

Body at Work: Michel Foucault and the Sociology of Sport

Geneviève Rail and Jean Harvey
University of Ottawa

This paper is an introduction to the topic of Michel Foucault and the sociology of sport. First, we discuss the concepts used in the works of Foucault that have had the greatest impact in sociology of sport. Second, we present a brief review of the important articles in sociology of sport that have been inspired by Foucault's approach. This exercise allows us to provide indices of the influence of the Foucauldian perspective on the sociology of sport: directly, by allowing us to situate the body at the center of research questions, or indirectly, in the context of the development and use of contemporary social theories.

Cet essai se veut avant tout une introduction à Michel Foucault et la sociologie du sport. En premier lieu sont discutés les concepts utilisés dans les travaux de Foucault qui ont eu le plus grand impact en sociologie du sport. En deuxième lieu est présentée une brève revue des textes marquants en sociologie du sport qui se sont inspirés de l'approche de Foucault. Cet exercice nous permet de donner quelques indices de l'influence de la perspective foucauldienne sur la sociologie du sport: que ce soit de façon directe, en permettant de mettre le corps au centre des problématiques, ou de façon indirecte, dans le contexte du développement et de l'utilisation des théories sociales contemporaines.

This article is primarily an introduction to Michel Foucault and the study of sport. The idea, here, is to briefly present the author. The article is not intended to present Foucault's oeuvre or summarize its essential points,¹ which would be presumptuous granted the limited space involved. In the first part of this article, we limit ourselves to a discussion of concepts developed by Foucault that have greatly impacted the sociology of sport. In the second part, we sketch an analysis of Foucault's influence on the sociology of sport by presenting some of the notable contributions of those who were inspired by his ideas or who have attempted to apply his analytical framework to the study of sport or physical education.

Foucauldian Concepts

In the early 1970s, Foucault added a third term, the body, to the discourse/power dialectic of his previous work. Foucault presents history as a genealogy

Geneviève Rail and Jean Harvey are with the School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, 125 University, P.O. Box 450 Stn. A, Ottawa, ON, Canada K1N 6N5.

and demonstrates how it is at the center of the articulation between body and history: "The genealogist is a person who diagnoses and examines the relationships between power, knowledge and the body in modern society" (Dosse, 1992, p. 314). Foucault intends to center his attention on the body, a body forgotten by history despite its crucial importance as a surface on which the social is inscribed. As a genealogist, he intends not to analyze behaviors or ideas but rather to examine the knowledge formations and systems of power that regulate corporal practices. His approach is based on the notion of *épistémé*, defined in his *Archeology of Knowledge* (1969/1972) as an ensemble of relations between practices which, at a given moment in history, bring about epistemological figures, sciences, and, eventually, formalized systems. These thematic and methodological orientations were to inspire Foucault in his next publications, particularly the books he wrote in the mid-70s: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* and the first volume of his series *The History of Sexuality*, works that have notably influenced writings in the sociology of sport and the body. A number of concepts are associated with the latter: discipline, biopower, surveillance, and panopticism. These concepts are briefly discussed next, along with the notions of "subjectification" and "technologies of the self," which Foucault developed in the last two books he wrote (1984/1985, 1984/1986) and which open new avenues of research in sport studies.

Discipline

This concept has without doubt had the most impact on sport sociology. Disciplines are an ensemble of typically "modern" formulas (Harvey & Sparks, 1991) of domination and integration to the social order that aim (a) to disperse, mark, and fix the population and (b) to train bodies of individuals so that their movements and gestures provide an optimum efficiency (Dostie, 1988).

Disciplines constitute concrete and distinct forms of power that are tools for the domination of bodies. These forms of power are distinct and new because they use normalization rather than repression to "invest" bodies. They more or less represent techniques and technologies of internalized norms, a secular version of the pastoral power seen with the church. Physical education, for example, can be understood as a discipline in the Foucauldian sense because it proposes teaching methods, principles, and conditions through which particular types of corporal practices can be inculcated (Harvey & Sparks, 1991). This is precisely the idea developed by Hargreaves in his chapter on physical education (see *Sport, Power and Culture*, 1986).

Biopower

The notion of discipline is intimately linked to that of power. More precisely, it is linked to the type of power exercised on the body. According to Foucault, power/knowledge is situated, in a privileged way, in a political technology of the body, and the power exercised on the body in the context of modernity is developed around two complementary poles:

One of the poles—the first to be formed, it seems—centered on the body as a machine: its disciplining . . . its integration into systems of efficient

and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterized the disciplines: an anatomo-politics of the human body. The second . . . focussed on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancies and longevity. . . . Their supervision was affected through an entire series of interventions and regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population. (Foucault, 1978a, p. 138)

