

## **The Concept of Biopower: The Use of Terror as a Political Technique of Controlling and Governing Citizens**

Preechaya Kittipaisalsilpa

Institute of Diplomacy and International Study, Rangsit University, Pathumthani, 12000 Thailand  
Email: preechaya.k@rsu.ac.th

Submitted 15 October, 2016; accepted in final from 14 November 2016

---

### **Abstract**

This paper discusses how the concept of biopower explains the use of terror as a political tactic for controlling and governing citizens. It attempts to demonstrate that biopower adds something to our understanding of fear as a political weapon. The paper mainly examines what biopower adds to the analysis of the use of terror and power as being exercised over bodies and populations. It begins the analysis by tracking back to the mainstream political thought of sovereignty, power, and fear in the work of Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes and before contrasting these ideas with Michel Foucault's notion of governmentality to show what is distinctive about the concept in a systematic manner. This is followed by the third section that provides an account of the use of biopower as a tactic of governmentality. It explains how biopower is reproduced by introducing three conceptualizations; as a technique shaping good elements from bad, biopolitical territorial borders, and the biopolitical framework of representability. Lastly, the paper provides the uses of biopolitics as the way biopower exercises the use of terror in War on Terror. The paper concludes fear is rather created and constructed as a form of a modern strategic model of power to control the bodies and populations beyond the level of the state itself.

*Keywords:* Biopower, biopolitics, governmentality, fear, Foucault, terror, sovereignty

---

### **1. Introduction**

'Terror' is an exceptionally inexplicit concept and has a wide range of meanings. In 1794, the term 'la terreur' was first used to describe a revolutionary in France. Unlike the way in which terrorism is commonly used today, it was employed to consolidate the new government's power and designate all dissidents who were not involved in the French Revolution as the enemy of the people. Later, during the First World War, the 'great terror' was used to describe the acts of Stalin by his political opponents. Following the Second World War, in another swing of the term's meaning, it was used in reference to the often violent revolutionary nationalist struggles that emerged in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East during the late 1940s in response to the continued colonial rule. More recent examples include the 9/11 terrorist attacks which redefined an 'act of terrorism' and led to the declaration of the 'War on Terror' (WoT), stated by former U.S. President George W. Bush who firstly used the term on 20 September 2001 (Gerges, 2009). Not surprisingly, the meaning of the word has changed over time to accommodate the political vernacular and discourse of each successful era.

The question bounces back, 'What is an act of terror?'. The word 'terrorism' was first popularized during the French Revolution. However, the meaning and the usage has been changing time to time in term how it operates. According to the recent frequencies of use of its definitional elements, the three elements that are most used to label the term 'terror', are violence and force (83.5%), political action (65%), and feeling of fear (51%) (Schmid & Jongman, 1988). Nowadays, the term terror is coming to a more common understanding as the above the use of its definitional elements, people tend to take it negatively, whereby the term of terrorism in the old times, the word was categorized as a positive reference. Contrasting commonly terrorism understood today, according to Hoffman (2006) terrorism during French Revolution meant to such revolutionary of antigovernment group undertaken by non-state actors. It was rather portrayed as one of the instruments of governance to established revolutionary state and specifically 'well designed and well planned' to consolidate the new government's element of power by frightening those whom government took as traitors and opposite side of the government. The meaning of act of terror has changed again by 1900s; it was depicted as the act of mass violence and repression employed by dictatorial states and leaders such as Benito Mussolini in Italy and Joseph Stalin in Russia in a straight line against

their own civilians as Social Hygiene and the Great Purge (1936–1938) representatively. (Goldstein, 2001). Following the Second World War until today, the term act of terror have begun to take the definition which is widely accepted today as the reference to the violent action by the nationalist, religious and specific political non-state movements. In recent, according to United Nations Security Council Resolution defines the act of terror as following:

Criminal acts, including (those) against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death,..., with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government.

