



جامعة الإسكندرية
ALEXANDRIA
UNIVERSITY
كلية الدراسات الاقتصادية والعلوم السياسية
Faculty of Economic Studies & Political Science
معرفة واتساء

المجلة العلمية
لكلية الدراسات الاقتصادية والعلوم السياسية

<https://esalexu.journals.ekb.eg>

دورية علمية محكمة

المجلد الثامن (العدد السادس عشر، يوليو 2023)

Biopolitics and Development: Governmentality in Egypt ⁽¹⁾

أحمد شندي إبراهيم

باحث دكتوراه العلوم السياسية

كلية الاقتصاد والعلوم السياسية

جامعة القاهرة

ahmed.shindy@must.edu.eg

⁽¹⁾ تم تقديم البحث في 2022/9/4، وتم قبوله للنشر في 2022/11/6.

ABSTRACT

French philosopher Michel Foucault is presented as the founding father of the concept of biopolitics, although the concept predates his theses. This is due to the importance of Foucault's approach to the concept, which made many scholars build on his important initial contributions to the various social and natural sciences.

The term biopolitics has witnessed great interest from political science researchers in recent years, especially political economy's scholars. largely due to the different explanations of the term presented by a number of thinkers at the beginning of the twenty-first century, especially Hardt and Negri, which came to link biopolitics with neoliberalism closely. Then talk about "Governmentality" as an art of government concerned with managing the lives and subjects of the population.

Studies dealing with the concept and its theoretical aspects in the context of the countries of the South have been scarce, despite many of them suffered from neoliberal policies. Egypt under the rule of former President Mubarak is not an exception with regard to countries that pursue governance to conform to neoliberal policies that seek to implement them, which this article seeks to address.

Keywords biopolitics, biopower, neoliberalism, governmentality, development, Egypt.

المخلص

يقدم الفيلسوف الفرنسي ميشيل فوكو على أنه الأب المؤسس لمفهوم السياسة الحيوية، على الرغم من أن المفهوم سابق على أطروحاته. ويرجع ذلك إلى أهمية تناول فوكو للمفهوم وتوظيفه، والتي جعلت العديد من العلماء يبنون على إسهاماته الأولى الهامة في مختلف العلوم الاجتماعية والطبيعية. وقد شهد مصطلح السياسة الحيوية اهتماماً كبيراً من باحثي العلوم السياسية في السنوات الأخيرة لاسيما دارسي الاقتصاد السياسي، ويرجع ذلك بشكل كبير للشروحات المختلفة للمصطلح التي قدمها عدد من المفكرين مع بدايات القرن الواحد والعشرين وبشكل خاص هارت ونيجري، والتي جاءت لربط السياسة الحيوية بالنيوليبرالية بشكل وثيق، ومن ثم الحديث عن "الحكمانية" كنظام للحكم يهتم بإدارة حياة السكان وذواتهم، وهو طرح فوكو الذي كان يكتنفه بعض الغموض.

وقد ندرت الدراسات التي تتناول المفهوم وجوانبه النظرية في سياق دول الجنوب، على الرغم من معاناة عديد منها من السياسات النيوليبرالية، ولا تعد مصر تحت حكم الرئيس الأسبق مبارك استثناءً فيما يتعلق بالدول التي تنتهج الحكمانية للتوافق مع سياسات نيوليبرالية تسعى لتنفيذها وهو ما تسعى الدراسة إلى تناوله.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السياسة الحيوية - القوة الحيوية - النيوليبرالية - الحكمانية - التنمية - مصر

PURPOSE

This paper is a scientific endeavor aims at addressing the concept of biopolitics from the perspective of comparative politics and, more precisely, studying the intersections between political economy and political sociology from a developmental perspective, with always referring to Egypt.

DESIGN/ METHODOLOGY/ APPROACH

This paper focuses on the analysis of biopolitics that explains the relationship between biopower (as a technique of neoliberalism) and development, moreover the impact of neoliberal policies on social and political practices in Egypt under Mubarak, using biopolitical and political economy approaches.

FINDINGS

Power relations always exist and the rising of neo type of power does not mean that other forms have disappeared. There is a clear relation between neoliberalism and the rising of biopower practices through governmentality, but it needs more studies from different angles to explain the changes of these practices according to biopower understanding.

ORIGINALITY/VALUE

Biopolitical studies are rare when it comes to development studies and biopolitics, especially in Arab countries. This study tries to start centering biopower concept and critical theory in the heart of Arab region studies.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of biopolitics is one of the most debatable concepts in social and human sciences in recent years. This is largely due to the difference in approaches in academia since it belongs to a large number of fields of research and study in social and human sciences, as well as natural sciences.

The concept of biopolitics in this study refers to the power relations exercised by the state and society over the population, and how these relations have a clear and direct impact on life (living or dead) and quality of life. The article is based on the argument of Foucault on biopolitics, which represents a shift in the form of power relations and their transfer from sovereign power to biopower, in which life appears as the object of politics. The article is also based mainly on the analysis of neo-liberal capitalism and its impact on political and social development. Furthermore, biopolitics in this context must be seen as a social practice that contained discourse of power, which affects the lives of the population through a new form of government. This is what we seek to explain in our study of the relationship between biopolitics and development.

This article critically analyzes the relation between biopower and development in Egypt from socio economic and political economy angles, and this will be addressed after outlining the key theoretical background of biopolitics/neoliberalism relations of power. The main argument here is to link the rising of the biopower practices in Egypt with neoliberalism politics in the late Mubarak time, which lead to governmentality as an art of government depends on biopolitical strategies.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are many previous studies that discussed the relationship between biopolitics and development, and neoliberalism in Egypt, which we can divide into two groups. The first group of studies dealt with the topic of biopolitics and its evolution. Foucault (2008) put forward "biopolitics" in this study as a form of neoliberal government that exercise power over the lives of the population, and he directly links the study of biopower with political economy. This study shows Foucault's shift towards the concept of "population" rather than "individuals" in dealing with biopower, where the control over economy and population from the point of view of "political rationality" as a general feature of neoliberal government. He explains that liberalism and the instruments of capitalist control, thus the exercise of power has shifted from the exercise of disciplinary power to the exercise of bio power. The study concludes that legitimacy is not the law but the political economy, where incompetence in practice means illegitimacy.

Lemke's (2011) study presented the stages of development of the concept, from Foucault to Hardt and Negri. The study presents two directions of the concept related to Foucault's argument of biopower. The first direction focuses on the political dimension, to consider how biopolitics performs its functions, and what are the differences between it and the formation of politics in its traditional form. He then presented a number of approaches in the same framework such as Body Politics, Politics of Life, as well as Biolegitimacy that focuses on the ethical dimensions of biopolitics. Lemke draws an important conclusion, mainly that biopolitical analysis has shown that this phenomenon is not the result of natural anthropological roots, legal development, or a global political framework, but is deeply rooted in social practice and political decision-making.

Moreover, Rabinow and Rose (2006) sought to provide conceptual explanations about biopolitics and biopower, arguing the importance of biopower approach in contemporary analyses. The study proceeds from Foucault's analysis of biopolitics, and refers to its expression of one or more "discourse of truth" that emphasize the vital nature of human beings. The study distinguishes between exceptional cases of biopolitical practices those of which can lead to murder, which expresses the politics of death, and biopower of the contemporary state that takes on a different form, where its process ranges from *Laissez Mourir* "let him die" to *Faire Vivre* "make him live", which can be referred to as strategies of governmentality.