The notion of power, for Foucault, goes beyond the sphere of the state, to which it was traditionally associated. Power is not ascribable to a class that would possess it. Rather, power circulates through a network of individuals; it is omnipresent; it is in everyone; it is immanent in the structuralist sense of the term. Foucault's analysis has thus the merit of not confusing power and the state for the same reality, this, evidently, at the cost of neglecting the existence of the state and for the benefit of an exclusive attention to the body. The strength of this perspective resides in the "positivity" of the notion of power. As Dostie has argued, "bio-power is functional, positive: it is exercised through motivating human beings rather than through menacing them of corporal punishments or repression" (translation, 1988, p. 221). There is another positive dimension to power that is expressed through the disciplines. Disciplines can be effective only if there is a liberation of forces. In other words, there cannot be subjectivity without autonomization. On the positivity of power and disciplines, Foucault goes as far as to say that

mastery, the consciousness of one's own body, becomes positive *only* through the invasion of the body by power: gymnastics, physical exercise, muscular development. . . . But at the very moment power has this effect . . . emerges inevitably the claiming of one's body against power. . . . Then, what gave power its strength becomes the way by which it is attacked. (translation, 1978b, p. 28, emphasis in the original)

This paradox, rather central in Foucault's oeuvre, seems nevertheless to have been absent up to now from Anglo-Saxon readings² of Foucault. Vigarello's article in this issue (1995) is interesting in that respect since it illuminates this positivity, this autonomy inherent to the notion of discipline.

Surveillance and Panopticism

In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975/1977), Foucault uses two concepts intricately linked to one another: surveillance and panopticism. To grossly summarize his arguments, we can say that feudal societies were under monarchic power that was expressed, among other ways, through the arrest of a small number of criminals whose exemplary and spectacular punishments were supposed to frighten the whole population. In contrast, modern societies utilize a disciplinary power based on a system of surveillance that is internalized to such an extent that each person now becomes his or her own overseer. To describe this disciplinary power, Foucault gives the example of Jeremy Bentham's "panopticon," a circular prison built so that prisoners are never sure whether

they are being observed by the guards in the tower at the center of the building. Because the panopticon allows guards to see inmates without being seen themselves, it becomes a means of disciplinary control by maximizing visibility in the sense that everyone watches and may be watched by someone else. At the end, the panopticon leads to a process of self-surveillance. Foucault's panopticism is evident when he argues that not only the prison but also the asylum, the casern, the factory, and the school are places where people (i.e., bodies) are distributed administratively in order to be watched and trained for optimal functioning. Panopticism represents a view of society that makes evident the ways in which surveillance and self-policing are used to ensure social control and order.

Technologies of the Self and Subjectification

In his early writings, culminating in *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault is concerned with knowledge formation, systems of power over individuals, and forms of social control. Starting with the second volume of *The History of Sexuality*, however, he becomes more and more interested in the process by which individuals are led to think about themselves, act for themselves, and transform themselves. In the introduction of *The History of Sexuality: Vol. 2. The Use of Pleasure* (1984/1985), Foucault justifies this radical shift by arguing that an analysis of the subject is only possible with an examination of the forms and modalities of relating to oneself. Through those forms and modalities, individuals constitute themselves and recognize themselves as subjects, a process Foucault labels "subjectification." In *The History of Sexuality: Vol. 3. The Care of Self* (1984/1986), Foucault expands on the notion of subjectification and how it can be realized through what he calls the "technologies of the self." Such technologies are those that "permit individuals to effect by their own means or with help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality" (Foucault, 1988, p. 18).

The six concepts introduced above are not the only ones that have been used in the sociology of sport. However, discipline, biopower, surveillance, panopticism, technologies of the self, and subjectification are key elements within the Foucauldian perspective. In turn, this perspective has greatly influenced contemporary social theories as well as sociology of sport. This is the topic of the next section.

Foucauldian Influence

The influence of Foucault on the sociology of sport has been felt in two ways. First, his influence has been felt indirectly, inasmuch as Foucault's works have made an important impact on contemporary social theories, notably British cultural studies and feminist cultural studies, which have been used by sport sociologists. Second, this influence has been felt directly, since the Foucauldian approach has allowed a positioning of the body at the center of research questions, and since sport sociologists have used Foucault's concepts to inform their studies on the sporting body.

Indirect Influence

Via British Cultural Studies. Foucault's concepts and writings have had their impact on British cultural studies, with which they share a critique of essentialism, of the liberal-humanist subject, and particularly of economic reductionism. In fact, British cultural studies is more than anything an intersection of various theories reacting against the structuralism of the 1970s. It has always focused on questions of power and culture, which were particularly sensitive issues for the British left at the time. The theme of popular culture as a site of struggle and resistance has been consistent within British cultural studies, but its theoretical base has been eclectic. Theoretical sources are to be found in Marxist literary criticism (especially in the works of Raymond Williams), in neo-Marxist theory (especially Gramsci's theory of hegemony), in ethnographic studies of the working class (notably with the works of E.P. Thompson), and finally in the works of Foucault and his analysis of power and disciplines.