(United Nations Security Council, 2004)

As such, Terrorism has been changing from time to time and thus, subjectively political labeled, creating the fear of terror amongst civilians in the state and substantially constraining them in a state of fear. Many scholars have defined the use of terror and fear as a political tactic and strategy (Laqueur, 1978; Genel, 2006; Pasi, 2012). According to Hoffman (2006), terrorism is labeled as an act of violence perceived to be against society; whether it involves antigovernment activities, organized crime syndicates or mob riots. Likewise, Laqueur (1978) also states, terror represents the most common feeling of wars in the last four decades. Therefore, the term terror in its most widely accepted contemporary usage seems to be fundamentally and inherently political. Consequently, the main argument of this paper is to discuss to what extent the concept of biopower can explain the use of terror as a political tactic for controlling and governing citizens. The paper determines to clarify the creation of terror and fear as one of the political instrumental and psychosocial weapon over the bodies and populations. The paper divides into sections; each consists of objectives, methodology, finding and conclusion respectively.

## 2. Objectives

The paper consists of a set of objectives that the readers can understand through the set of construal structure. The objective of this research paper is to look at the use of ‘terror’ as a political tactic in an alternative viewpoint. The paper aims to analyze this argument by mainly employing Michel Foucault along with his post-structural concept. By employing the usage of ‘biopower’ and ‘biopolitics’ as political techniques in the conception of governability, which in this paper analysis, this alternative theory gives more explanations than the mainstream IR theory. In this respects, this paper sees to details the important compliments in which biopolitical power could play a role in term of political tools and strategies used to wage the fear of terror to govern over the populace.

## 3. Materials and methods

This section provides detail of method used in a replication of the study. In the introduction part of the paper, researcher lays the fundamental formula uses for the whole work. It includes the background of the study, the statement of the problem, research questions and hypothesis, research objectives, and scope and limitations. The working approach draws both parallels of the mainstream political and the alternative literature from various cities throughout the state and from all levels of analysis. From the knowledge generated by this study, other scholars also derive proposals, in addition to those formulated by the researcher for further systematic research and theoretical refinement.

At the outset, the paper tracks back to the mainstream political thought of sovereignty, power, and fear in the work of Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes, following with introduction of Michel Foucault theory of governmentality and the explanation of biopower as a tactic used in governmentality. The political framework of these thinkers is set to be compared and analyzed theoretically. Also, the paper emphasizes how biopower is reproduced by introducing three conceptualizations; as a technique shaping good elements from bad, biopolitical territorial borders, and the biopolitical framework of representability. As a result, it concludes with the ultimate tactic of biopolitics in exercising power to control the populations.

#### 4. Results

The paper opens with Machiavelli and Hobbes's statements as they both recognize that fear is the source of political power over people's life to maintain the ruler's sovereignty in the state. Machiavelli posts, one can govern and hold the power of sovereignty by emphasizing fear and love. Hobbes in along with Machiavelli posts in his theory of social contract whereby citizens should be governed by the hand of fear excising by the head of states. In contrast, Foucault goes further and develops these ideas beyond mainstream political theory. Fear, instead of in a great extent is used to indicate one's preference in a particular matter by the state government. It is exposed in the name of disciplinary power by the state over the civilians. As the result of the research, this paper concludes, fear is created, constructed as a form of a modern strategic biopolitical model of power beyond the level of the state itself, however, exists to constitute over the population's lives.

#### 5. Discussion

##### 5.1 Machiavelli, Hobbes and Foucault on Sovereignty, Power, and Fear

The relationship between sovereignty, power, and fear in political thought has been addressed by many thinkers over the centuries (as cited in Tickner, 2003). More than any other philosophers, Machiavelli's and Hobbes' basic assumption is to study the role of the government and the nature of morality in society. Both thinkers revolutionize political thought by introducing the use of fear in governing. In the first outset of the paper, it will first explain Machiavelli's and Hobbes's ideas before exploring the political ideas of Foucault.

During the 16<sup>th</sup> century the concept of the 'will of the prince' was introduced by Machiavelli as an absolute form of sovereignty to govern people in the state (Maurizio, 2010). As Machiavelli puts it, the Prince as the ruler of the 'state' is to secure the future of the 'state' using all means necessary. Machiavelli endorses the certain kind power of the state to exercising over its people as such killing, violence, and cruelty toward the greater good. Secondly, the Prince does not have to be concerned with model social and human behavior because bad behavior is excusable when done for the public good (Coyle, 1995). Machiavelli tackles the question of using fear to control citizens. He emphasizes that policy of using violence create fear. Fear is a means that can justify an end. Fear is a tool of prince's governing. Fear is a means of ensuring the security of the ruler and the common good. While, Machiavelli proposes that a characteristic leader should be both loved and feared (Patapan, 2006). Affection and fear both are both powerful drives for rulers. Nevertheless, love, darling, and affection sometimes forge a bond of obligation whereby fear modestly encourages obedience. Fear is a strong component that motivates people to obey the laws, orders, and social norms. Without fear of those consequences, states will be in the chaos with nothing fences the line. Thus, rulers will have no power to control the people under their authority. Machiavelli emphasizes that fear will keep the leader in a much stronger position. Rulers who have gained power through exercising their ability to control the state are in the most secure position, maintaining respect and continually asserting their authority.

