexible and pragmatic. Such a venue

---

<sup>1</sup> See Paul Rabinow, Anthropos Today: Reflections on Modern Equipment (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

is structured by vigorous insistence, generating an assurance that warranted assertions will continue to be produced, tested, and effectively deployed. Once human practices equipment is provisionally synthesized and put to use in relation to upstream and downstream design parameters, then it is ready to be put to use and, when appropriate, remediated. Agile assemblages as venues for the composition of human practices equipment instantiate the challenge of how, where, and why human practices equipmental platform actually will be used.

An equipmental composition ready to use  
is an **equipmental platform**.

**Equipmental platforms** are analytically composed of the series:  
Mode of Jurisdiction, Method, Purpose

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF JURISDICTION</b>	<b>METHOD</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Regulation</b>	<b>Modulation</b>	<b>Security</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Protection</b>	<b>Emergency Intervention</b>	<b>Restoration</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Remediation</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<b>Resourceful solutions</b>

- **What is a Mode of Jurisdiction in an equipmental platform?**
- A **mode of jurisdiction** distinguishes the way in which an equipmental platform discriminates appropriate (i.e. coherent and co-operable) equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities it discriminates and organizes are those activities that govern the object (relation) within a relational field. Equipmental

platforms function as the basis for the organization of these equipmental activities. Of the possible ways in which an object can be governed, only those modes of jurisdiction qualify for an equipmental platform that can be made to operate according to a specific metric, i.e. adjust an object (relation) according to the standards of a given relational field. How the relation between the qualified mode of jurisdiction and an object (relation) adjusted to a relational field is made ready for use is **method**.

- **What is Method in an equipmental platform?**
- A **method** in an equipmental platform designates how the relation between a mode of jurisdiction and an object (relation) adjusted to a relational field is made ready for use. In this way, method functions as a primary structural joint between an equipmental platform and a **contemporary figure**. A method establishes a type of jurisdictional relationship. Of the possible jurisdictional relations that can be established, only those will qualify for a specific equipmental platform that support the equipmental platform so as to organize activities that work on objects according to the requirements of a given mode of ontology. The rationale for which one undertakes the organization of activities that method supports is an equipmental platform's **purpose**.
- **What is Purpose in an equipmental platform?**
- **Purpose** in an equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which the platform is composed. If mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way in which platforms organize governing activities, and if method designates how these governing relations are established, then purpose characterizes that for which equipmental platforms were originally composed. Equipmental platforms function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization into concrete problems such that these problems can be taken up as a set of possible solutions.

---

A biopolitical equipmental composition ready to use is  
a **biopolitical equipmental platform**.

**Biopolitical equipmental platforms**  
are analytically composed of the series:

## Regulation, Modulation, Security.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF JURISDICTION</b>	<b>METHOD</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
<b>BIOPOLITICAL</b>	<b>Regulation</b>	<b>Modulation</b>	<b>Security</b>

- **What is Regulation as a mode of jurisdiction in a biopolitical equipmental platform?**
- **Regulation** as a mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way in which a biopolitical equipmental platform discriminates appropriate equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities **regulation** distinguishes and organizes are those activities that govern the relation population-body within the relational field of normalization. Of the possible ways in which population-body can be governed, only those modes of regulation qualify for a biopolitical equipmental platform that can be made to operate according to a metric of normalization, i.e. that can calibrate population-body according to the standards of a relational field of normalization. How the relation between regulation and population-body calibrated to a relational field of normalization is made ready for use is a question of **modulation**.
- **What is Modulation as a method in a biopolitical equipmental platform?**
- As a method in a biopolitical equipmental platform, **modulation** designates how the relation between regulation and population-bodies calibrated to a relational field of normalization is made ready for use. In this way, modulation functions as a primary structural joint between a biopolitical equipmental platform and the **figure of biopower**. Modulation establishes a type of regulatory relationship. Of the possible regulatory relationships that can be established, only those will qualify for a biopolitical equipmental platform that support the platform so as to organize activities that govern population-body according to the requirements of probabilistic series. The rationale for which one undertakes the regulatory activities that modulation supports is the biopolitical equipmental platform's **purpose**. That purpose is **security**.