As Cole (1993a) points out, the conceptual apparatus produced at the intersection of British cultural studies and Foucault's writings breaks with classical theories of power by reconceptualizing the location, modalities, and exercise of this power. That is, the conceptual apparatus ceases to associate power with the state and its repressive effects in order to consider its productive effects at the everyday, corporal level. Such a focus on power and the body may explain why British cultural studies has greatly influenced the sociology of sport. In their article published in *Quest* in 1993, Andrews and Loy provide an excellent review of this question. They demonstrate, among other things, how the British intellectual movement has been widely appropriated by scholars in various areas of the humanities and by members of the sport sociology communities in Britain, Canada, the United States, and Australia.

Via Feminist Cultural Studies. With regard to feminist cultural studies, the themes of discipline and power, as defined by Foucault, have had the most determinant impact. As Cole suggests,

[many of the] feminist critiques produced in the 1970s and 80s located the body as a site of power . . . [and] remained embedded in a politics of "violation" and a corresponding demand for "control over" women's bodies. Such projects locate the body in an unproblematized realm of the private, assume an individual that stands outside of cultural production, and theorize power as easily locatable. (1993a, p. 84)

We agree with Cole that the impact of Foucault has been to facilitate the theorization of the body as a site of cultural political struggles such as those seen in relation to AIDS, eugenics and new reproductive technologies, the Human Genome Project, the "war on drugs," racism, agism, sexism, and heterosexism. This theorization has marked an important turn in feminist cultural studies and in sport sociology, since similar cultural political battles have been and are still being fought on the sport terrain. More recently, proponents of feminist cultural studies and other poststructuralist feminists have provided additional avenues of research in sport sociology by pointing to the "positive" theoretical and epistemological possibilities resulting from Foucault's radical shift. As Foucault himself points out,

Perhaps I've insisted too much on the technology of domination and power. I am more and more interested in the interaction between oneself and others and in the technologies of individual domination, the history of how an individual acts upon himself, in the technologies of the self. (Foucault, 1988, p. 19)

Foucault's shift has brought new tools with which to theorize sport, notably sport as a space where technologies of the self and processes of subjectification are constantly at play. Foucault's later writings also allow us to consider subjectification as a critical and theoretical project, as a way of engendering distinct positions in theory through various practices of speaking the self. Probyn (1992), for example, proposes that images of the self (the self in discourse) can be used to articulate alternative positions. She thus considers uses of the self not as reflections of "her" but rather, as Stuart Hall states, "as that of representation which is able to constitute us as new kinds of subjects and thereby enable us to discover places from which to speak" (1990, p. 237). Many feminists in cultural studies (e.g., Burgess, 1991; Hooks, 1992; Miller, 1991) have turned to themselves as a way of speaking about the personal. In her book *Sexing the Self*, Probyn tackles this question of the sex of the self to suggest that there are ways of using our gendered selves in order to speak and theorize nonessential but embodied selves:

A renewed theorization of experience sets out the conditions of possibility for the construction of a new, empowered speaking position within cultural theory. Far from being a self-indulgent affirmation, the experiential can be made to articulate both ontological and epistemological levels of analysis. . . . The articulated analytic-critical practice emphasizes the social distinctions and experiential differentiations of gender, class, ethnicity, race, sexual preference, economics and age. However, speaking the self does not claim to represent "differences" as fixed essences. (1993, p. 30)

Via a Focus on the Body. If the influence of Foucault on sport sociology has been (and is to be) felt indirectly through his impact on British cultural studies and feminist cultural studies, it is possible to identify another level of influence via contemporary social theories, this influence being situated at a thematic level. Foucault was not the first to propose that the body become an object of study in general social theory. We need only to point out Mauss' classical essay entitled "Bodily Techniques," first published in 1954, which presents itself precisely in the form of a call for research on the body. Nevertheless, through his studies on the clinic (1963/1972), penal institutions (1975/1977), the history of human sciences (1976/1978), and sexuality (1984/1985) Foucault has put the body at the center of the research agenda in the social sciences and humanities, which has brought about a proliferation of publications on this topic (we can here underline the works of Turner in 1984, and those of Featherstone, Hepworth, and Turner in 1991).

Direct Influence

With regard to the direct influence of the Foucauldian perspective on the sociology of sport, we can say that it was first felt through an interest in the

body; sociology of sport has embodied itself in the last 10 years. We mention here Loy, Andrews, and Rinehart's (1993) article, which offers an excellent review of the writings on the body in sociology of sport, as well as the article of Featherstone (in press).

Foucault's direct influence has also been noted in the fact that some of the important works on sport and physical education have been directly inspired by the Foucauldian perspective. It is possible to identify four research groups in this regard: (a) those authors who have made an appeal to welcome Foucault in the sociology of sport, (b) those who have used the notions of rupture and *épistémé* in their works, (c) those who have integrated the concepts of surveillance, power, discipline, and the gaze, and (d) those who have looked at the process of subjectification and technologies of the self in relation to sport.