The second group of studies includes the most important studies that dealt with the relationship between biopolitics and development. Sylvester's (2006) study seeks to highlight the place of biopolitics in development and postcolonial studies. It focuses on postcolonial transformations in a number of African countries, where the state has been active in practices related to the injury or killing of local citizens sometimes under the pretext of "development". The study depends on examples from Zimbabwe and Rwanda as they represent different models of that transformation, linking biopolitics and development, and repositioning political economy in development studies. Moreover, the study adopts Agamben's argument on biopolitics, as it focuses on the state's exclusion of itself from the state of law, in order to practice murder and torture in camps or private places. The study argues that these practices are not limited to totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, but also extended those practices to democratic countries, in prisons and

detention centers. Finally, the study finds that colonial development policies are bio power excellence, as they have shifted the form of these biopolitics from their direct and violent form in the past to other forms that integrate these policies within the art of governance itself and practice a number of these practices under the pretext of development.

Parfitt's (2009) study presents Foucault and Agamben's argument about biopolitics and its relationship to sovereignty as an introduction to addressing biopolitics as "developmental practice". The study argues that various development interventions have led to the worsening of the conditions of the poor even more, as they were governed by "bare life" in "Agamben" words. The study gives a number of examples of neoliberal development policies to illustrate this argument, by providing a number of examples from African experiences such as Ghana and Malawi. The study concludes that Foucault's argument about biopolitics is more plausible in relation to his assertion that any exercise of power has creative and destructive aspects. Development theorists therefore point out that such interventions must be viewed in a balanced critical manner, in terms of considering that they may represent support for the poor through grassroots organizations or that they pose risks to the further marginalization and exclusion of the poor.

Furthermore, Reid's (2013) study argues that studying the relation of biopolitics and governments of liberal regimes developed with new views of development itself, moving beyond the vision that views development as merely achieving economic growth, to bring development out towards freedom, empowerment and the liberation of the human subject from economic requirements. The study argues that claims of "resilience" and how people should be "flexible" in the neoliberal discourse of sustainable development mean that these people do not perceive the state as responsible for securing decent living standards for them, as this discourse promotes the belief that human beings should develop themselves and thus secure better living standards for themselves. Here, the discourse of sustainable development has shifted from being "human life" to becoming "the biosphere", and then shifting from economic development to sustainable development. The study concludes that promoting the resilience of sustainable development, which is strongly compatible with and serves neoliberal biopolitics, necessitates the creation of different development policies and practices that can provide space for conflict with the forms of

neoliberalism offered by Western countries and institutions. The study here calls for the rehabilitation of the political factor and the idea of governance, in the direction of global calls under the name of "developmental" that serve neoliberal biopolitics.

Farah (2010) begun from the idea that the political regime is dominant in the social systems of the Third World. Moreover, that the engine of various relations at the level of economy, democracy and gender are power relations. The study concludes that at the level of the state's relationship with development in Egypt, the state's intervention in the economy in several periods led to increasing economic growth, mainly when the state is independent of the different powers of all social classes. However, in the end, the erosion of that independence led to the domination of certain groups over the system and the deterioration of development. The study highlights the importance of reshaping hegemonic power relations so that Egypt can solve its problems, in addition to establishing development policies which focus on people actual needs and seek to narrow social gaps in the socio-economic system, especially gender gaps.

Thus, based on the previous studies, it can be said that Foucault's study on biopolitics is institutionalized in addressing and analyzing the evolution of the concept of biopolitics and its framework. This has led to place the concept at the heart of political economy and analysis of modern capitalist practice. Although Foucault did not mention it in his book explicitly, the critique of neoliberalism and capitalist practices is present throughout the study. So that many see him as one of the heralds of the emergence of political neoliberalism⁽²⁾, but this did not prevent some from arguing that he is a supporter of the neoliberal economy, and "fond of neoliberal policies."⁽³⁾ Due to the nature of the study, which is one of the early and founding studies of the concept of biopolitics, no criticism of the concept was addressed in it, nor did it focus on how to produce biopolitics. "Hardt and Negri fill that gap in their argument of the productive dimension of the biopower as the study here will explain it in detail.

⁽²⁾ See for Example: Tom, C. (2011). Neoliberalism: A Foucauldian Perspective. *International Review of Social Research*, 1(2), 109-124.

⁽³⁾ See for Example: Zamora, D., & Behrent, M. C. (Ed.) (2016). *Foucault and Neoliberalism*. UK: Polity press. Specially chapter 2: Zamora, D., & Behrent, M. C. (Ed.) (2016). Liberalism without humanism: Michel Foucault and the free-market Creed. In *Foucault and Neoliberalism* (pp. 1976–1979). UK: Polity press.

Despite the importance of the study of "Lemke", it is important to clarify that the order of its presentation relied on a chronological presentation of the development of biopolitics rather than objective one. As the argument of "Hardt and Negri" is closely related to what Foucault presented and number of thinkers may even link them with intermediate attempts, such as Gilles Deleuze, who was able to present the transition from disciplinary power to biopower in Foucault's thought clearly⁽⁴⁾. Also, Deleuze's contribution with Felix Guattari⁽⁵⁾ in the critique of capitalism, addressing the transformation of power relations, that Lemke did not explain clearly.

Rabino and Rose's study illustrates the downside of biopolitics, which revolves mainly around Agamben's proposition, and what might be called "life deprivation policies," and it was clear from the initial study that Agamben's actions differ fundamentally with Foucault's proposition on biopolitics. Foucault was arguing that "sovereign power" is over and that biopolitics is a new form of power, while Agamben points out that it is a historical extension of sovereign power. Although the study puts Hardt and Negri in the same direction with Agamben, we are going to explain in our study that sovereign power, and the notions of bare life and power in the state of exception are not so much preoccupation, but rather more they focused on linking biopolitics to political economy and immaterial labor as a form of practice of contemporary governments within the framework of a new world order.

The previous studies of biopolitics and development also showed that there is a lack of studies of the analysis of biopolitics from political economy approach, as most studies focus on studying the relationship between biopolitics to sovereignty as well as the negative (often destructive) side of biopolitics. However, the focus on biopolitics as a social practice and associated power relations is still shrouded in relative scarcity. Although studies on the relationship of biopolitics to development have been increasing recently, addressing this relationship by studying political and social evolution, which is at the heart of political economy study, in addition to providing a critical analysis of new forms of liberal government, still

⁽⁴⁾ See: Deleuze, G. (2006). *Foucault* (7th ed.). (S. Hand, Trans.) USA: The University of Minnesota Press.

⁽⁵⁾ See: Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia* (11th ed.). (B. Massumi, Trans.) USA: The University of Minnesota Press.

represents a gap in the research field of biopolitics that we seek to compensate for in our study.

III. BIOPOLITICS: HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND REDEFINING THE POLITICAL

“Biopolitics” in linguistic meanings refers to “politics that deals with life” (Lemke, 2011:2), but the journey of the term was not that easy. Swede Rudolph Kjellen started to employ the term in his theory about the state in 1916, considered it as a “form of life” driven by instinct and nature (In: Esposito, 2008:16), which means dealing with life as the origin of political, social, and all human activities.

The most significant development of biopolitical term at that stage came with the 1930s, where it was linked to racist ideas, especially ethnic cleansing by Nazi Germany, where the linkage between politics and life is easily noticed. It mainly expresses politics as ending life practices, and adapts bodies to serve the third Reich. The second wave of studying biopolitics started in France in the 1960s, dominated by the anthropological dimension, where the writings focused on addressing the human and civilization at the expense of the political and the historical. This posted a threat that the concept would lose its meaning and turn into a form of traditional "humanism" (Esposito, 2008).