Instead of focusing from the top-down sovereignty like Machiavelli, Hobbes believes that by analyzing the human instincts in 'state', one could design a system of government that meets the needs of its citizens and would promote good behavior and counteract bad behavior. Hobbes bases his argument on an articulated view of the state of nature as the condition of war of everyone against everyone (Hobbes, 2012). To avert a descent into the state of nature men must enter into a social contract submitting to the authority and protection of a sovereign. The reason people would surrender their freedom to an absolute ruler is that life in the state of nature is dangerous, so people will do whatever is necessary to secure survival. Likewise, Hobbes emphasizes the determining power of fear in the state of nature. Fear, according to Hobbes, suffuses and shapes human life (Blits, 1989). Hobbes considers fear to be the most powerful force in human life. At once the principal cause of war and the principal means to peace, fear is the basis both of man's most urgent plight and his only possible escape. Hobbes contends that a government is born as a result of a social contract, the result of fearing to feel fearful in the state of nature. The government will only exist if everyone agrees to give up his or her rights to sole sovereignty. However, the first difference

between these two philosophers lies in their belief where they place the role of sovereignty. Machiavelli points out what conduct he considers to be correct for a ruler to be able to exercise the power of fear to control his people. Hobbes, in contrast, believes that a ruler can do anything since every man has given up his freedom in exchange for his survival in the state of nature. Secondly, Hobbes' philosophical framework regarding the origin of government is more complete and correct than Machiavelli's version. The role of government in Machiavelli's philosophy is about creating a guideline for a ruler to acquire and to maintain political power. Machiavelli does not underline the origin of government in his work, whereas Hobbes tries to understand the formulation of a government by conceptualizing a world without a government to trace the roots and the reason why the government is important (Danaher, 2000). Although these two theorists explore the question of government and human nature slightly differently, they both agree that fear is a source of political power and that people are in a constant state of fear in the absence of political society.

Sovereignty underwent a transformation from Machiavelli to Hobbes, finding a more limited account of the sovereign right of death and power over life as conditioned by the defense of the sovereign (Dean, 2010). Although Hobbes and Machiavelli agree in terms of sovereignty in that the state has the power over one's life, their mechanism of sovereignty still distinguishes between the state and people within the state (Genel, 2006).

Consequently, Foucault criticizes mainstream political philosophy for its reliance on the notion of formal authority and its insistence on analyzing mechanisms of sovereignty. Foucault firstly states his thinking and theory during his lecture at the Collège de France during 1977-1978. In Foucault's work, he examines relations of power in such a way as to challenge the dominant state-centered understanding of power. The power rather than being centered on the state is diffused across a great many micro-sites throughout society. In Foucault's perspective, the state is the expression of the structures and configuration of power in society rather than controlled by individual sovereignty. Hardt and Negri (2000) have also supported Foucault and argue that there is a new worldwide 'network of power'. Here now, power is no long defined by the power of nation-states but instead by supranational organisms (Reid, 2005; Dean, 2007). Supranational organisms can be explained in term of the organ where members transcend national boundaries, or their interests are linked and shared among them. Within those supranational organisms, they neither use voting system nor legitimate power to exercise their order; instead, the power is exercised differently through governing over the body of its populace. This kind of governing is introduced by Foucault and called as "governmentality" (Foucault, 2008) Foucault introduced governmentality during his lectures on biopolitics at the College de France in 1979. The term governmentality is the combination of two French words; govern (governer) and mentality (mentalité), which can be succinct as the conduct of conduct. In other words, it has been known by another name as the art of governing. In deeper meaning, governmentality refers to the way of an individual's conduct is shifting away from a central authority such as states or institutions but being individually shaped and controlled among the populations. The concept of governmentality consequently focuses on the process of governing individuals on two reciprocal structures of power; forms of techniques and knowledge. Governmentality, in Foucault's eyes, is a hope to answer how individuals act, do and behave in the state and how they are expected to conduct themselves through obligating laws, norms, the expectation of social policies, institutions, and ideologies without noticing the state enforcement. Therefore, governmentality perspectives open up a new era of government.