Appeals. In the Anglo-Saxon sport sociology communities, Foucault has struck a sensitive chord and there have been a number of appeals to use his concepts and methods. Whitson (1989) has suggested that sport scholars consider Foucault's ideas regarding discipline, pleasure, and the body. Theberge (1991) has discussed the potential of the genealogical method for the sociology of sport and the importance of Foucault's formulations for feminist poststructuralist research on the social construction of gender. Andrews (1993) has no doubt made the best effort to succinctly present Foucault's theoretical and substantive ideas and the manner in which they have been appropriated by sport sociologists publishing in the English language. Finally, Cole (1991) as well as Cole and Rail (1994) have focused on the ways in which Foucault-inspired feminist cultural studies can provide a critique of the modernist preoccupations of science from which emerge new questions on science. These authors have argued that by extrapolating these questions to sport sciences we can begin to understand sport as a technology, as an ensemble of practices and knowledges that discipline, condition, and mark the body according to the terms of a postmodern capitalist society. These authors have also discussed the far-reaching implications of such a perspective for the sport studies agenda.

Rupture and Épistémé. As Loudcher and Vivier (1994) suggest in their excellent review of Foucault-inspired texts in physical education and sport in France, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences* (1966/1970) has been the key book for the works of the second group of researchers (this book touches on various epochs—suggesting that each develops an *épistémé*³ allowing the emergence of particular knowledges—but focuses on the way in which human sciences emerged in the 19th century). In his book titled *Excellence corporelle* (Corporal Excellence), Defrance (1987) borrows from Foucault to speak of "social mutations" and the appearance of new corporal practices at the end of the 18th century in France. Similarly, Gleyse (1992, 1993) develops the idea that corporal practices are formed in relation to an *épistémé* and are linked to the development of techniques and sciences in a given era. Loudcher (1994) uses the Foucauldian method and the notion of *épistémé* to study the *savate* and suggests that this form of boxing is not the result of a continuous process dating back to antiquity but rather is the product of identifiable historical conditions. Clément (1993) takes up the ideas of *énoncés* (statements) and *visibilités* (visibilities) that are at the basis of Foucault's archeological analysis. Clément proposes that *énoncés* are conceptions, doctrines, or methods in physical education, while *visibilités* correspond to practices. He shows how *énoncés* and *visibilités* are not

necessarily in a causal relation but rather are in another relation where power infiltrates and spreads itself. In his study, he argues that the establishment of school gymnastics at the end of the last century was more linked with the domination that the military and doctors wanted to exercise on the school than with the hygienist discourse of the time.

Surveillance, Power, Discipline, and the Gaze. With respect to the third research group, attention has been more focused on the issues of surveillance, power, and discipline. For example, we can cite two important books published in French: Vigarello's *Le corps redressé* (The Straightened-Up Body) and Dostie's *Les corps investis* (The Invested Bodies). Published in 1978, *Le corps redressé* constitutes, to our knowledge, the first Foucault-inspired work on physical education to be published, no doubt because Vigarello was a close collaborator of Foucault for some time. The first lines of his introduction are quite revealing in terms of the approach:

Pedagogies are carriers of precepts which give the body a form, and control it to submit it to norms in a way more efficient than thought. . . . The body is the first place where the adult hand marks the child; it is the first space where we impose social and psychological limits to its behavior; it is the emblem where culture inscribes its signs as blazons. (translation, Vigarello, 1978, p. 9)

The book presents itself as a story of the pedagogies of "corporal rightness," of their inflections as much in the norms they have proposed as in the rationalizations that have been used to justify them. More than a simple history of the various strategies deployed to straighten up the body, this book offers a nuanced genealogy of bodily models.

Dostie's work, *Les corps investis*, published in Montréal in 1988, is an excellent application of the Foucauldian grid and, at the same time, is a good introduction to Foucault's oeuvre on the body and power. The book has five parts: the historicity of the biological body, the social element of the body, the political investment of the body, the sexualization of the body, and the sportization of the body. Of course, the last part is particularly interesting here. Dostie defines the sportization of the body as "a process through which the body becomes a sporting body, that is, acquires characteristics and abilities which favor the execution of sport performances" (translation, Dostie, 1988, p. 225). For Dostie, this sportization "could be considered as a bio-power mechanism which allows both the disciplined training of individual bodies and their massive mobilization" (translation, p. 167). To support this thesis, Dostie brings back the words of Ehrenberg, which can be found in his excellent article published in 1979 in the journal *Les temps modernes*. Ehrenberg argues that historically sport has spread itself out through a double mechanism: first as a "technology of individual behavior based on hygiene, pedagogy, and physiology to constitute the individual subject," and second as a "technique to mobilize the crowds, populations and dispersed communities in order to transform them in coherent masses" (translation, cited in Dostie, 1988, p. 168).