The evolution of the human race was the central focus of the anthropological approach of biopolitics at that stage, where empirical methods were used to explore political behavior, which was mainly due to biological factors. This understanding of biopolitics “oriented toward describing and explaining observable behavior in order to draw conclusions for a rational politics” (Lemke, 2011:17).

Those multiple perceptions effected how thinkers and scholars are using and interpreting the concept in the texts of social sciences through decades. However, the third wave of studying biopolitics in the 1970s began dealing with life processes as an objective of politics. That peak of biopolitical interest in the field of political science was accompanied by the radical technological progress of that period in some fields such as biotechnology and genetic engineering. This created attention to study political, social and economic structures and its impact on life. In other words,

how economic and social policies can be formulated to preserve life against policies that threaten human life and nature in general.

It has become clear that biopolitics has created a major shift in politics, where life is no longer just a "subject" of politics, but it is the heart of politics and the definition of the political issue. "Biopolitics is not the expression of a sovereign will but aims at the administration and regulation of life processes on the level of populations" (Lemke, 2011:4).

This argument goes beyond previous arguments, to focus on the relational and historical idea of biopolitics, which was introduced by the French philosopher Michel Foucault. He is the most important of those who began to lay the foundations of the concept in terms of clarification of its relationship to power, governing and society.

A. BIOPOLITICS: ART OF GOVERNING HUMAN BEINGS

Foucault believes that power is developed in the seventeenth century in a way that the exercise of power over life became for a management purpose, when an explosion of techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations have arisen (Foucault, 1978). Foucault stresses in his arguments about the emergence of biopolitics. He argues that biopolitics was necessary to the development of capitalism, since the latter would not have been developed without the integration of bodies in the production machine, controlling population phenomena in line with economic processes, and ensuring compliance with power (Foucault, 1978). Moreover, "biopolitics created in the eighteenth century as techniques of power present at every level of the social body and utilized by very diverse institutions (the family and the army, schools and the police, individual medicine and the administration of collective bodies), operated in the sphere of economic processes" (Foucault, 1978, :141).

All the previous analysis of biopower, presented by Foucault over years, led to the crystallization of his last thesis about the biopower as a governing tool. He argues that sovereign power has historically ended, and all power structures and forms, which exist now, present biopower structures and forms through relations of power that aim to control all aspects of life with the government in the heart. By simple words, he does not consider liberalism as an economic theory nor a political ideology; however, he started to treat biopolitics as techniques of liberalism that have been explored as an

art of governing human beings (Foucault, 2008). Thus, the judgment criterion of the government's performance shifts from the legitimacy of government decisions and policies to whether or not such policies succeed. Then self-limitation of governmental reason started to arise from the political economy rather than law (Foucault, 2008).

Foucault puts "liberalism" as a general framework for biopolitics that ensures the connection between the political anatomy of the human body (Foucault's first interest) and the investigation of subjectivation, which is the ethical political forms of existence. This makes the main concern is how subjects were governed as legal persons and human beings at the same time (Lemke, 2011). Foucault deals with the subjectivation as the subject that forms power through the social practice of liberal governance politics. Moreover, he stresses that this power exists in authority, in society, and everywhere, as pointed out earlier.

B. BIOPOLITICS: PRODUCTIVE DIMENSION OF BIOPOWER

Based on Foucault's contribution, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri introduced their understandings of power and authority through the idea of collapsing the sovereignty of national state and rising of "Empire". "Empire" here is considered as a new global system, which expresses a new form of hegemony beyond national, and nation-state, where domination and hegemony are created by bio production of politics. It made "Empire", as a governing regime, came as a result of biopolitics practices (Hardt and Negri, 2001).

According to Hardt and Negri, the highest function of this power is "to invest life through and through and its primary task is to administer life. Biopower thus refers to a situation in which what is directly at stake in power is the production and reproduction of life itself" (Hardt and Negri, 2001:24). Accordingly, the transition from disciplinary society to the society of control made a huge turn in power relation, which spread to reach every social practice in the society.

Hardt and Negri (2001) differentiate between disciplinary society and the society of control. In the disciplinary society, the relationship between power and the individual is static relationship, where discipline practices were unable to exceed the traditional disciplinary institution's practices such as in prison, school and hospital. However, the relationship in the society of control

is open, qualitative, and affective. Moreover, the whole social body is included in the mechanism of power in which political power is completely "vital". Power here is expressed as a control reaching the depths of the population at the levels of consciousness and body, as well as through social relations.

Hardt and Negri (2001) focus on the "productive dimension of biopower" because they believe that Foucault failed to identify "the mechanisms of production in the biopolitical community". Moreover, the following contributions (especially by Deleuze and Guattari), which are made to try to deal with this gap, were important but they could not solve the dilemma. Besides, the advanced contributions of many Italian Marxists thinkers did not provide a solid theoretical framework that can determine the productive dimension of biopower, despite the importance of their use of Marxist concepts, especially the concept of "the general intellect".

Hardt and Negri (2001) argue that the creation of wealth in society is due to biopolitical production, where the production of social life itself represents an increase in economic, political and cultural intersections. Biopolitics here reflects a new phase of capitalism characterized by the disappearance of the boundaries between economy and politics, as well as between production and reproduction. It reflects a new form of sovereignty within a global system of control. This new phase has been transformed from traditional forms of politics guaranteed by the constitution into forms of intervention that follow the logic of the police state.

The change that began in the 1970s in terms of production patterns represents the replacement of the model of industrial capitalism with the so-called "cognitive capitalism". Yann Moulier Boutang defines it, clearly and intensively as "the accumulation of consists mainly of knowledge, which becomes the basic source of value, as well as the principles location of the process of valorization" (Boutang, 2011:47).

Then technology and communication networks are the basis of that type of capitalism, which can be directly linked to the process of globalization, at least with the process of globalization moving forward in the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Knowledge becomes the core of the process of capitalism, expressed by the biopower in its productive dimension, which highly goes towards immaterial labor. This expresses the stage in which the industrial production in its traditional form is followed by the information

production, largely characterized by what can be called the "service economy".

C. NEOLIBERALISM AND DEVELOPMENT: POLITICAL AND SOCIAL EVOLUTION

The academic community is divided into two conflicting parts when it comes to the definition of neoliberalism, as distinguishing between how the right-wing circles (the international financial institutions and the investment banks) define it, on one hand, and the leftist academics on the other (Adly, 2016). Williamson refers to neoliberalism as "a set of policies and procedures that liberate economic transactions from the bureaucratic management of the state, trade unions and other political entities, and take it back to the freedom of the market which is subject to less restrictive controls and restrictions" (In: Adly, 2016: 38).

While the second trend refers to it as the ideological basis of an unequal process, since the end of the seventies, to reduce the size of the state and the extent of its intervention under the claim of restoring market freedom. However, it was actually a process of continuous dismantling of both state welfare structures and Keynesian policies that after forty years has led to the distribution of income and wealth to the higher categories through tax cuts and the expansion of borrowing. This process also raised unemployment rates and the stagnation of real wages (Adly, 2016). Perhaps these two trends in defining neoliberalism emphasize the main idea of dealing with neoliberalism as an "ideological" or at least a "political" agenda.

David Harvey refers to neoliberalism as primarily a "theory of political economy practices" (Harvey, 2007). These practices affirm that the good life of human beings is achieved through the liberation of individual skills and freedoms, with an institutional system characterized by full support for human rights, private property, free markets and free trade. In this case, the role of the state is limited to creating the appropriate institutional structure for such practices.