- **What is Security as the purpose of a biopolitical equipmental platform?**
- **Security** in a biopolitical equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which the biopolitical platform is composed. This characterization consists of two steps: the determination of a problem within a broad field of problematization and the articulation of possible solutions to this problem. Regulation designates the way in which a biopolitical platform operates in a field of normalization so as to introduce determination into an indeterminate field of security. Modulation designates how relations are established between the biopolitical platform and the field of normalization. In a broad sense, security is the problem for which biopolitical equipmental platforms are composed as components of a solution. Through biopolitical equipmental intervention the general problem-space of security is rendered susceptible to pragmatic intervention. Biopolitical platforms function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization of the figure of biopower into concrete problems of security such that a set of possible solutions become available.

A human rights equipmental composition ready to use is a **human rights equipmental platform**.

**Human rights equipmental platforms** are analytically composed of the series: Protection, Emergency Intervention, Restoration.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF JURISDICTION</b>	<b>METHOD</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Protection</b>	<b>Emergency Intervention</b>	<b>Restoration</b>

- **What is Protection as a mode of jurisdiction in a human rights equipmental platform?**
- **Protection** as a mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way in which a human rights equipmental platform discriminates appropriate equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. The kinds of activities **protection** distinguishes and organizes are those activities that redress violations or transgressions of humanity-human according to a metric of dignity. Of the possible ways in which the relation humanity-human can be redressed, only those modes of protection qualify for a human rights equipmental platform that are mobilized and directed in the name of dignity. That is to say, dignity constitutes a determination of the way in which human rights equipment operates, i.e. through the protection of humanity-human according to the standard of a relational field of dignity. How the relation between protection and humanity-human as a recognized part of the relational field of dignity is made ready to use is **emergency intervention**.
- **What is Emergency Intervention as a method in a human rights equipmental platform?**
- As a method in a human rights equipmental platform, **emergency intervention** designates how the relation between protection and humanity-human in a relational field of dignity is made ready for use. In this way, emergency intervention functions as a primary structural joint between a human rights equipmental platform and the **figure of human dignity**. Emergency intervention establishes a type of jurisdictional relationship. Of the possible jurisdictional relationships that can be established, only those will qualify for a human rights equipmental platform that declaim the existence of archonic being instantiated in humanity-humans in such a way that violations can be identified and protective action taken. The purpose for which one protects the relation humanity-human through emergency intervention is **restoration**.
- **What is Restoration as the purpose of a human rights equipmental platform?**
- **Restoration** in a human rights equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which a human rights equipmental platform is composed. This characterization consists of two steps: the determination of a concrete problem within a broad field of problematization and the articulation

of possible solutions to this problem. Within the general problematization of the worth of human beings, taken up as a figure of dignity, a series of indeterminations and blockages are framed as a problem of the violation of rights inherent in humanity. That is to say, the object (relation) humanity-human is framed as the bearer of dignity by way of these rights. In this way, human dignity, which, as archonic, could not otherwise be worked on, can subsequently be made susceptible to equipmental intervention. The purpose of this intervention is restoration. Restoration as the purpose of the human rights equipmental platform thus frames the challenge of how to address the permanent problem of human rights violations such that it can be managed through protection and emergency intervention. In sum, human rights equipmental platforms function as a pragmatic means of transforming aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization of the figure of human dignity into concrete problems of the violations of rights such that a set of possible solutions become available.

A human practices equipmental composition ready to use is a **human practices equipmental platform**.

**Human practices equipmental platforms**

are analytically composed of the series:

Remediation, Collaboration, Resourceful Solutions.

<b>TYPES</b>	<b>MODE OF JURISDICTION</b>	<b>METHOD</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
<b>HUMAN PRACTICES</b>	<b>Remediation</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<b>Resourceful solutions</b>

- **What is Remediation as a mode of jurisdiction in a human practices equipmental platform?**

