

Anastasia KRAVETS

National technical university, Dnipro, Ukraine

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2433-5836

kravets.anastasiya@gmail.com

## Globalization/Human Safety: A Biopolitical Approach

**Abstract:** Biopolitics focuses on the impact of globalization on the well-being of the individual and society as a whole. Accordingly, issues of human security and the threats posed by the process of globalization, as well as the transition from a disciplinary regime to a regime of governance at the global level, which, based on democratic values and liberal norms, are raised. That is why the problem of social justice and equality is solved. The issue of human safety within global governance should be emphasized. It is about a sense of security as a basic human need. Moreover, it is about the global security necessary for the survival and reproduction of humanity as a whole. As well as the study of potential socio-political consequences of the development of biotechnology and genetic engineering in the global dimension. This huge set of issues must be concretized, systematized, and logically structured through the analysis of the impact of globalization on the state of the individual, its relationship with the concept of bios; introduction at the international level of the doctrines of social justice, protection of human and civil rights at the global level; study of potential socio-political consequences of the development of biotechnology in the global dimension; introduction of new biopolitical models of power, governance and international relations; analysis of the theory of global evolution.

**Key words:** bios, biopolitics, biopower, globalization, human safety, biotechnologies

---

**W**e emphasize that the biopolitical view of globalization processes has certain features. At the same time, it should be emphasized that researchers, who are interested in this issue (A. Negri, R. Petman, M. Cage, S. Kostyuchkov, etc.), offer different views, different research emphases that does not contribute to the integrity of the understanding of the biopolitical interpretation of globalization. Sometimes their views are very controversial. Therefore, scientific knowledge about the biopolitical approach to the analysis of this crucial problem of today needs to be concretized, systematized, and further scientific developed.

At the same time, not one of the researchers writes about taking the entirety of human security and globalization. Human security should be a priority in national and international politics. The purpose of the article is to study the impact of globalization on human well-being and safety in the modern world.

### **Areas of analysis globalization/human safety**

We consider it expedient to highlight the following areas (features) in the analysis of this problem:

- 1) neoliberal globalization – bios – man. It analyzes how globalization affects the human condition, correlates with the concept of bios and makes the transition from “disciplinary regime” (industrial state) to “governance regime” (post-industrial state);
- 2) biopolitics – international values – liberal norms. We are talking about the implementation at the international level of the doctrines of social justice and human rights, which have contributed to the unification of people, the establishment of equality and freedom. It analyzes the values contained in modern theories of evolution, based on the dichotomy of nature/education/consciousness and will;
- 3) biopolitics – international relations – globalization. The attention of the international community should be focused on the creation and implementation of security ideas and practices within global governance. The main goal is to draw attention to the global health problem of the world’s population and to implement in international relations a norm that protects human security. The best way to achieve this goal is an approach that combines common and individual interests through a biopolitical perspective to better manage the population as a global mass and protect its most vulnerable;
- 4) biopolitics – a global evolutionary approach – technologies of controlled evolution. Within the framework of the global evolutionary methodology, biopolitics and biopower are analyzed with an emphasis on the potential consequences of the development of technologies of controlled evolution and their impact on humans. In this case, man is considered in the context of the development of three interdependent forms of the evolutionary process – biological, socio-cultural and technological;
- 5) biopolitics – globalization – personality. The perspective model of civil society and the role of the individual in the conditions of threats

and challenges of the modern globalized and internationalized world are analyzed;

- 6) biopolitics – bodies/borders (territoriality) – post-nationalism. In the era of globalization, the paradigm of identification of a body/person on the basis of national identity, based on the principle of “state-territory-people,” is replaced by a post-national paradigm: “Where a person has not identified the integration of power” (Vaiier, 2016);
- 7) biopolitics – theories of global evolution – the evolution of political reality. Evolution is seen as a global process that combines organic (biological) and cultural evolution. In this case, both directions of evolution are considered based on the principles of invariance, variability and transmission, which reveal the meaning of such a process as the evolution of political reality, in the context of reproduction of the phenomenon of politics and man as a political being.

### **Neoliberal globalization/bios/man**

The first feature is best revealed by the study of A. Negri. In the beginning, the scientist asks two key questions: 1) how is work organized in the conditions of neoliberal globalization and how is it enshrined in the bios? 2) when and how life itself enters the sphere of power and becomes a central issue? In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to rethink the current relationship of power, focusing on the person and his well-being. And this is possible due to the introduction into scientific circulation of new concepts: “bioenergy” and “biopolitics.” A. Negri offers a “fascinating rethinking of power,” which provides a “unique and provocative lens” through which to explore globalization in relation to the human condition. In this case, the central concept is “bioenergy biopolitics” (Negri, 2007).