The spread of neoliberal policies began in the late 1970s as an attempt to emerge from the economic recession and to resolve existing economic problems that led to the collapse of embedded liberalism. This is followed by the state withdrew from direct intervention in the economy as well as supported social protection and welfare policies. Harvey (2007) asserts that one of the most important symptoms of neoliberalism and state withdrawal is

the re-empowerment of richer groups within society. After the wealth of these groups is collapsed with the cumulative recession of the 1970s, and it multiplied later with neoliberal policies, all efforts of equal distribution of wealth disappeared, after they have been bearing fruits by the end of the 1950s. This led to view neoliberalism as a utopian political project aimed at reorganizing global capitalism with the aim of restructuring capitalist accumulation as well as the power of economic elites (Harvey, 2007). The re-empowerment of economic elites was the dominant project that neoliberal policies could achieve when it failed to deal with the first project of capital accumulation. "Samir Amin" by stressing that the emergence and rise of neoliberal policies created a slowdown in growth, which in turn affected the public finances due to the collapse of tax revenues, and covered the deficit by increasing the public debt (Amin, 2003).

Piketty (2014) points out that the resurgence of inequality after 1980 is mainly due to the political transformations of the past several decades, particularly those related to taxes and finance. Besides, the history of inequality is shaped in the way that economic, social and political actors see what is just and what is unjust. The relative strength of these actors and the collective choices that produce inequality arise from involving all the actors. Here, Piketty emphasizes that the inequality produced by capitalism, especially in its neoliberal form, is not necessarily a purely economic product, however it represents a history of different interactions between different forces, thus we can say that it is the result of unbalanced power relations.

Foucault's abstracts, especially in his late writings, tend to look at neoliberalism as the narrative that tells us the story of the art of governance, which is concerned with shaping the behavior of the population in the finer details of life. Foucault's view of "war" as the "grid of intelligibility"⁽⁶⁾ within society, which is responsible for subject perception, emphasizes that "governmentality" is responsible for the formation of a "grid of intelligibility" that has become different in terms of their nature as they have started to include action relations rather than coercive ones (Protevi, 2009). Foucault argues that transformation of power within society from sovereign power to biopower has become the most delicate detail of the lives of the population

⁽⁶⁾ Foucault means that any intelligible ordering requires a "system of elements" or grid in terms of which similarities and differences, or any other basis of organization, may be cast. For more details, see: (Foucault, 1970)

through "governmentality". At this point, the action and the counteraction represent the base of power relations produced by the biopower, which is expressed by neoliberal government. Thus, the freedom of individuals here is the basis for the work of biopower, unlike sovereign power, such as restriction / prevention, which is the basis for the exercise of power /authority.

In short, Foucault and the biopolitical approach did not deal with neoliberalism as a political or ideological theory, but it was treated as a set of practices representing governance techniques that direct population subjects to certain levels of mobility that reflect government politics. Foucault does not consider the economy as an institution outside the state or against the state, but he deals with it as the emergence of new forms of knowledge and power (Cotoi, 2011). Besides, in the framework of neoliberalism, it represents the new patterns of knowledge that accompanied the transition from sovereign power to biopower and expresses the transition and evolution at the political and social levels.

IV. BIOPOLITICS GENOLOGY IN EGYPT:

Many policies were pursued with the beginning of the neoliberal transition from its first inception in 1990, through the climax of the neoliberal transformation in 2004 with the government of Ahmed Nazif. This government included a large number of neoliberal-oriented businessmen, until the fall of Mubarak regime in 2011 in Egypt. These policies pursued to shape the lives of Egyptians to suit the rule of the market, which had a profound impact on the restructuring of political and social relations. This transformation of economic productivity relations has produced biopolitical power in both public and private spheres.

A STRONG REGIME AND A WEAK STATE: GOVERNMENTALITY AND STATE OF EXCEPTION

The nature of the major economic transformations since the 1990s enhanced the strength of the Egyptian regime in a way that allowed it to intervene in the private sphere, which led to the significant melting of the boundaries between the public and private sphere. Thus, the neoliberal economic transformation became a form of social practice that shapes the lives of individuals. Moreover, it reproduces the population (multitude) according to its own conditions and under its control, hence the regime

realized that it was inevitable to open the public sphere under neoliberal economic policies that seek global integration.

The political regime under Mubarak, until the fall of his regime with the outbreak of the revolution of 25 January 2011, has replaced many policies of repression with others for the purpose of prevention (arguably repression by prevention) as a form of influence and exercise of power. Thus, law has become one of the most important security instruments of the political regime (especially emergency law), which was used to facilitate governing and earn economic legitimacy. Using the emergency law (continuing from 1958) and the legal structure as security instrument made it different in comparison with previous periods. The law here became an "infrastructure", which means it was a part of the production processes according to Foucault and Max Weber, unlike Marx who emphasized the "superstructure" of the legal structure in society (Foucault, 2004).

Foucault points out that the art of governing, which is called governmentality, is new in its effects, and principles, and in some elements. It is an abandonment of the interest of the state, as it is based on the idea of less governing. Hence, the question of the government's economy dominated the questions of constitution and legitimacy (in its traditional sense) as the question of the government's economy is certainly about the extent to how much it is liberal (Foucault, 2004:28-29). Here it can be emphasized that Foucault's view of governmentality does not mean "the end of state sovereignty or power". His general view of power denies its "supersonicity" and that it works in one direction from the top down. However, the view of governmentality as a form of liberal governance presents the trilogy of sovereignty – discipline – government, where he is mainly interested in terms of sovereignty, by examining how sovereignty has been influenced by recent developments in disciplinary and governmental techniques that shape and regulate behaviors of individuals within the state (Joseph, 2012:23-24). Hence, it can be said that governmentality represents the relationship that produces a "biopolitical power" towards the population and vice versa.

Disciplinary power represents the transition from sovereign power (such as general execution practices) to a correction system as the "prison". Thus, the "body" here is the focus and the objective of disciplinary power. This disciplinary power needs to be practiced within specific monitoring and supervision institutions which go beyond imprisonment to include time-

limited control institutions such as hospitals, schools. Governmentality, as a technical instrument of politics/biopolitical power, respects the natural processes of the economic sphere and biopolitical policy through representing a more liberal form of power, which governs "remotely", as opposed to the disciplinary institutions that exercise disciplinary power. The focus of governmentality is on "creating free and effective subjects" (Joseph, 2012:24-25), in the society as a whole, without restriction on specific institutions and time. The production of biopolitical power by market practices is reflected in social practices in general.

In the Egyptian political regime, President Nasser's regime used sovereign and disciplined power mainly in dealing with political opponents as well as dissenters. While although Sadat initiated some liberal economic and political trends, he could not continue that approach. His reign was characterized by the use of disciplinary power to control political opponents and dissenters. Though, the political regime under President Mubarak took a different direction in terms of power relations, we will clarify them in the context of what comes next.

A. GOVERNMENTALITY UNDER LIBERALISM: THE PARADOX OF GOVERNANCE AND FREEDOM

The 1980 referendum to amend Egypt's constitution came to recognize multipartyism more broadly. This was seen at the time as a step towards political reform which became a necessity with the launch of neoliberal economic policies that actually began with the 1990s. However, the accompanying amount of freedom of the press and the media have always been restricted by the control of political power. The political regime kept the ideas of "public sector that leads progress in all areas", the "people who control all the tools of production", and the national economy organized in accordance with a comprehensive development plan" all included in the Constitution of the State (Constitution of 1971, even after its amendment in 1980), contrary to the principles of pluralism and orientation towards a market economy (Al-Najjar, 1997:36). Despite this conflict, President Mubarak's regime has been moving steadily toward economic liberalism, and most of these constitutional texts became irrelevant with the liberal transition practices in the early 1990s. The regime therefore did not care about political freedom but it focused mainly on economic freedom (in some way) on the

basis that it was the way out of successive economic crises on the Egyptian economy.