Furthermore, Foucault's analysis of governmentality concerns the nature of sovereignty and highlights different kinds of power in society such as knowledge and the collection of techniques. Knowledge and social practice thus are linked to social power. He suggests that political theorists need to develop an approach to understanding power that causes changes in society. Unlike Hobbes who is only concerned with government in social contract form, Foucault specifies the relationship between sovereignty, discipline, and government. He suggests that it should be viewed as a "triangle: sovereignty, discipline, and governmental management, which have a population as its main target and the apparatuses of security as its essential mechanism" (Dean, 2013). To say, his analysis of governmentality can be understood, as the new entitlement of the modern nation state from "to let live and make die" as "to make life and let die" (Foucault, 2003a). His theory of govern with the mentality is a new way of understanding how the new formation of power dominates the states today.

Additionally, Foucault's analysis of governmentality allows more scope to identify a better answer to the relationship between fear and modern power (Debrix & Barder, 2011). Foucault poses that power passes through individuals (Foucault, 2003b). Foucault's concept of governmentality is different from Hobbes' because he poses that fear is not what the state lets people be free from. Instead, fear is actually what the governmental agent of the state reproduces over time to time to establish the control of the social body through preservation of life (Foucault, 2008). Foucault's governmentality points out that fear has to be made reproductively and continuingly within the society, in order to allow the sovereign state to mobilize death, fear and terror through "lives bodies in society" (Debrix & Barder, 2011). The development of disciplinary power over life is explained by Foucault who focuses on how the government uses fear to govern the population and to wage war in the name of life necessity. His primary concern is not with war understood as a source of modern institutions, discourses or practices but with war conceived as constitutive of specific types of modern power relations (Foucault, 2003b). Fear is thus a form of peace that takes place in modern societies realized through the war in which population conditions are variably manipulated and put to work in developing modern strategic models of power.

One example of governmentality as a way to control bodies lies in a designed prison 'Panopticon' by Jeremy Bentham. Panopticon is designed as a circular tower where there is an observation or inspection tower as in the center, and along with the main circular wall, it is divided into open cells with no fence facing to the observation tower. A single watchman serves as a guard in the tower where the prisoners are put into each cell and are unable to tell whether they are being watched by the person in the tower or not. The key point of Panopticon is that even though it is impossible for a single guard to observe all prisoners' cell at once, the prisoners are unable to tell whether they are being a watch. Accordingly, they must then act as they are being watched all the time. As a result, they must repetitively control their own behavior while staying in the cell. Foucault uses Panopticon as the grand metaphors to demonstrate how fear of terror and violence from a guard on duty can correct the prisoners' behaviors. They must behave, act and do well in order not to be punished. Nowadays, developing on Foucault's concept, the advanced technology has allowed for the deployment of panoptic structures emerged from Panopticon model, setting up throughout society. Surveillance by CCTV is an excellent example put into work as the government's observation tower of the populace.

As Foucault intimates, fear is what must be reproduced by governmental agents in order to establish control. It is indeed the case that, through a series of governmentalized techniques, fear has been made beneficial. Many scholars also state on this argument. Hobbes' model of the state of nature as a system of power and Schmitt's concept of enmity are premised upon the idea that a concentration of fear is examples of the political tactic of using fear (Schmitt, 2007). Therefore, in order to reproduce and use fear to target the population effectively, the government must have techniques of governing an anonymous mass of bodies rather than social institutions or individuals (Agamben, 2005). Among those forms of governing, biopolitics can be characterized as a political technique of governmentality for controlling and governing citizens.

## 5.2 Biopower and Biopolitics as the Use of Terror as Political Techniques

The notion of biopower and biopolitics, for Foucault, are commonly used to describe a form of power over bodies and lives. These two concepts are closely related (Genel, 2006). The concept of biopower for Foucault is used "to designate what brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life" (Calhoun, Gerties, Pfaff, & Virk 2007). It is coined by the relations of a set power-knowledge reproduced by the government to manage people in a wider extent through state discipline. Foucault explains further as:

By this I mean a number of phenomena that seem to me to be quite significant, namely, the set of mechanisms through which the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power, or, in other words, how, starting from the 18th century, modern Western societies took on board the fundamental biological fact that human beings are a species. This is what I have called biopower.