In addition to Vigarello and Dostie, a few authors have offered Foucauldian analyses of sport or physical education. For instance, in an excellent chapter entitled "Schooling the Body" and a subsequent article, Hargreaves (1986, 1987)

demonstrates how modern British physical education can be understood as a discipline because it provides a set of teaching methods, principles, and conditions through which a desired set of bodily practices are inculcated. Hargreaves' chapter in *Sport, Power and Culture* (1986) is a good example of the application of Foucault's ideas à la British cultural studies: It provides a history of physical education in England as a political project of social control aiming at disciplining the working class through meticulous work on their body. As outlined by Loy, Andrews, and Rinehart (1993), Hargreaves demonstrates how official objectives, in conjunction with the disciplinary regimes of physical education, "schooled" the bodies in such a way that they reproduced specific class, gender, and ethnic divisions. Harvey and Sparks (1991) discuss 19th-century gymnastics in France to illustrate the political uses of the body by the state. They argue that the state's politics of body management was evident first in the concurrent policies of repression of gymnastics associations and exploitation of gymnastics in military training, and later in the merger of gymnastics, military training, and education. Harvey and Sparks suggest that 19th-century French gymnastics may be described in terms of micropowers of the body, although the overt use of the state apparatus by the dominant classes leads them to conclude that the state itself had become invested with power and that this phenomenon is better understood by integrating with the Foucauldian framework theoretical elements borrowed from Bourdieu. In an anthology edited by Vigarello (1993) and devoted to Foucauldian works on "the government of the body," Courtine (1993) offers an excellent piece on sport, more specifically, bodybuilding and ostentatious puritanism in American body culture. He sheds much light on the American "obsession with corporal envelopes" (translation, p. 229) by a genealogical analysis of the relationship between narcissism and discipline. Courtine concludes that the narcissistic moment of the body culture in the United States corresponds not to hedonism but to a disciplinary reinforcement, an intensification of controls, a repuritanization of behaviors. Cole (1993a) shows the influence of Foucault on feminist cultural studies and takes this framework as a starting point to investigate (a) the technologies of gender, sport, and bodybuilding and their tendencies to discipline and normalize bodies and identities, and (b) the matrix of bodily surveillance technologies legitimated through sport, the ways in which they have been used to probe "suspicious" bodies for impurities, and their implications for women.

A few articles have addressed issues of power and surveillance in sport and have integrated the concept of "the gaze," developed by Foucault (1963/1972) in *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*, and those of "pleasure" and "desire," as discussed in *The Use of Pleasure* (Foucault, 1984/1985). For instance, Haber (in press) and Patton (in press) examine women's bodybuilding and look at the male gaze and the content of the shock produced by muscled women. Drawing on Foucault's principles of power, pleasure, and desire, Haber notes the dilemma posed by a type of power that works not through repression but rather through bodily aesthetics that produce anxieties, desires, and identities while establishing parameters around women's choices. Patton builds on feminist theories of representation to discuss how the sport/spectacle dynamic has shaped various representations of bodybuilding by attempting to accommodate male anxieties while allowing possibilities for a female pleasure and a lesbian gaze. King (1993) uses Foucauldian conceptions of power and the body to study the case of Magic Johnson and the manner in which the process

of hero creation/destruction has relied on the subjugation of his body so that it may carry specific messages about the meaning of AIDS. She argues that commercial and professional sport interests have used Johnson to enter into an established discourse that reproduces the homophobic and misogynist messages surrounding AIDS and the HIV virus. Finally, the works of Cole (1993b) and Cole and Denny (in press) are guided by a series of questions about the relations among the body, normalizing technologies, and the production of suspicion, threat, and identity. Their projects are concerned with the production of deviant bodies (notably those of professional African American athletes) via technologies legitimated through sport. Their Foucauldian analyses are centered on the operations of power concealed through the apparently self-evident category of sport and have the merit of reconceptualizing "sport" as an ensemble of disciplining and normalizing practices (e.g., science, medicine, governing institutions, media) that produce and put under surveillance multiple bodies (e.g., raced, sexed, classed, heterosexualized, patriotic, cyborg).

Subjectification and Technologies of the Self. It is possible to identify a fourth research group whose works also indicate the direct influence of Foucault on the sociology of sport. This group includes a few authors who have looked (tentatively, we may add) at the process of subjectification and at technologies of the self in relation to sport. Boudreau, Folman, and Konzak (1992) propose a reply to Foucault's question, "Is there a self or a subjectification process in Oriental techniques?" These authors present technologies of the self as practices to acquire not only bodily competencies but also certain attitudes toward the self, and they argue that *karate-do* can be seen as a set of technologies of the self and artistic operations of subjectification. Heikkala (1993) similarly discusses the "techniques of the self" but mostly critiques the way in which sport performance depends on a series of disciplinary and normalizing techniques of the body and self.

To conclude on the subject of Foucault's direct influence in sport sociology, we should mention that there have been discussions concerning a change of name for the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport (NASSS). At the 1993 general annual meeting, there was a motion (which was eventually tabled) to adopt the name of "North American Society for the Study of Physical Culture and Sport." One of the arguments advanced by the movers of this motion was that the term *physical culture*, interpreted as *bodily culture*, better described the diversity of interests of the society's membership, which include exercise, fitness, sport, physical education, the body, and sexuality. Such a name change would not be without consequences. It would signal an enlargement of research questions, which would no longer be confined to sport. Sport would be apprehended in a larger context, that of the body.