The provisions of the 1971 constitution allow government officials to combine their positions as well as membership of the People's Assembly that is a clear violation of the principle of separation of powers. These provisions have benefited many ministers and officials in different governments during President Mubarak's era. Moreover, the provisions of rights and freedoms enshrined in Title III of the constitution have resulted in their practical application through laws. This enabled the executive branch to take away those rights whenever they wish, especially with the existence of the emergency law which led to make the control of all these rights and freedom in the hands of the minister of the interior (Al-Najjar, 1997:37).

Over time, the Egyptian political system has become "a typical case of the success of the ruling elite in emptying the process of democratic transition from its true content, as it has been engineered in a way that enhances the regime's ability to continue in power, based on constitutional, legal, political and security mechanisms" (Tawfiq, 2010:12).

According to Tawfiq (2010) the Egyptian political system under Mubarak suffered from a "structural crisis", whose manifestations lie in the personalization of power, the absence of the principle of balance between the authorities, the absence of sharing power and the principle of peaceful mobilization of power. Moreover, they lie in the rigidity and calcification of the ruling elite, the existence of a major imbalance in the pluralistic party system, the weakness of political participation, the absence or weakness of the credibility of the official political discourse, the uncertainty of the future of the political system as Mubarak ages (82 years in 2010), as well as the continued introduction of the emergency law in his reign since 1981 without interruption. This raises an important question about the context of governmentality practices and liberalism as its general framework in the countries in the South, particularly Egypt, which is, can we talk about governmentality under an authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regime, or it is linked only to western democratic regimes?

It can be said that governmentality is linked to liberal-oriented economic practice, not the nature of the political regime. Moreover, Foucault argues that the fact that general framework of governmentality is liberalism does not mean that it respects or guarantees freedom, as it indicates that it

consumes freedom mainly freedom of the market - freedom of seller and customer, freedom of ownership. As result of the governmentality need to consume freedom, it is obliged to produce it, and therefore produces and regulates it for consumption (Foucault, 2004:63). Here, Foucault sees the liberalism that originated in Europe in the 18th century and then continued, as the "art of new governance" that produces freedom, also established borders, control and oppression on this freedom. Thus, the component of "security" emerged as a complement and a regulator of freedom based on preserving the collective interest, and these security strategies often reach the stage, which it became an opposite of liberalism (Foucault, 2004:65).

B. GOVERNANCE IN THE CASE OF EXCEPTION IN NON-DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES: (CASE OF EGYPT)

The Italian philosopher "Agambin" acknowledged the difficulty of defining the state of exception, but proceeded from Carl Schmitt's thesis, which defined the exception as "the situation in which the decision is taken by the sovereign ruler" (Schmitt, 2005:5). Accordingly, the exception should be understood as referring to the general concept in the theory of the state, and not just a theoretical component that applies to emergencies, which is convenient with the legislative definition of sovereignty on a logical systematic and legal basis (Schmitt, 2005:5). Here, Schmidt made the concepts of sovereignty and exception in tandem, which at one point established authoritarian regimes on legal grounds, particularly the case of Nazi Germany in the twentieth century.

The state of exception, which is considered in the midst of the emergency law that continued throughout Mubarak's rule, is the cornerstone of the various crises that have affected the political regime, and indeed society as a whole. Perhaps the description of the political regime in Egypt as semi-authoritarian at times and tyrannical at other times, or as a hybrid regime, is explained by what "Agambin" refers to as the exception under biopolitical politics. This reflects "the threshold at which the lack of differentiation between democracy and tyranny begins" (Agamben, 2005:3). Here, Agambin shows the disappearance or fragility of the boundaries between what is democratic and what is authoritarian, or more precisely between what is legal and what an exception is. In this case, the public legal system is surrounded by other laws that represent an exception, and these exceptional laws and

procedures take root to become part of the legal system used by the regime in its rule.

Egypt's successive political regimes have a long history of using exceptional courts for political purposes, from the military courts of Orabi and his Egyptian peasant supporters in 1884, to the Denshway Court in 1906, which tried and executed Egyptian peasants and established under the English occupation using Egyptian judges. This became a repeated pattern since the beginning of the July 1952 regime and extended beyond.

The July regime began using the exceptional courts early under the army's control of power, and this was reflected in its response to the strike and sit-in of workers of the Egyptian Spinning and Textile Company in Kafr Al-Dwar (August 1952) by force and the use of sovereign power within its primitive framework to end the situation. Then an extraordinary court was established in the factory land surrounded by army tanks to try workers after confrontations between workers and the army. Mohammed Al-Baqari and Mohammed Khamis⁽⁷⁾ were sentenced to death, while others were sentenced to life imprisonment. The death sentences were carried out in less than a month by a court, which was made of military personnel. The trial lacked the lowest standards of justice, beside that all the rulings of these courts are final rulings that cannot be challenged.

C. EMERGENCY: STATE OF EXCEPTION GOVERNS

The court of treachery is the first exceptional court established by Law No. 344 of 1952, to try public officials, ministers, members of parliament and others who hold public office side by side with previous politicians. Also, it practices criminalization of the retrograde effect, which is an explicit violation of the rule on the legality of criminalization, and punishment, which stipulates that there is no crime and no punishment except for acts subsequent to the effective date of the law (Abu Saada, 2006:251).

The July 1967 regime legalized the revolutionary court established in 1953 by a military majority to rule on political cases, by passing Law 48 of 1967 to establish a court to which cases of a political nature are referred by

⁽⁷⁾ For more details, see: Al-Qalyubi, M. K. (2013). *My name is Mustafa Khamis* [documentary film]. Moreover, Naguib, M. (1984). *Mohamed Naguib Diaries: I was President of Egypt*. Cairo: The Modern Egyptian Office, pp. 170-173. Also, Albaghdadi, A. (1977). *Abd-Allatif Albaghdadi Diaries Vol. 1*. Cairo: The Modern Egyptian Office, pp. 54-55.

the president of the republic without providing for a military majority in the composition of the court. This court continues to date and whose rulings may not be appealed.

In 1958, President Nasser passed Law 162, which regulates the state of emergency, which has been in use since then and throughout the rule of presidents Sadat and Mubarak. It gave the president the power to refer crimes punishable by common law to what is known as emergency state security courts. This law made it easier to prosecute various political currents and opponents, and all acts of demonstrations and sit-ins, and other peaceful movements to object or demand rights have become easier to try as act of threatening the security of the state.

President Sadat has issued the law on the protection of values from defect in 1980 to exclude his political opponents and currents violating his politics. This law established powers for the Socialist Prosecutor General, which was stipulated in article 179 of the 1971 constitution paralleling the powers of the Public Prosecutor's Office, resulting in a dual judicial system of justice subject to the executive branch (Abu Saada, 2006:254-256). However, the most dangerous step was the constitutionalization of the State Security Courts under Article 171 of the 1971 constitution. Then, Law no.105 was issued establishing these courts in June 1980. This exceptional legal context that accumulated for decades was a general context of 30 years of rule, the period of president Mubarak's rule until his overthrow at the outbreak of the 25th of January 2011 revolution. He was the greatest beneficiary of that case of exception although he did not establish it in the first place.