- **Remediation** as a mode of jurisdiction distinguishes the way the way in which a human practices equipmental platform discriminates appropriate equipmental activities and the way in which it functions as the basis for the organization of these activities. Remediation entails two integral facets: a change of media, and an amelioration, but not perfection, of an object or situation. These facets are interconnected by a metric of flourishing. The kinds of activities remediation distinguishes and organizes are those activities that engage forms-pathways within a field of flourishing. Of the possible ways in which forms-pathways can be engaged, only those activities organized by a mode of remediation qualify for a human practices equipmental platform. This means that remediation as mode of jurisdiction qualifies for a human practices equipmental platform in so far as it contributes practices which adjust forms-pathways according to the standards of a relational field of flourishing. A metric of flourishing engages human practices equipmental platforms through experimenting with changes of media and ameliorative actions. The metric provides a gauge of and for these remedial practices by assessing the extent to which flourishing is encouraged. A human practices equipmental platform thus functions to organize inventive form-making activities in such a way as to encourage flourishing. The way in which such activities are organized is through the remediation of forms-pathways. How the relation between remediation and forms-pathways adjusted to a relational field of flourishing is made ready for use is **collaboration**.
- **What is Collaboration as a method in a human practices equipmental platform?**
- As a method in a human practices equipmental platform, **collaboration** designates how the relation between remediation and forms-pathways adjusted to a relational field of flourishing is made ready for use. In this way, collaboration functions as a primary structural joint between a human practices equipmental platform and the **figure of synthetic anthropos**. Collaboration establishes relations in a way that can be distinguished from cooperation. A collaborative method proceeds from an interdependent division of labor on shared problems. A cooperative method consists in demarcated work with regular exchange, but does not entail common definition of problems or shared techniques of remediation. Collaboration establishes a type of jurisdictional relationship. Of the possible jurisdictional

relations that can be established, only those will qualify for a human practices equipmental platform that promote and contribute to the remediation of forms-pathways in emergent assemblages. The purpose for which one remediates forms-pathways through collaboration is **resourceful solutions** to significant real world problems.

- **What are Resourceful Solutions as the purpose of a human practices equipmental platform?**
- **Resourceful solutions** as the purpose in a human practices equipmental platform characterizes the specific rationale according to which the platform is composed. The characterization consists of two steps: the determination of a problem within a broad field of problematization and the articulation of possible solutions to this problem. Resourceful solutions produce determinations in a situation in which what counts as a significant and manageable problem of flourishing is underdetermined. Those problems count as significant that can be framed as a problem of the remediation of forms-pathways through the leveraging and assembling of existing talent, technology, and resources. Through human practices equipmental intervention the general problem-space of flourishing is rendered susceptible to pragmatic intervention. Human practices platforms function as a pragmatic means of taking up aspects (e.g. blockages, difficulties, disruptions of the play of true and false, etc.) of a broader problematization of the figure of synthetic anthropos as manageable real world problems. By taking up aspects of the broader problematization in this way, existing resources can be assembled and a range of possible solutions opened up.

## APPENDIX OF CONCEPTS

---

Affect	Parastema
Analysis	Parrhesia
Anthropology	Pathway
Apparatus	Philosophy
Assemblage	Political Spirituality
Case	Problem
Collaboration	Problematization
Contemporary	Ramify
Design	Reconstruction
Diagnosis	Rectification
Discordancy	Remediation
Equipment (paraskeue)	Salvation (Soteria)
Ethical Mode	Subjectivation
Form	Synthesis
History of the Present	Theme
Indeterminacy	Theology
Jurisdiction	Truth Claim
Mode	Venues
Ontology	Veridiction

## AFFECT

Affect characterizes the way in which a relational field is structured such that a specific type of disposition is likely to be generated. Of all the possible dispositions generated in a relational field only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's mode of veridiction can be made to function within a given form of equipment.

Cluster I: Diagnosing Equipment: Affect, Diagnosis, Truth Claim, Ethical Mode, Equipment

## ANALYSIS

An analysis functions to lay out tables of categories in order to facilitate the work of decomposing complex wholes into distinct elements. This decomposition serves to test the logic on the basis of which composition has taken place.

Cluster I: Fieldwork in theology: Analysis, Problem, Assemblage, Ontology, Synthesis, Theology

## ANTHROPOLOGY

The study of the logos of the human thing (anthropos) has been figured in multiple ways historically. Most recently it has been figured as life, labor and language which might be in a process of re-problematization today.

Cluster I: Contemporary mode of Anthropology: Anthropology, Mode, Contemporary, Problem, Equipment

## APPARATUS

Apparatuses are stabilized forms composed of heterogeneous objects that bring multiple aspects of domains together and set them to work in a regulated functional manner. Apparatuses are long standing, long enduring specific responses to particular dimensions of larger problematizations.