Can we impute to Foucault the whole responsibility for the seismic tremors that have traversed the field of sociology of sport in the last 10 years? Obviously not. We certainly cannot forget the crucial importance of the feminist movement and women's studies, which have situated the body at the center of power processes. It is also the motions initiated by protest movements at the end of the 1960s that have put the body on the map, so to speak, and that have constituted a fertile ground for Foucault's ideas, Foucault being a committed intellectual himself and consequently having been influenced as well by these motions. Only an in-depth examination of the evolution of sociology of sport accompanied by

a serious inquiry into the evolution of contemporary social theories will bring about elements of answer to this question.

Foucault's Critics

Considering the numerous writings and positions associated with Foucault, it is not surprising that he has had a good number of critics. Among the feminists, some have accused him of not speaking for women (it has often been said that "there are no women in Foucault") and of not considering the different solicitations of men and women within his discourse on sexuality (de Lauretis, 1987; Modleski, 1991; Morris, 1988). However, Foucault was highly interested in the questions of power, gender, and sexuality, and, therefore, an important number of feminist authors have appropriated a Foucauldian perspective. In fact, we do agree with Probyn's observation (1993, p. 113) that "over the years there have been many women in Foucault." Sawicki, for instance, has identified:

those who use his analysis of disciplining power to isolate disciplinary technologies of women's bodies that are dominating and hence difficult to resist, and those who acknowledge domination but center on cultures of resistance to hegemonic power/knowledge formations and how individuals who are targets of this power can play a role in its constitution and its demise. (1991, p. 14)

To those two "takes" on Foucault, Probyn (1992) suggests the addition of a third one that may be helpful for feminism: to leave analyses of women as disciplined objects in order to investigate the gendered processes of subjectification. In her book, Probyn (1993) does just that, and her dialogue with Foucault is quite revealing in terms of the importance of his writings for the development of a theoretical level from which emerges the possibility of "sexing the self." Finally, Cole (1993a) makes the point that based on Foucault's more recent writings, it is possible to elaborate modes of conceptualizing gender and subjectification that are among the most pertinent for a feminist cultural analysis of sport and the body.

As Berthelot and his collaborators (1985) report, several other critiques have been addressed to Foucault. For the sake of brevity, they can be grouped here in three sets. The first set of criticisms has been voiced by historians, who have critiqued Foucault for the rapidity of his analyses. His genealogies, dealing with long periods of time, rely on not enough empirical data, historians argue. Foucault's use of normative texts rather than archival evidence has led to additional critiques regarding the reliability of his analyses. In reply to this first set of criticisms, we may say that Foucault was concerned with the history of "mentality," to use his own word, and not with detailed accounts of sets of events. This does not mean, however, that such detailed, evidence-based analyses cannot be done (for example, see Ehrenberg, 1979; Gleyse, 1993; Vigarello, 1978).

A second set of criticisms has been put forth by sociologists, particularly Marxists, for his notion of power. With his notion of "immanence" or the idea of power emerging out of individual interaction, stemming from the "bottom"

of society rather than from above, Foucault has been accused of having conceptualized a form of power not rooted in social struggles: a classless power. This very notion of immanent power has also led to the labeling of Foucault's work as structuralist. In contrast, other authors such as Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983) have successfully demonstrated that Foucault has gone beyond structuralism.

The third set of criticisms is associated with Foucault's pessimist view of society. In this case, his use of Bentham's panopticon and the repressive side of his concept of the disciplines have usually been pointed out. In Foucault's defense, we have already argued in this article that the positive side of power and the disciplines has also been conceptualized. In our opinion, and to conclude on Foucault's critics, it would be more appropriate to simply say that Foucault was Foucauldian.

Conclusion

This article was meant to illuminate the sizable influence of Foucault's oeuvre on contemporary social theories and on the sociology of sport. Some of the key concepts developed by Foucault (*épistémé*, discipline, biopower, surveillance, panopticism, gaze, technologies of the self, subjectification) were introduced as well as the manner in which they have been utilized in the English and French language sociology of sport communities.

In closing, we would like to make two important points regarding the Foucauldian approach and sociology of sport. First, the usual readings of Foucault transpire negative notions of power and the disciplines. These concepts are interpreted as many procedures of domination that bring about a passivity of the body, a "sterilization of life," to borrow an expression from Vigarello. In *Discipline and Punish*, however, Foucault extends his analysis to demonstrate its limits and to speak of the positive dimensions underlying power and the disciplines. By highlighting the productive side of power, Foucault suggests the existence of a body escaping repression: an active, autonomous, and powerful body. Perhaps much is to be gained in sociology of sport from a consideration of the "positivity" of such a perspective.

Second, we suggested earlier that the emergence of the Foucauldian approach and new theoretical perspectives such as Foucault-inspired cultural studies and poststructuralism has significant implications for the kinds of questions sport sociologists choose to ask. However, based on our review of Foucauldian texts in sociology of sport, we can conclude that new questions have rarely been asked. As Loudcher and Vivier (1994) have suggested, perhaps there is a need to go beyond structural approaches and welcome genealogy as a perspective and method. Structural analyses, along with their a priori mental categories, have had much success in sport sciences in general, and sport sociology in particular, but it may be because they are simply reassuring or avoiding the question of "who speaks?" No doubt the consideration of genealogy would put into question the taken-for-granted ideas about the identity of the sport sciences, ideas to which scholars in the field seem attached, but it would allow an enlightened reconceptualization of both sport and the body.