(Foucault, 2007)

Biopower thus underlines the practice of modern supranational organisms and nation states which uses to govern their populations through diverse of techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of entire populations. Biopower signifies the power or abstract force which is produced, exercised and realized through practices associated with the body and the mechanism of biopolitics such as strategies to affect particular things that depend on the human life in its biological dimension. The concept biopolitics, in return, signifies the specific set of techniques and knowledge by which one aims to produce the biological in a specific form of the techniques where biopower is exercised in its many forms of applications (Foucault, 2008). Foucault sees how the biopower being exercised through different kinds of series of techniques that control and circuitously operate within the societal body where the populations are victims. According to Foucault, he emphasizes governmentality method recreate individuals as docile of bodies to be reproduced and controlled by the political governing. Agamben (1998) also notes governmentality reproduces a “bare life” in which the species as a simple body becomes “what is at stake in a society’s political strategies”. Therefore, biopolitical techniques designate the way through which biopower is continually reproduced and sustained through life. Life here must be understood as a process comprising forces and desires by which the life of the species grows and reproduces. However, the actual structure of biopolitics is dependent upon particular political rationalities according to which one aims to rationalize the phenomena characteristic to the body of the population (Foucault, 2008). Biopolitics can be understood as three different ways to control and govern citizens: as a technique shaping good elements from bad, biopolitical territorial borders, and the biopolitical framework of representability.

Firstly, as Foucault claims, the biopolitical technique is designed “to make live and let die”, which later enabled a new form of governance (Foucault, 2003a). Instead of disciplining individual bodies, biopolitics seeks to maximize circulation, flows, and movement of people by shifting ‘goods’ elements of populations from ‘bad’ and giving a misidentification to people (Werbin, 2009). In the context of governmentalized power, the biopolitical production of fear features of the population became the target of political strategies. As Foucault claims, governmental agents always reproduce ‘fear’ in order to establish control. Through a series of governmentalized techniques fear has been made beneficial. For instance, biopower according to the concepts of Foucault can be seen in mass genocides of Jews during Second World War by Hitler and more recently in Sudan and Kosovo where the governments use the difference in beliefs and races to control the population by creating the fear of each other to destroy their enemy (Castells, 2004). Furthermore, the concept of biopower can explain the use of terror as a political tactic not only within its state but also the within the wide range of a continent (Marks, 2006) As can be seen in the studies of the aftermath of the Second World War, the discipline of security studies shares the standard interpretation of Second World War as a ‘good war’ where “the war is seen as a struggle between democracy and totalitarianism, freedom and tyranny, good and evil, in which the “good guy won.” (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006). During this period the tension between two competing sides also creates the fear that the citizens have framed in their mind (Butler, 2009). In a similar manner during the Cold War and Cuban Missile Crisis, Russia and Cuba are accounted for as evil and communist where they aim to take away the freedom from democratic countries (Columba & Vaughan-Williams, 2010). Furthermore, in the Vietnam War the state is divided into two sides: North Vietnam supported by the Soviet Union, China as a communist power and the government of South Vietnam supported by the US as democratic (Hardt & Negri, 2004). This type of biopower is justifiable according to the concepts of Foucault.

Secondly, biopolitical tactics also control people within the frame of ‘biopolitical border’. Biopolitics, as it has historically existed, has always had its border. On Foucault’s account, a biopolitical border is different to a geopolitical border, which is a territorial division between the land of one state and the land of another that divides the population (Kelly, 2010). An example of a biopolitical border can be seen particularly within the European Schengenland area (Walters, 2002; Salter, 2006). The territorial border can function as a place where people are categorized as to the populations that they belong to, however, the biopolitical covers both within and outside the state territory (Art & Waltz, 1999). People cross territorial borders without being allowed to join the population within that territory, just as they are allowed to leave that territory without being assumed to have left the population. For example, illegal migrants are in this position of having crossed borders without being able to surmount the biopolitical border. Likewise, the European migrant crises, with million Syrian migrants crossing into Europe since

2015, causes many EU countries to cope with this influx and what best to deal with these non-citizens in their countries (Walters, 2002). However, the EU citizens instead are the one who forces those migrants leaving their home countries, feeling fearful of the aliens entering their territory. At present, the old form of the nation-state is now declining, and there is an emergence of a new form of sovereignty (Hardt & Negri, 2004). It is the biopolitics that allows the government today to deploy sovereign power and maintain the degree of domination against people outside from getting inside. Therefore, people have been trapped within the framework of the biopolitical.