Here it can be said that the political regime during the rule of President Mubarak was working under a state of exception in terms of law and practice. The powers of the president expanded significantly in the face of the legislative and judicial authority because of taking advantage of constitutionalization of the state of exception that took place under President Sadat. In addition to controlling the powers of the government, many of whose members in successive governments brought together the executive and legislative office, and even the executive branch became the first legislator of the laws at that time from within the parliament itself. In spite of the legislative and supervisory powers and powers constitutionally enjoyed by the People's Assembly, its role in political life is weak and fragile. In terms of the legislative process, experience in practice has confirmed that the

government presents the majority law drafts, as most contemporary political regimes do, including those of western democracies, but has remained without real opposition as a result of the ruling party's significant control over the election process and parliamentary membership. The constitutional amendments in 2007 was accompanied by the expansion of the authority's power, which was accompanied by new authorities for the president. More importantly, the president became entitled to issue a decision to dissolve the People's Assembly, if necessary, without holding a popular referendum as article 136 provided before the amendment (Tawfiq, 2010:22-23).

Moreover, various amendments to the Law on the Establishment of the Special Court of Political Parties in 1994 (Resolution 221) and 2005 (Law 177) have taken place, which resulted in preventing any political parties opposed to the ruling regime. This is consistent with Agamben's reference to the fact that one of the most political features of the state of exception lies in the "temporary abolition of discrimination between legislative, executive and judicial authorities, which reveal their propensity to become a permanent mode of government" (Agamben, 2005:7).

Although the legal articles of the exception are present in various constitutional and legal systems around the world, and have even been established mainly in western countries, these countries linked using the exception with the case of necessity which has a temporary nature by definition. This link guaranteed the prevention of shifting towards authoritarian rule. In the case of many constitutional regimes in the South, particularly Egypt, the state of necessity represented a general context to govern. Egypt's 30-year-old regime sought to extend and expand the state of exception through intensive practice.

D. GOVERNANCE TECHNIQUES UNDER EXCEPTION

Mubarak's rule treated Egyptians as "populations" not subjects ruled by a shepherd, or family governed by a "head of the family" as envisioned by president Sadat, and not a people with a "leader", or part of a larger homeland, the "Arab world" as President Nasser envisioned it. This was encouraged by the fact that most Arab countries cut relations with Egypt until the early 1990s following Egypt's signing of the Camp David Accords in the late 1970s, as well as the neo-liberal economic orientation, which in its theoretical premises emphasizes individual freedom, and the values of citizenship at the beginning

of the 1990s. Therefore, citizens were treated as "populations" of different subjects, and do not represent people in one body.

Liberal policies and subsequent neoliberal turn have led to biopolitical policies that separate citizens' rights from their natural lives or "bare lives" as Agambin points out, "The state here, same like human rights charters, sees life as "a life that is at risk of being killed and not sacrificable" (Agamben, 1998:78) At the same time, the state has left the role of preserving this life - step by step - to local charitable institutions, which is a real separation between the developmental and the political roles of the state. Alternatively, some kind of "cutting phase for the separation of human and citizen rights" (Agamben, 1998:78). Funds are raised from these charities to provide food, housing and treatment for this body, and also to bury it. It coincided with the adoption of neoliberal policies gradually and the withdrawal of the state from pushing development outside the capital and the main cities, which resulted in a steady increase of these organizations since the seventies through the nineties and until the outbreak of the January 2011 revolution. The number of civil organizations in total reached nearly 30,000, in which charities organizations (social assistance) accounted for up to 32%, and the rest of organizations providing health care and education services. In addition, organizations with religious nature increased this figure to about 80% of the total organizations (Kandil, 2018:20), which over time resulted in a large presence on the ground of political Islam because of its control over a large proportion of these organizations. Thus, these groups in one way or another link charity to politics.

From the beginning of the 1990s until the outbreak of the January 2011 revolution, the practices of the political regime in Egypt led to the consolidation of the concept of the "Homo Sacer" which is rooted in the expression of Agambin. This concept refers to the person who is ostracized and excluded from public life, whether because of his intellectual or ideological differences, or because he belongs to poor and marginalized groups with economic expression, or for his religious or gender affiliation. "Homo Sacer" in the Egyptian context is not only excluded but also abused and tortured by a package of exceptional legal rules.

Notably the emergency law, as well as the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1992, whose generality of its articles infringed on the rights and freedoms of

individuals to whom the legal status of terrorist act does not apply, in view of article 86 bis, which states in one of its paragraphs:

“Anyone who has established, organized or managed, contrary to the provisions of the law... shall be sentenced to imprisonment. All of it, a body, organization, group or gang, whose purpose is to call by any means to disrupt the provisions of the constitution or laws, to prevent one of the state institutions or one of the public authorities from carrying out their work, to attack the personal freedom of the citizen or others, to the freedoms and public rights assigned to them by the constitution and the law, or to harm national unity or social peace and punish with temporary hard labour anyone who has assumed leadership or provided them with material or legal aid.”

It is clear that concepts such as "national unity" and "social peace" and other paragraphs referring to the concepts of community security and safety are subject to non-strict legal definition, as well as other paragraphs that include saying, writing and publications. They therefore also prolong the promotion of ideas and beliefs in any way.

This, in addition to subjecting individuals to exceptional courts, whether state security courts or military courts, has violently violated the rights of many citizens, prolonging the right to life itself, as systematic torture has been practiced by security powers, particularly the state security apparatus, towards many Egyptians. This is confirmed by the Nadeem Center for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence and Torture by saying that: "Torture is protected by artillery from exceptional laws and a state of emergency, which are immune to Egyptian legislation and lack of political will to combat torture, and therefore have become a systematic policy of the state of Egypt" (FIDH, 2010:13).

It was not surprising, therefore, that the initial spark of the January 2011 revolution was mainly directed against security violations against Egyptians, especially with the death of a number of citizens by the security apparatus as a result of torture and the expansion of detentions, making the "detainee" here a seeming embodiment of the state of exception. Hence, power is exercised on the bodies of detainees, and exclusion and ostracism are exercised on a large part of the population outside the detention facility. It can therefore be said that the neoliberal trends, particularly in the context of the states of the south, often has a "weak state", which abandons the provision of many of the life components of its citizens, leaving the

government to the market ostensibly. At the same time, they launch a state of legal exception to strengthen their political regime as means of exercising power and strengthening their protection of power. Thus, creating neoliberalism here is a form of exception (by Law) rather than the rule of law, since it cannot practice exclusion, repression and torture without legal cover, which is a form of governing technique under governmentality.

Governmentality has developed security and legal techniques for governing under neoliberalism, with the aim of leading and controlling individuals and their bodies on one hand, while not being economically responsible for them in a binding manner. Thus, it creates a strategy of making individuals, groups and institutions responsible for social risks such as poverty, unemployment and disease, and turn responsibility into a form of "self-responsibility" (Lemek, 2001:201). Then the lives of individuals within society become their responsibility, and certainly it takes long periods of time to appear as a general technique of governance, in Egypt. This has been happening gradually since the 1990s, although it has clear manifestations with the government of Ahmed Nazif emerged in 2004. The main feature of governance then became "state withdrawal", and the state sought with privatization and structural adjustment programs to dismantle the public sector to achieve this withdrawal. This withdrawal aimed to leave the responsibility of the employments process, setting up private enterprises or joining private sector companies to individuals.

Taking biopolitics in its neoliberal context here goes beyond the view of neoliberalism as merely a political agenda for governing and managing the economy, where it is seen in this context as also more focused aimed at controlling individuals and their subjects. Despite the importance of security as a main technique for managing governance in a biopolitical context, the second and no less important technique is the relations of debt, given that this technique shapes the form of power relations, whether in terms of the relationship of the regime to the elite, or the relationship of the regime to members of society.