Cluster I: Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: Apparatus, Pathway, History of the Present, Ramify, Contemporary

## ASSEMBLAGE

A nascent organizational form that attempts to identify and associate elements from diverse domains (e.g. law, technology, government, media, science, spatial arrangements, etc.), in response to events that signal the insufficiency and discordancy of previous apparatuses in relation to emergent problems. The first challenge is to diagnose the situation so as to demarcate a relational field from an under-determined problem space. Given the demarcation of a relational field and the increased determination of a problem space, the second challenge is to specify and select the type of objects that will count. In doing this a third challenge presents itself: veridictional and jurisdictional criteria

Cluster I: Fieldwork in theology: Assemblage, Problem, Analysis, Ontology, Synthesis, Theology

## CASE

Our use of the term case follows in the tradition of casuistry in its various ramifications from ethics to law and medicine. We distinguish cases from examples. Whereas examples function to illustrate theory, cases are specific whilst also having ramifying analogical relations to other cases.

Cluster I: Cases in the Human Sciences: Case , Theme, Design, Venue, Form

## COLLABORATION

As a mode of work collaboration should be distinguished from cooperation. A cooperative mode consists in demarcated work with regular exchange. Cooperation, unlike collaboration, does not entail common definition of problems or shared practices of addressing those problems. A collaborative mode proceeds from an interdependent division of labor on shared problems. Collaboration, unlike cooperation, entails common definition of problems and shared practices of addressing those problems.

Cluster I: Modes of collaboration: Collaboration, Venues, Contemporary, Reconstruction, Equipment



## CONTEMPORARY

Just as one can take up the “modern” as an ethos and not a period, one can take it up as a moving ratio. In that perspective, tradition and modernity are not opposed but paired: “tradition is a moving image of the past, opposed not to modernity but to alienation”. One can take up the contemporary as “a moving ratio of modernity, moving through the recent past and the near future in a (non-linear) space that gauges modernity as an ethos already becoming historical”.

Cluster 1: Modes of Collaboration: Contemporary, Collaboration, Venue, Reconstruction, Equipment

Cluster 2: Critical Position for Human Practices: Contemporary, History of the Present, Problematization, Remediation, Diagnosis

Cluster 3: Contemporary Mode of Anthropology: Contemporary, Anthropology, Mode, Problem, Equipment

Cluster 4: Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: Contemporary, Apparatus, Pathway, History of the Present, Ramify

## DESIGN

Design is a problem of composition. This problem is constituted by upstream and downstream parameters. Upstream: capable of integrating heterogeneous elements according to a particular metric. Downstream: capable of functioning in specific cases while remaining available for re-articulation in other cases.

Cluster 1: Cases in the Human Sciences: Design, Case, Theme, Venue

## DIAGNOSIS

Diagnosis has two functions. The first is analytic. It functions to lay out tables of categories. That is to say, a diagnosis serves a critical function; it facilitates the work of decomposition of complex wholes in order to test the logic on the basis of which composition has taken place. In diagnosis, the work of decomposition cannot be an end-in-itself. Rather, analysis must be followed by recomposition. This synthetic work is the second function of a diagnosis.

Cluster 1: Diagnosing Equipment: Diagnosis, Affect, Truth Claim, Ethical Mode,

## Equipment

Cluster 2: Critical position for Human Practices: Diagnosis, Contemporary, History of the Present, Problematization, Remediation

Cluster 3: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality: Diagnosis, Salvation, Veridiction, Jurisdiction, Political Spirituality

## DISCORDANCY

Discordancy is one type of breakdown which occasions thinking. Discordancy is a question of ethics insofar as rectification of discordancy requires recursive discernment of ethical practices within defined modes of jurisdiction. Discordancy is a question of alignment and discrimination carried out through the practice of inquiry.

Cluster 1: Determining Situations of Inquiry: Discordancy, Problem, Indetermination, Rectification, Reconstruction

## EQUIPMENT (PARASKEUE)

Equipment, though conceptual in design and formulation, is pragmatic in use. Defined abstractly equipment is a set of truth claims, affects and ethical orientations designed and composed into a practice. Equipment, which has historically taken different forms, enables practical responses to changing conditions brought about by specific problems, events and general reconfigurations. Today there is a rather inchoate, if insistent, demand for new equipment to reconfigure and reconstruct the relations between and among the life sciences, the human sciences, and diverse citizenries both national and global.