According to Foucault (2008), the subject-object of biopolitics is framed at the focal point of knowledge and power: the populations are characterized precisely by their ability to experience the terror that works together with survival mechanisms. Put otherwise, the state in the emergency form that replaces laws with norms should not be considered as the notion of exception (Schmitt, 2007; Agamben, 2005), which is defined as a feature of the modern state in totalitarian forms. It should be, instead, examined in its biological senses (Dillon & Reid, 2009). Dillon and Reid have stressed how biopolitics today maintains the kind of permanent state of emergency that promotes lives of the emergency of its emergence. This is implemented by administering life through contingency, which also encompasses fundamentally the promotion of death, more precisely, the death of those elements that threaten life's capacity for emergence.

Thirdly, the war images can be taken as evidence that there is a close kinship between biopolitics and war. It shows how the biopolitical framework is formed by governmentality tactics; creating and reproducing the very experience of fear is seen as essential to the life of the organism by recurring flashbacks or hallucinations that finally end up devouring external perception (Butler, 2004; Barkawi & Laffey, 2006). In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, the live images of the twin towers collapsing have become the iconic visual representation of the 'War on Terror'. It has been interpreted as providing evidence of the link between terrorism and violence (Tripathy, 2013). The war photos show how our dominant cognitive interpretative structures delimit our vision and what fragments of reality are already interpreted for us. Peter van Agtmael, a well-known documentary photographer on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, also argues that war images not only demonstrate the constant complex relations between what reality of fear is produced and represented, but that it also displays a 'biopolitical frame of representability' that consists in facilitating and privileging modes of representation according to various forms of preservation, the enhancement of human lives and bodies, and human self-preservation (Debrix & Barder, 2011). For instance, the photo includes three different identifications between war victims, the soldiers, and terrorists, and we can see that there are lives being threatened while others are being the victors and also how life itself is being defined and regenerated. The image brings the notion that the body can be destroyed or killed through the operation of state sovereignty.

Taking Foucault's turn, (2003b), the biopolitical framework of representability also opens up two problems within the predominant perspective on political modernity. First, this framework intervenes at the level of sovereign power. Within the state, biopower seeks to build the new form of power, which is power over life that then leads to a reconsideration of a traditional model of centralized sovereign power by Hobbes and Machiavelli. Secondly, biopolitics indicates different relationships between sovereignty, violence, and death (Campbell, 2011). In the above example of war images, death does not disappear from the biopolitical frameworks. Instead, it functions within the relationship between life and fear of death. Therefore, the concept of biopolitics helps to bring into focus a series of strategies and interventions of power, authority, and control at the level of population life that connect life to the war.

### **5.3 Biopower in War on Terror**

War in modern society has now become the regime of exercising biopower, particularly the war on terror as "a form of a rule aimed not only at controlling the population but producing and reproducing all aspects of social life" (Hardt & Negri, 2004). In order to preserve life from the disasters and atrocities of war, liberal regimes have to conduct wars or war campaigns by deploying strategies that must target not only the lives of enemies but also the lives of populations in need of preservation and protection (Hardt & Negri, 2004). Since the acts of 9/11 in Washington D.C., 3/11 train bombings in Madrid on 11 March 2004, and 7/7 suicide bomb attacks in London on 7 July 2005, people in the West have come to the realization that they are now living in the terrifying experience of the fear of terror (Bauman, 2006).

In the context of the 'War on Terror', there has been a convenient excuse for Western states to authorize their power to intervene in other states in the name of an eradication of danger to the West. The US declaration of the War on Terror and invasion of Middle Eastern states invokes the state sovereignty that constitutes the strategy of power within the modern context. For instance, on September 2001, two passenger jets were flown into the twin tower of the World Trade Centre (WTC) in New York, and another plane crashed into the Pentagon in Washington DC. The deaths totaled 3500 people. Within a month, President in that uproar time George W. Bush, declared a global war against terrorism. The operation "Enduring Freedom" was launched against the Taliban government in Afghanistan and operation "Iraqi Freedom" against Saddam Hussein. In this analytical context, the current war on terror launched by the liberal states like the US after 9/11 is no different from all other liberal wars, wars being waged on life but also on behalf of life itself. They use the fear of terror as the defense of vitality.