V. PRODUCTION OF HOMO-ECONOMICUS AND INDEBTED SOCIETY IN EGYPT

Liberal policies here are seen as producing a biopower, which in turn reshapes the subject of individuals, so the primary focus of attention is not to

evaluate these policies but to consider what they have produced. This represents the shift from evaluating neoliberal policies to try to understand and assimilate the status quo by stopping at how truth and individual subjects are produced (Read, 2009:26), so producing population as individuals is a major concern.

It is clear that formation of individuals' subjects and human nature is an important focus of Foucault's research, therefore in his discussion of neoliberalism he argues that the market is "more than just a particular institution or practice to the point where it has become the basis for reinterpretation and thus a critique of state authorities" (Read, 2009:27). More specifically, Foucault argues that neoliberalism has led to the reversal of social-economic relations, which what we have been calling social phenomena in terms of its structure and processes are now within the scope of neoliberalism's work (Foucault, 2004:240). In his analysis of American neoliberalism, Foucault points out that the generalization of the market and its economic form to the social body partly led to the economic dismantling of traditional non-economic social behaviors. For example, the mother's relationship with her children, and the placement of the husband-wife relationship in some form of creating a productive unit based on the conclusion of mutual deals within the home (Foucault, 2004:243).

In other words, the utilitarian subject, which is central to Homo economicus creation, dominates the form of power relations within the family, as well as at the level of social processes. Within the framework of governmentality, governance disappears in its traditional "responsible" form to individuals. Thus, the art of government seeks to shape, manage and dominate the lives of individuals through their subjects which, here is within the realm of neoliberalism, are utilitarian subjects.

Here Maurizio Lazzarato points out more clearly, and more specifically, that the existing new patterns of relationships are essentially "debt" relationships, since the dominance of the Homo economicus model in its neoliberal context is based on the creditor-debtor relationship (Lazzarato 2011:31). The power of debt is not exercised through coercion or ideological practices, but rather the debtor is "free" in his actions within the framework specified by the debt he has contracted. Just as international institutions produce biopower through neoliberal economic programs that plunge many countries of the South into debt, and often enter into an economic recession

(IMF and World Bank policies in Egypt here). It is the result of a choice that appears to be a "free" choice. (Lazzarato, 2011:31). Also the creditor-debtor relationship reshapes social relations and the production of the population subjects, where "the production of subjectivity occupies the first and most important place in the forms of production, it is the commodity that falls within the production of all other goods" (Lazzarato, 2011:33-34).

President Mubarak began his rule with a domestic debt of 14.7 billion Egyptian pounds. This debt reached 888 billion pounds in 2011, while the external debt in 2010 amounted to 33 billion dollars with a debt service of 6 billion dollars for the same year, after half of Egypt's external debt was reduced after its participation in the Second Gulf War. Then Mubarak doubled the external debt from \$25 billion in 1981 to \$50 billion in 1991 (Farouk, 2016:604-605).

Jalal Amin describes the Egyptian state's response in 1991 to the invitation to participate by the United States of America in the Second Gulf War as "the exact right time for Shylock (creditor) to deduct a pound of meat from Antonio's body (the debtor) where the pound of meat required in this case was for Egypt to stand by the United States of America against Saddam Hussein, and involving Egyptian armed forces to participate in the war, as a way to fulfill debts that Egypt did not have any resources to repay," as the foreign debt amounted to at the beginning of the nineties \$49 billion, equivalent to 150% of GDP (Amin, 2012:104, 106-107).

With the policies of economic openness, the upper strata of Egyptian society "addicted" to a new way of life based on "debt" and the postponement of payment as an encouragement to buy and consume, which entails a form of submission to the creditor, which also happened to the Egyptian state (Amin, 2012). Liberal policies show how the biopower produces social relations centered on a relationship of debt. This was reflected in the form of political practice as well in the formation of foreign debt relations, which put pressure on Egyptian policies as a result of its association with international lending institutions, especially the major countries that have great control over those institutions, mainly the United States of America. Thus, the "debt" produced by these liberal relations became the engine of most of these policies, beginning with the Second Gulf War and beyond.

Here it should be noted that despite the extensive privatization movement pursued by the Egyptian government, the state has used the

banking sector as a main tool to control businessmen, as it still monopolizes 60% of deposits, and about 55% of loans (Soliman, 2011:432). Moreover, the relationship of the debt has been a key instrument in the management of governance internally in Egypt, where the political regime controls the management of the financial economic system through its bureaucratic organizations. Besides, financial policies have been linked. In particular, lending policies are based on the proximity of businessmen to the regime and their agreement with its political orientations and not the effectiveness of the feasibility studies presented. Moreover, the political regime has retained a large area of representation (and restriction) of capitalism through its control over large organizations such as the Federation of Egyptian Industries and the General Federation of Chambers of Commerce, where it appoints their presidents, and a third of the members of the first and half of the members of the second (Soliman, 2011:432-433).

The relations of debt in Egypt extended to the character of social relations, as well as the relations of the political regime with society, especially the business community under governmentality. In his important study of debt, Greber (2019:621) argues that debt bondage is "the main principle of employment of workers on a planetary level. whether literally, in many parts of East Asia, Latin America, or in the figurative sense, where most of those who work feel paid or paid even do what they do in order to initially pay the installments of their interest-bearing loans". Perhaps the sit-in of groups from the "Alumni Youth Association" in early 2004 in Egypt reflects that form of power relations. The sit-in of these groups was not against the authority, aiming at obtaining wages or bonuses, or improving working conditions, as it is common in sit-ins and strikes of labor movements in Egypt. However, these sit-in was held against one of the branches of the Industrial Development Bank (a public sector bank) with the aim of obtaining loans from the Social Fund funded by the World Bank at the time, which they believe are entitled to receive it, (Elyachar, 2004). The sit-in here was to obtain loans then bear the "debt" and its burdens, in order to improve and develop their living conditions. This means to risk collision with the security services, to be attacked and perhaps imprisoned only in order to be "indebted". This is a way that sees only debt as an engine of development and change and is a clear indication of how debt is formulated for social subjects under governmentality as a different form of power.

On the other hand, Harvey portrays neoliberalism as a political project to re-empower the power of economic elites; it represents its most important successes in bringing about an accumulation of capital that has brought economic elites back to the forefront. Even if any of the principles of neoliberalism contradicts that project of maintaining the conditions of economic empowerment of elites, leading to an override of those principles in favor of those elites (Harvey, 2007:19). Thus, the accumulation of wealth and the consolidation of the economic centers of the ruling elites here are a major focus of the mechanisms of action of neoliberalism, and a major goal for them.

In Egyptian context, others argue that "the state in Egypt has two characteristics: the first is that its primary function is to maintain the harmony and unity of the social composition and the second is that it is characterized by a degree of autonomy from its segments" (In: Gamal, 2013:83). With the deeper neoliberal transformation in 2004 with the government of Ahmed Nazif taking power and the emergence of the project of Gamal Mubarak's succession of power, the bureaucracy has shifted from a class that manages the economic assets of society to a class that owns it. Thus, monopolized political resources (relations of influence – power) turned into economic resources (loans, deals, capital...) and inherited to the generation of children (Soliman, 2011: 434).

Moreover, Abdel Fadel refers to neoliberalism in Egypt as a model of "crony capitalism". The pattern of wealth creation in that period is based on earning from the opportunities provided to them by kinship, friendship and affinity relations associated with the circles of government. The most important common features of these circles are excessive dependence on debt relations through borrowing from the banking sector, the predominance of the familial character over their legal, organizational and administrative structures, and the achievement of monopolistic profits as a result of a high degree of monopoly in the market (Abdel Fadel, 2011:76). Here it can be said that in the light of the changing of power relations in society, and within the ruling elite itself, debt has become beyond its role as economic technique and serve as a security technique for governance as well which aimed to manage the behaviors of the governed. It allows prediction, calculation, measurement and then the engineering of social relations (Lazzarato, 2011:45-46).