In our opinion, and judging from the importance of the impact Foucault has had (and the one he will likely have in the future), we can conclude that despite the wish once made by Baudrillard (1987), we are not about to "forget Foucault"!

References

- Andrews, D.L. (1993). Desperately seeking Michel: Foucault's genealogy, the body, and critical sport sociology. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, **10**, 148-167.
- Andrews, D.L., & Loy, J.W. (1993). British cultural studies and sport: Past encounters and future possibilities. *Quest*, **45**, 255-276.
- Baudrillard, J. (1987). *Forget Foucault*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Bernaer, J., & Rasmussen, D. (1988). *The final Foucault*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Berthelot, J.M., Drulhe, M., Clément, S., Forné, J., & M'Boj, G. (1985). Les sociologies et le corps [Sociologies and the body]. *Current Sociology*, **33**(2), 1-209.
- Boudreau, F., Folman, R., & Konzak, B. (1992). Les techniques martiales orientales comme technologies du soi: une réponse à Michel Foucault [Oriental martial techniques as technologies of the self: A reply to Michel Foucault]. *Sociologie et Société*, **24**(1), 141-156.
- Burgess, M. (1991). Comment "je" entre dans le texte [How "I" enter into the text]. *Possibles*, **15**(4), 173-180.
- Clément, J.P. (1993). L'enjeu identitaire [Identity at stake]. In J.P. Clément & M. Herr (Eds.), *L'identité de l'éducation physique scolaire au XXe siècle* (pp. 13-25). Clermont-Ferrand, France: Éditions A.F.R.A.P.S.
- Cole, C.L. (1991, November). *Dialogues "on" the body: Feminist cultural studies and Foucault*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport, Milwaukee, WI.
- Cole, C.L. (1993a). Resisting the canon: Feminist cultural studies, sport, and technologies of the body. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, **17**(2), 77-97.
- Cole, C.L. (1993b, November). *Technologies of deviant bodies: The ensemble of sport and (re)territorializing practices*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport, Ottawa, ON.
- Cole, C.L., & Denny, H. (in press). Visualizing deviance in (post)Reagan America: Magic Johnson, AIDS, and the promiscuous world of professional sport. *Critical Sociology*.
- Cole, C.L., & Rail, G. (1994). La science comme pratique culturelle: vers une déstabilisation de l'objet des études du sport [Science as cultural practice: Toward a destabilization of the object of knowledge in sport studies]. In A.F.R.A.P.S./L.A.R.E.S.H.A.P. (Eds.), *STAPS: aspects épistémologiques, méthodologiques et impacts sociaux* (pp. 4-11). Marseille, France: Éditions Robert.
- Courtine, J.J. (1993). Les stakhanovistes du narcissisme [The Stakhanovists of narcissism]. In G. Vigarello (Ed.), *Communications, Numéro 56. Le gouvernement du corps* (pp. 225-251). Paris: Seuil.
- Defrance, J. (1987). *L'excellence corporelle* [Bodily excellence]. Rennes, France: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- de Lauretis, T. (1987). *Technologies of gender: Essays on theory, film and fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1986). *Foucault*. Paris: Minuit.
- Dosse, F. (1992). *Histoire du structuralisme* [History of structuralism]. Paris: La découverte.
- Dostie, M. (1988). *Les corps investis* [The invested bodies]. Montréal, PQ: St-Martin.
- Dreyfus, H., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ehrenberg, A. (1979). Des jardins de bravoure et des piscines roboratrices [Gardens of bravery and invigorating pools]. *Les Temps Modernes*, **35**(399), 676-719.

- Featherstone, M. (in press). The body, culture and sport. In C.L. Cole, J.W. Loy, & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Exercising power: The making and remaking of the body*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Featherstone, M., Hepworth, M., & Turner, B.S. (1991). *The body: Social process and cultural theory*. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Random House. (Original work published in French in 1966)
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The birth of the clinic: An archeology of medical perception*. New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in French in 1963)
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge*. New York: Harber Torchbooks. (Original work published in French in 1969)
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published in French in 1975)
- Foucault, M. (1978a). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 1. An introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published in French in 1976)
- Foucault, M. (1978b). Pouvoir et corps [Power and body]. In *Quel Corps?* (pp. 27-35). Paris: Maspero.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 2. The use of pleasure*. New York: Random House. (Original work published in French in 1984)
- Foucault, M. (1986). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 3. The care of self*. New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published in French in 1984)
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L.H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P.H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gleyse, J. (1992). Corps, techniques et sciences: quelques éléments d'archéologie, de l'âge classique à la post-modernité [Body, techniques and sciences: A few elements of archeology, from the classical period to postmodernity]. *Revue STAPS*, **29**, 43-54.
- Gleyse, J. (1993). Archéologie de la cognomorphose d'un champ: conceptions du travail, des sciences et conceptions de l'E.P.S. [Archeology of a field's cognomorphosis: Conceptions of work, sciences, and school physical education]. In J.P. Clément & M. Herr (Eds.), *L'identité de l'éducation physique scolaire au XXe siècle* (pp. 283-296). Clermont-Ferrand, France: Éditions A.F.R.A.P.S.
- Haber, H. (in press). Muscles and politics: Shaping the feminist revolt. In C.L. Cole, J.W. Loy, & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Exercising power: The making and remaking of the body*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, culture, community, difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hargreaves, J. (1986). *Sport, power and culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hargreaves, J. (1987). The body, sport and power relations. In J. Horne, D. Jary, & A. Tomlinson (Eds.), *Sport, leisure and social relations* (pp. 139-159). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Harvey, J., & Sparks, R. (1991). The politics of the body in the context of modernity. *Quest*, **43**, 164-189.
- Heikkala, J. (1993). Discipline and excel: Techniques of the self and body and the logic of competing. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, **10**, 397-412.
- Hooks, B. (1992). Representing whiteness in the Black imagination. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P.A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies: An introduction* (pp. 338-346). New York and London: Routledge.