Biopolitical concepts can examine the 'War on Terror' for two reasons. First, they place the war on terror within the historical liberal way of war in which the war on terror is the violence of the long liberal quest to wage war on life and to subject the population to be obsessed with winning wars. The US has been playing as the winner and holds the hegemonic power. The War on Terror is declared as a rhetorical device to alert the Americans to the dangers of terrorism, and it is their duty to stand against these evil acts (Guibernau, 2007). The government exercises the use of governmentality technique in which the biopolitical forces plays an integral role in the state's strategies that make the War on Terror possible. Thus, the 'War on Terror' is constructed as the use of the fear of terror as the defense of vitality and strategies of governmentalizing that typically seek to take control of life in the modern state. Second, the biopolitical sense fits perfectly with the war on terror case because it subsumes the logic of terror under the logic of war (Art & Waltz, 1999). As the paper has illustrated so far, terror is the name, which has been given to wars that threaten liberal ways of life. Therefore, to consider the fear of terror, it can be taken as the techniques of governmentality as the right to go to war and wage its name.

As could be seen through Machiavelli and Hobbes, they both recognize that fear is the source of political power as a power over people's life to maintain the ruler's sovereignty in the state. Foucault goes further and develops these ideas beyond mainstream political theory. Fear is rather used and continually reproduced by the government to govern the population in the name of the disciplinary power over life. Fear is thus a form of the modern strategic model of power. This strategy is not about the power or control of the one and only centralized sovereign but also beyond the level of the state itself. The use of fear in governmentalizing is all about diffusing micro-sites of power throughout the society which is designed to target the population's bodies rather than social institutions or individuals in order to preserve the territorial integrity of the state, its unity, and political identity. Biopolitics is a mechanism of power which exercises biopower that consists of techniques and practices to manage people as a group, insofar as it is concerned with regulating bodies and populations. It is usually distinguished from other techniques of governmentality in targeting a population as whole rather than specific individuals. On the contrary, biopolitics can be characterized as a technique of governmentality. The subject-object of biopolitics relies on knowledge in which the populations are characterized precisely by their experience of terror. This paper demonstrates three different examples of how biopower is used to control and govern lives in the state: a technique shipping good elements from bad, biopolitical borders and the biopolitical framework of representability. Thus, biopolitics can explain the ways in which the living bodies have become objects of government and have been strategically integrated into power relations in modern society. As Foucault (1978) says, biopolitical wars are no longer conducted on behalf of the old form of sovereign. Instead, they are now "waged on behalf of the existence of everyone".

## 6. Conclusion

The act of terror has been changing over time from French Revolution until recent. However, the concept does not change by itself, yet it has rather been relabelled by the form of political movement to suit with its objective. The paper answers how the concept of biopower can be used to analyse the use of terror as a political technique of controlling and governing citizens. The paper gives the analysis on the use of terror as a political tactic for controlling and governing citizens by demonstrating Foucault's concept of governmentality and the use of biopower as a tactic of governmentality. The biopower is reproduced