Cluster 1: Modes of Collaboration: Equipment, Contemporary, Collaboration, Venue, Reconstruction

Cluster 2: Contemporary Mode of Anthropology: Equipment, Contemporary, Anthropology, Mode, Problem

Cluster 3: Diagnosing Equipment: Equipment, Diagnosis, Affect, Truth Claim, Ethical Mode

## ETHICAL MODE

An ethical mode distinguishes the way in which, within a given form of equipment, practices are taken up as ethical. Those practices qualify as ethical which can be made to operate on an axis of better and worse. An ethical mode forms part of equipment when it can be made to operate on an axis of better and worse relative to a metric, i.e. the standards that order the contemporary figure in relation to which equipment is composed.

Cluster I: Diagnosing Equipment: Ethical Mode, Equipment, Diagnosis, Affect, Truth Claim

## FORM

Given that diagnosis and inquiry are internal to a problematic situation the challenge of form giving is to determine, bring together and compose relevant elements, in such a way that care and thought become both a practice and an outcome. Thus the work of form giving becomes an ethical part of inquiry.

Cluster I: Cases in the Human Sciences: Form, Design, Case, Theme, Venue

## HISTORY OF THE PRESENT

Foucault experimented throughout his life with developing methods of analysis adequate to diagnosing and conceptualizing problematizations in history. Although he never settled on a fixed or definitive method, his consistent, if not unique goal, was to contribute to a “History of the Present.” In that project, a certain understanding of the past would provide a means of showing the contingency of the present and thereby contribute to making a more open future.

Cluster I: Critical position for Human Practices: History of the Present, Diagnosis, Contemporary, Problematization, Remediation

Cluster 2 Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: History of the Present, Contemporary, Apparatus, Pathway, Ramify

## INDETERMINACY

Indeterminacy is one type of breakdown which occasions thinking. Indeterminacy is a scientific question insofar as rectification of indeterminacy requires recursive experimentation within various defined modes of veridiction. Indeterminacy is a question of knowing and thinking.

Cluster I: Determining Situations of Inquiry: Indetermination, Discordancy, Problem, Rectification, Reconstruction

## JURISDICTION

Modes of jurisdiction determine and govern those activities taken to be coherent and co-operable. The diagnostic challenge is to determine how much adjustment of existing jurisdictional modes is required in order to govern the objects constituted within a given relational field.

Cluster I: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality: Jurisdiction, Diagnosis, Salvation, Veridiction, Political Spirituality

## MODE

Mode indicates a way of doing something, the form in which something exists, and the form's temporality. The mode in which you think through a problem specifies objectives of thought, limits and the position from which one thinks.

Cluster I: Contemporary Mode of Anthropology: Mode, Contemporary, Anthropology, Problem, Equipment

## ONTOLOGY

Ontology is the study of things of the world and how they are turned into objects. The task for an anthropology of the contemporary is to examine interactions between what there is, what is brought into the world and how the practices of understanding are an essential component of ontology.

Cluster I: Fieldwork in theology: Ontology, Assemblage, Problem, Analysis, Synthesis, Theology

## PARASTEMA

Parastema is a character and virtue term. It designates the questions a person must keep in mind in order to do what they do truthfully. In this light parastema can be understood as part of an ethical substance.

Cluster I: Becoming a friend of thinking: Parastema, Truth claim, Parrhesia, Subjectivation, Philosophy

## PARRHESIA

Parrhesia designates a way of speaking the truth which involves a) the truth speaker firmly believing that they are speaking the truth and b) in a situation in which speaking the truth puts the speaker at risk.

Cluster I: Becoming a friend of thinking: Parrhesia, Parastema, Truth claim, Subjectivation, Philosophy

## PATHWAY

Operating genealogically, a pathway functions to orient inquiry. It picks out and connects elements across a heterogeneous and dynamic contemporary problem space. A pathway reduces historical complexity to a path-connected set of nodes.

Cluster I: Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: Pathway, History of the Present, Contemporary, Apparatus, Ramify

## PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy is the form of thought that asks not what is true and false, but what determines that there is and can be truth and falsehood and whether or not we can separate the true and the false.

Cluster I: Becoming a friend of thinking: Philosophy, Parrhesia, Parastema, Truth claim, Subjectivation

## POLITICAL SPIRITUALITY

Political Spirituality concerns the question of how anthropologically specific modes of veridiction, jurisdiction, and subjectivation – truth telling and governing oneself and others – are interconnected and given form. Put differently, the challenge is to characterize ways of distinguishing true and false in connection to ways of governing oneself and the other.