- King, S. (1993). The politics of the body and the body politic: Magic Johnson and the ideology of AIDS. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, **10**, 270-285.
- Loudcher, J.F. (1994). Du duel à l'épée au duel à mains nues: émergence d'une pratique physique, la savate [From the sword duel to the bare hands duel: Emergence of "savate" as a physical practice]. *Sciences et motricité*, **21**, 12-21.
- Loudcher, J.F., & Vivier, C. (1994, May). *Michel Foucault et la recherche en histoire de l'éducation physique et du sport* [Michel Foucault and research in the history of physical education and sport]. Paper presented at the conference entitled "Have we used up Foucault? Assessment of the understanding of bodily practices on the basis of an archeology of knowledge," Université de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France.
- Loy, J.W., Andrews, D.L., & Rinehart, R.E. (1993). The body in culture and sport. *Sport Science Review*, **2**(1), 69-91.
- Mauss, M. (1973). Les techniques du corps [Bodily techniques]. In *Sociologie et anthropologie* (pp. 365-386). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (Original work published in 1954)
- Miller, J. (1993). *The passion of Michel Foucault*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Miller, N.K. (1991). *Getting personal: Feminist occasions and other auto-biographical acts*. New York: Routledge.
- Modleski, T. (1991). *Feminism without women: Culture and criticism in a "post-feminist" age*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Morris, M. (1988). *The pirate's fiancée: Feminism reading postmodernism*. London: Verso.
- Patton, C. (in press). Rock hard. In C.L. Cole, J.W. Loy, & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Exercising power: The making and remaking of the body*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Poulantzas, N. (1978). *State, power, socialism*. London: New Left Books.
- Probyn, E. (1992). Corps féminin, soi féministe: le dédoublement de l'énonciation sociologique [Female bodies, feminist selves: A doubled enunciative position in sociology]. *Sociologie et Société*, **24**(1), 33-46.
- Probyn, E. (1993). *Sexing the self: Gendered positions in cultural studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, power and the body*. New York: Routledge.
- Smart, B. (1985). *Michel Foucault*. London: Tavistock.
- Theberge, N. (1991). Reflections on the body in the sociology of sport. *Quest*, **43**, 123-134.
- Turner, B.S. (1984). *The body and society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Vigarello, G. (1978). *Le corps redressé* [The straightened-up body]. Paris: Éditions universitaires.
- Vigarello, G. (Ed.) (1993). *Communications, Numéro 56. Le gouvernement du corps* [Communications, Number 56. The government of the body]. Paris: Seuil.
- Vigarello, G. (1995). Life of the body in *Discipline and Punish*. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, **12**, 158-163.
- Whitson, D. (1989). Discourse of critique in sport sociology. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, **6**, 61-65.

Notes

¹For the neophyte, we rather would like to point out a number of excellent works on Foucault, such as the special issue of the journal *Critique*, which appeared in 1986

and presents a bibliography of Foucault's writings (in English language, a similar but more complete bibliography appears in a collection of essays entitled *The Final Foucault* edited by Bernauer and Rasmussen, 1988), also Deleuze (1986), Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983), Dostie (1988), Poulantzas (1978), Smart (1985), and Miller (1993).

²The expression "Anglo-Saxon readings" is used here to designate readings done within a cultural and linguistic space that is different from the Francophone space. Of course, the use of this general qualifier should not be associated with the idea that Anglo-Saxon readings are monolithic, since there are indeed very different readings of Foucault in the English-language literature.

³Dostie provides a very concise definition of *épistémé*: "configuration of knowledge at a given time period, which structures the scientific thinking specific to this period" (translation, 1988, p. 22).

Acknowledgment

This is a revised and translated version of a paper presented at the 1993 Annual Conference of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. This article was submitted for review in its English version, and we are very grateful to the anonymous *SSJ* reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Copyright of Sociology of Sport Journal is the property of Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.