VI. CONCLUSION

The study represents the evolution of the concept of biopolitics and how the using of the concept changed over time. Moreover, the study focused on the modern understanding of the concept, which introduced by Foucault and developed by many Italian thinkers, mainly Hardt and Negri.

It can be said that since the analysis of biopolitics is mainly related to social practice and its relationship to the political and economic dimensions, then biopolitical analysis is not necessarily aimed at rejecting reality, but rather analyzing it and looking at the roots of its genesis to try to put forward new alternatives and ideas.

One of the main ideas explained in the study was the paradox of governance and freedom in liberal context, which lead to governmentality as an art of governing human beings by neoliberal policies.

The study went further to analyze the power relation in the Egyptian society by focusing on the idea of "the indebted societies" created by governmentality in neoliberalism context.

The study shows how many of the studies, which deal with neoliberalism from a critical perspective, show that it deepens the gap between classes and deepens inequity and inequality within society. Moreover, other studies indicate that it serves as a political agenda for the re-empowerment of economic elites. Despite their relevance, still there are a gap of analyzing the power relations and its political and social production that have already reshaped the subjects of individuals. On the other hand, biopolitical theorists using political economy approach focus on how neoliberalism produces a power that is vitally reformulating the concepts of labor and population. This creates a form of power relations within society placing biopower in its neoliberal context at the heart of social practice. Therefore, upcoming research agenda of biopolitical scholars have to put into consideration extending their studies to south countries, also involving interdisciplinary approaches in their methods especially political economy, political sociology and development studies.

REFERENCES

1. Abdel Fadel, M. (2011). *Crony capitalism, a study in social economy*. Cairo: Al Ain publisher.
2. Abu Saada, H. (2006). Resorting to Exceptional Courts to Escape Independent Judges, In: Abdel Fattah, N. (Ed.), *Judges and Political Reform*, Cairo: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, pp. 249-278.
3. Adly, A. (2016), Why neoliberal solution field in Egypt? In: Gamal, W. (Ed.), *Egyptian Economy in twenty first century*, Cairo: Al Maraya for Cultural production, pp. 38-57.
4. Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*, (K. Attell, Trans.), Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press ed.
5. Albaghdadi, A. (1977). *Abd-allatif Albaghdadi Diaries Vol. 1*. Cairo: The Modern Egyptian Office.
6. Al-Najjar, S. (1997). *Renewing the Political and Economic System in Egypt, Part one*, Cairo: Dar Al-Shorouk.
7. Al-Qalyubi, M. K. (2013). *My name is Mustafa Khamis* [documentary film].
8. Amin, G. (2012), *Story of Egyptian Economy*, Cairo: Dar El Shorouk.
9. Amin, S. (2003), *Obsolescent Capitalism: Contemporary Politics and Global Disorder*, Zed Books.
10. Barakat, A. (2018). *The Village and Power in Egypt in the Nineteenth Century*, Cairo: The Egyptian General Book Organization.
11. Boutang, Y. M. (2011). *Cognitive Capitalism* (E. Emery, Trans.) Cambridge: Polity Press.
12. Cotoi, C. (2011). Neoliberalism: A Foucauldian Perspective, *International Review of Social Research*, 1(2), 109-124.
13. Deleuze, G. (2006). *Foucault* (7th ed.). (S. Hand, Trans.) USA: The University of Minnesota Press.
14. Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia* (11th ed.). (B. Massumi, Trans.) USA: The University of Minnesota Press.
15. Elyachar, J. (2004). Striking for debt: Power, Finance, and governmentality in Egypt, *Anthropological Notebooks* 10, (1), 27-56.
16. Esposito, R. (2008), *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. (T. Campbell, Trans.), London: University of Minnesota Press.

Biopolitics and Development: Governmentality in Egypt
Ahmed Shendy Ibrahim

17. Farah, N. (2010). *The political economy of Egypt: the role of power relations in development*. (M. Kassem, Trans.) Cairo: The National Center for translation
18. Farouk, A. (2016). *The Strategic Pillars of Rebuilding the Egyptian State*, Cairo: The Egyptian General Book Organization.
19. Foucault, M. (1970). *Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. (R. Hurley, Trans.), New York: Pantheon Books.
20. Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: Volume one: An Introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.), New York: Pantheon Books.
21. Foucault, M. (2004). *The Birth of Biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. (M. Senellart, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
22. Foucault, M. (2008), *The Birth of Biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, (M. Senellart, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
23. Gamal, W. (2013). *Egyptian Economy in twenty first century*: Al Maraya for Cultural production.
24. Greber, D. (2019). *Debt: The First Five Thousand Years*, (Zaki A. Trans.) Cairo: National Center for Translation.
25. Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire (Fourth printing ed.)*, London: Harvard University Press.
26. Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
27. FIDH. (2010), International Federation for Human Rights, No. 534a.
28. Joseph, J. (2012). *The Social in the Global—Social Theory, Governmentality and Global Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Kandil, A. (2018). *Civil Associations in Egypt and the Years of Risk (2011-2017)*, Cairo: Available via Author website: <http://amanikandil.com/>.
30. Lazzarato, M. (2011). *The Making of the Indebted Man: An Essay on the Neoliberal Condition*, (David J. Trans.), Los Angeles, Semiotext, Distributed by the MIT Press.
31. Lemke, T. (2001). The birth of biopolitics; Michel Foucault at College de France on neo-liberal governmentality, *Economy and Society*, 30 (2), 190-207.
32. Lemke, T. (2011). *Biopolitics: An advanced introduction*. (E. F. Trump, Trans.) NY: New York University Press.
33. Naguib, M. (1984). *Mohamed Naguib Diaries: I was President of Egypt*. Cairo: The Modern Egyptian Office.

34. Parfitt, T. (2009). Are the Third World Poor Hominess Sacri? Biopolitics, Sovereignty, and Development. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 34(1), 41-58.
35. Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
36. Protevi, J. (2009). What does Foucault thinks is new about neoliberalism? *Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, 21(4), 1-33.
37. Rabinow P. & Rose N. (2006). Biopower Today. *BioSocieties*, 1, 195–217.
38. Read, Jason, (2009). A Genealogy of Homo-Economics: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity, *Foucault Studies*, No 6. pp.25-36.
39. Reid, J. (2013). Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of the Sustainable Development-Resilience Nexus. *International Political Sociology*, 7(4), 353–367.
40. Schmitt, Carl, (2005). *Political theology: four chapters on the concept of sovereignty* (Schwab, G. Trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
41. Soliman, S. (2011), *Strong Regime, Weak State: Fiscal Crisis and Political Change in Egypt under Mubarak*, California: Stanford University Press.
42. Sylvester, C. (2006). Bare Life as a Development/Postcolonial Problematic. *Geographical Journal*, 172(1), 66-77.
43. Tawfiq, H. (2010). *The Crisis of the Egyptian Political Regime: The Balance of Powers and the Dilemma of Legitimacy in Egypt: Consumption of the Balances of Power*, Doha: Al Jazeera Center for Studies.
44. Tom, C. (2011). Neoliberalism: A Foucauldian Perspective. *International Review of Social Research*, 1(2), 109-124.
45. Zamora, D., & Behrent, M. C. (Ed.) (2016). *Foucault and Neoliberalism*. UK: Polity press.