Cluster I: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality: Political Spirituality, Diagnosis, Salvation, Veridiction, Jurisdiction

## PROBLEM

A problem is composed of conceptual and practical poles. On the conceptual side a problem involves the work of transforming breakdowns, difficulties, discordancy, etc. into material (questions, objects, sites of inquiry, etc.) for thought. On the practical side a problem involves the formulation, design, and facilitation of possible courses of action that have been opened up and made available as solutions.

Cluster I: Determining Situations of Inquiry: Problem, Indetermination, Discordancy, Rectification, Reconstruction

## PROBLEMATIZATION

A problematization “is the ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc).” We are attempting to provide a problematization of the near future. In this position the challenge is not to make the present seem contingent, but to remediate current blockages and opportunities by conceptualizing the near future as a series of problems in relationship to which possible solutions become available to thought.

Cluster I: Critical position for Human Practices: Problematization, Diagnosis, Contemporary, History of the Present, Remediation

## RAMIFY

To ramify means to produce differentiated trajectories from previous determinations. This unmooring produces unexpected effects that may complicate a situation or make the desired result more difficult to achieve.

Cluster I: Reworking Genealogy for the Contemporary: Ramify, Pathway, History of the Present, Contemporary, Apparatus

## RECONSTRUCTION

“Reconstruction” Dewey writes, “can be nothing less than the work of developing, of forming, of producing (in the literal sense of that word) the intellectual instrumentalities which will progressively direct inquiry into the deeply and inclusively human – that is to say moral – facts of the present scene and situation.” We argue that the capacity to contribute collaboratively to such a reconstructed situation constitutes a basic parameter of flourishing – the metric of our ethical engagement.

Cluster I: Determining Situations of Inquiry: Reconstruction, Problem, Indetermination, Discordancy, Rectification

## RECTIFICATION

In common usage rectification means to put something right. In chemistry, rectification refers to a process of refinement through distillation. Our anticipation is that rectification will expedite experimental reorientation consisting of strategies for redesign and recomposition.

Cluster I: Determining Situations of Inquiry: Rectification, Reconstruction, Problem, Indetermination, Discordancy

## REMEDICATION

The term remediation has two relevant facets. First, it means to remedy, to make something better. Second, remediation entails a change of medium. Together, these two facets provide the specification of a specific mode of equipment. When confronted by difficulties (conceptual breakdowns, unfamiliarity, technical

blockages and the like), ethical practice must be able to render these difficulties in the form of coherent problems that can be reflected on and attended to.

Cluster I: Critical position for Human Practices: Remediation, Problematization, Diagnosis, Contemporary, History of the Present

## SALVATION (SOTERIA)

In classical thought the term soteria, or salvation, had a range of meanings. It could designate the movement from the negative to the positive such as from death to life – salvation from a danger or from accusation. Or it could refer solely to the positive, such as the preservation of something precious or the realization of completion or perfection. Taken in light of this range of meanings, we can say that salvation is a transformed way of being involving movement from incapacity to capacity.

Cluster I: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality: Salvation, Diagnosis, Veridiction, Jurisdiction, Political Spirituality

## SUBJECTIVATION

Subjectivation designates researches, practices, experiences and relationships, by way of which modes of virtual existence for possible subjects can be actualized.

Cluster I: Becoming a friend of thinking: Subjectivation, Parrhesia, Parastema, Truth claim, Philosophy

## SYNTHESIS

The work of analysis cannot be an end in itself. Rather, analysis must be followed by recomposition – the production of a composite whole whose logic of composition cannot be reduced to its constitutive elements.

Cluster I: Fieldwork in theology: Synthesis, Assemblage, Problem, Analysis, Ontology, Theology



## THEME

A theme is an artful presentation of a problem space that groups heterogeneous topoi into a systematic frame.

Cluster 1: Cases in the Human Sciences: Theme, Case, Design, Venue, Form

## THEOLOGY

The study of the logos of the divine (theos) has been figured in multiple ways historically. Most recently it has been figured as a problem of dignity, pastoral care and vocation, which might be in a process of re-problematization today.