through three conceptualizations; technique is shaping good elements from bad, biopolitical territorial borders, and the biopolitical framework of representability. However, the paper concludes that the uses of biopolitics are one of the ways biopower can exercise the use of terror unexceptionally. Biopolitical framework opens up two problems within the mainstream theory. Primarily, it opens the solid level of sovereign power. While the sovereignty portrayed by Machiavelli and Hobbes, centralizes the idea on rulers and state government, the concept of biopower power highlights a new way of building a form of power as the relations of power-knowledge over the populace. Furthermore, biopolitics shows diverse relations between subject and object among power, individuals, and fear. It forms a reproduction series of strategy that government uses to control the population life by their experience of terror, fear, and death. As a result, the paper illustrates that biopolitics can explain how population lives can transform to be objects of government in a loop of power relations in modern society. As a final point, Foucault's writings on sovereignty, governmentality and biopolitics are very influential in social and political thought because his work allows scholars to recognize the biopolitics as the new paradigm power in term of the conduct of conduct over the populace. Foucault's idea of biopolitics forms one of the cornerstones of important techniques of social control by the state in a 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## 7. References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*. University of Chicago Press.
- Art, R. & Waltz, K. N. (1999). *The use of force: Military power and international politics*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Barkawi, T. & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329-352.
- Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid fear*. Polity Press.
- Blits, J.H. (1989). Hobbesian Fear. *Political theory*, 17(3), 417-431.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious Life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of war: when is life grievable?*. Verso.
- Calhoun, C., Gerties, J., Pfaff, M. S., & Virk, I. (2007). *Contemporary sociological theory*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Campbell, T.C. (2011). *Improper life: Technology and biopolitics from Heidegger to Agamben*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Castells, M (2004). *The power of identity (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Blackwell.
- Columba, P., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010). *Critical security studies: an introduction*. Routledge.
- Coyle, M. (1995). *Niccolò Machiavelli's the prince: New interdisciplinary papers*. Manchester University Press.
- Danaher, G., Schirato, G., & Webb, J. (2000). *Understanding Foucault*. Sage Publications.
- Dean, M. (2007). *Governing societies: Political perspectives on domestic and international rule*. Open University Press.
- Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Sage Publications.
- Dean, M. (2013). *The Signature of power: Sovereignty, governmentality and biopolitics*. Sage Publications.
- Debrix, F. & Barder, A. D. (2011). *Beyond biopolitics: Theory, violence, and horror in world politics*. Routledge.
- Dillon, M., & Reid, J. (2009). *The liberal way of war: Killing to make life live*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: The birth of the prison*. Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2003a). *Society must be defended*. Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2003b). *Society must be defended: lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*. Palgrave.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979*. Macmillan.
- Genel, K.(2006). The question of biopower: Foucault and Agamben, Rethinking Marxism. *A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, 18(1), 43-62.
- Gerges, F.A. (2009). *The far enemy: Why Jihad went global (2nd Ed.)*. Columbia University Press.

- Goldstein, R.J. (2001). *Political censorship: New York times 20th century in review*. Taylor & Francis.
- Guibernau, M (2007). *The identity of nations*. Polity Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A (2000). *Empire*. Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: war and democracy in the age of Empire*. Penguin Books.
- Hobbes, T. (2012). Leviathan. In: Malcolm, N. *Leviathan*. Clarendon Press.
- Hoffman, B (2006). *Inside terrorism*. Columbia University Press.
- Kelly, M.G.E. (2010). International Biopolitics: Foucault, globalisation and imperialism. *Theoria*, 57(123), 1-26.
- Laqueur, W. (1978). *Terrorism*. Abacus.
- Marks, J. (2006). Biopolitics. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23, 333-335.
- Maurizio, V. (2010). *Machiavelli's God*. Princeton University Press.
- Pasi, V. (2012). Affectivity, biopolitics and the virtual reality of war. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 29(2), 63-83.
- Patapan, H. (2006). *Machiavelli in love: The modern politics of love and fear*. Lexington.
- Reid, J. (2005). The biopolitics of the war on terror: A critique of the 'return of imperialism' thesis in international relations. *Third world quarterly*, 26(2), 237-252.
- Reid, J. (2006). *The biopolitics of the war on terror: Life struggles, liberal modernity, and the defence of logistical societies*. Manchester University Press.
- Salter, M. B. (2006). The global visa regime and the political technologies of the international self: Borders, bodies, biopolitics. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 31(2), 167-189.
- Schmid, A. P., & Jongman A. J (1988). *Political terrorism: A new guide to actors, authors, concepts, data bases, theories and literature*. Transaction Books.
- Schmitt, C (2007). *The concept of the political*. University of Chicago Press.
- Tickner, A. (2003). Seeing IR differently: Notes from the third world. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 32(2), 296-324.
- Tripathy, J. (2013). Biopolitics, torture, and the making of the terrorist: a paper on unmoderning. *Social Semiotics*, 3(11), 1-16.
- United Nations Security Council (2004). UN Security Council Resolution 1566 (2004), Terrorism, 10(1566).
- Walters, W. (2002). Mapping Schengenland: Denaturalizing the border. *Environment and planning: Society and space*, 20(5), 561 – 580.
- Werbin, K.C. (2009). Fear and no-fly listing in Canada: The biopolitics of the "war on terror". *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34(4), 613-634.