Cluster 1: Fieldwork in theology: Theology, Synthesis, Assemblage, Problem, Analysis, Ontology

## TRUTH CLAIM

The term truth-claim designates that subset of speech acts that count as true and false within a given equipmental form. Within this class of serious speech acts, only those that can be made to cohere with a given figure's mode of veridiction qualify as truth claims.

Cluster 1: Becoming a friend of thinking: Truth claim, Subjectivation, Parrhesia, Parastema, Philosophy

Cluster 2: Diagnosing Equipment: Truth Claim, Equipment, Diagnosis, Affect, Ethical Mode

## VENUES

Venue characterizes the scene, site, or setting in which specialists work on design and synthesis. Such venues may have been already stabilized or institutionalized, they may coincide with the articulation of the practice itself, or they may emerge through the practice of equipmental composition. The venue is not a neutral scene in which specialists work, nor is it only the site within which a given mode of composition is advanced. Rather, it is a facility. That is to say, when composition is successful, the venue facilitates rather than obstructs the design and synthesis of specific interfaces.

Cluster 1: Modes of collaboration: Venues, Collaboration, Contemporary, Reconstruction, Equipment

Cluster 2: Cases in the Human Sciences: Venues, Case, Theme, Design, Form

## VERIDICTION

The term veridiction distinguishes the ways in which the speech acts that are taken to be true and false are produced and authorized. The work of diagnosis entails determining the extent to which previous authorized speech acts are adequate to the contemporary problem.

Cluster 1: Diagnosis of Political Spirituality: Veridiction, Salvation, Diagnosis, Jurisdiction, Political Spirituality

# ENDNOTES

- 1 Definitions from the online Windows dictionary.
- 2 Paul Rabinow, Symbolic Domination: Cultural Form and Historical Change in Morocco, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).
- 3 Paul Rabinow, Marking Time: On the Anthropology of the Contemporary, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Quoted in Paul Rabinow, Anthropos Today, 18.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 On “practice” see Alisdair MacIntyre, After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1984).
- 9 Paul Rabinow and Gaymon Bennett. “From Bio-Ethics to Human Practices or Assembling Contemporary Equipment,” in Beatriz da Costa and Kavita Philip, eds. Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).
- 10 Michel Foucault, L’Herméneutique du sujet, Cours au Collège de France, 1981-82. ‘Hautes Études,’ Paris: Éditions de l’École des Hautes Etudes, Éditions Gallimard, Éditions du Seuil, 2001. Scholarly édition and After-word by Frédéric Gros. P. 312.
- 11 Foucault, « *[L]’épreuve de soi-même comme sujet qui pense effectivement ce qu’il pense et qui agit comme il pense, avec comme objectif, une certaine transformation du sujet qui doit le constituer comme, disons : sujet éthique de la vérité.*» Ibid., 442.
- 12 An example of meditation understood as a practice and a test of the state of a subject seeking an ethos is found in Épictète, Livre I, 16. Épictète speaks of a distinctive faculty we have that functions differently than other faculties. We have other faculties such as those that enable us to play a musical instrument or to use language. These faculties, however, cannot tell us whether or not we should be playing an instrument or speaking. If one wants to know whether it is good or bad to play an instrument, it is necessary to turn elsewhere. And the place one must turn is to that other faculty, a faculty that is given the name of ‘reason.’ Reason therefore is assigned a kind of regulatory position, one whose function turns on taking care of the ‘souci de soi.’ Foucault, L’Herméneutique du sujet, 438.

- 13 Foucault, Résumé du cours, L'Herméneutique du sujet, 479.
- 14 Gros, "After-word," L'Herméneutique du sujet, 510.
- 15 Paul Rabinow French Modern: Norms and Forms of Modern Equipment, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 2.
- 16 It has been plausibly argued, and empirically demonstrated in various instances, that the regime of governmentality to which the state equipment form of political rationality was indebted has undergone a fundamental transformations in recent decades. For example, Nikolas Rose, Powers of Freedom (Cambridge :Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- 17 It shouldn't be overlooked that with the Belmont Report ethicists, for the first time, are made part of the U.S. government, despite the increasing turn to moral discourse as the site of truth distinctions since 1950.
- 18 Albert Jonsen, The Birth of Bioethics (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- 19 Paul Rabinow, Anthropos Today (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).
- 20 Michel Foucault, "Questions of Method," in Power: Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, eds. James D. Faubion and Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 2000), 230-233.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 238.
- 22 *Ibid.*