A. Negri believes that the impetus for such changes was the emergence of world capital, which led to radical political, social and economic changes. A key factor in this process is the radical transformation of the production process through the development of information and communication technologies: “This contributes to the emergence of ‘intangible labor’ and ‘general intelligence’ as the dominant productive forces, as opposed to direct material production” (Negri, 2007).

What is innovative is that A. Negri views this process as subjective, so his theory has a poststructuralist trajectory. This subjectivity, through technical, cultural and linguistic knowledge, makes possible the existence

of a high-tech state: "Such subjectivity becomes a direct productive force, forming a new global potential for generalizing social knowledge, which is now a necessary condition for production" (Negri, 2007).

Subjectivity is the key feature of transformational change, when the focus is not on humanity as a global mass or society, but on the individual.

A. Negri is interested in the issue of transition from an industrial state to a post-industrial one, from a "disciplinary regime" to a "management regime." Following M. Foucault, A. Negri found that: "Biopolitics and biopower are not static, they change over history and demand productivity at the center of power" (Negri, 2007).

In fact, biopolitics and biopower imply a complete abandonment of the use of disciplinary techniques in all spheres of society, whether economics or politics.

The only remark that A. Negri makes about the biopolitical approach to globalization is that in biopolitics there is a tendency to reduce all intellectual research to a biological component, with complete disregard for the sphere of politics, which leads to the formation of a policy of "flesh and bones" can't be allowed (Negri, 2007).

We cannot completely agree with this statement, because today biopolitics operates with a huge array of purely political terms, which gives its own meaning. For example: political systems are transformed into biopolitical, and political leadership into biopolitical. The same applies to politics, which is evolving into biopolitics, and power, which acquires the features of biopower.

Instead, it is an apt opinion that the main specificity of M. Foucault's biopolitics is the relationship between power and life, which gives space "to obtain free subjectivity." This distinguishes biopolitics from such a direction as "vitalism," which is interested in life and death, aggression and individualism. A. Negri: "Biopolitics is 'not a return to the origins' but a way of re-immersing thought in nature: it is an attempt to build thinking depending on the way of life (individual or collective)" (Negri, 2007). And further: "Biopolitics is not a mystery with many vague relations, it, on the contrary, is involved in the relief of all political thought due to its subjectivity. The concept of biopolitics accompanies the transition to the postmodern when power relations are interrupted by the resistance of the subjects to whom they apply. It is the opposite of authoritarianism and any manifestation of power in the form of force" (Negri, 2007).

And further, the researcher raises a very important question about the choice and application of the correct research methodology. After all, bi-

opolitics is characterized by the application of an evolutionary approach to the study of political phenomena and processes. A. Negri proposes to use a genealogical approach, because it allows you to build an effective biopolitical discourse, which should be based on a series of “dispositive” of subjective origin: “Dispositive – a group of homogeneous practices and strategies that characterize the state of power in this epoch” (Negri, 2007).

At the same time, the scientist insists on distinguishing between such concepts as “control dispositive” and “normative dispositive.” This concept also characterizes the ambiguity in biopolitics: on the one hand, power controls life, on the other – life responds to power, for example, in the form of resistance. A. Negri: “When we talk about the dispositive, we mean a type of genealogical thinking, the development of which includes the movement of desires and reasoning. In this way, we make the power relations subjective, relatively the world, society, individual institutions, and individual practices” (Negri, 2007).

But if M. Foucault speaks of opposition to disciplinary power, then A. Negri considers biopolitics as opposition to capitalization and materialization of life. Biopolitics is a “contradictory context of life” for the researcher and, by definition, is an expansion of economic and political contradictions in the entire social structure and the emergence of points (nodes) of resistance that permeate it. A. Negri: “State power is never absolute, it only presents itself as absolute, but it will always consist of a complex set of relations that include resistance” (Negri, 2007).

This, in fact, explains the fact that dictatorships and totalitarian regimes are eternal. Thus, A. Negri, in our opinion, is a follower of the founder of the French biopolitical school M. Foucault, who also speaks of a new format of power and governance – biopolitics and biopower, which necessarily include opposition to the disciplinary authority.

### **Biopolitics/international values/liberal norms**

An interesting study of the relationship between biopolitics and international values is presented by R. Pettman in his report at the 11th Biopolitical Conference, held within the Congress of the International Association of Political Sciences on August 17, 1979: “Biopolitics and International Values: Exploring Liberal norms” (Pettman, 1981). He later published a fundamental work, *European Biopolitics and International*

Values, which deals with a scientific understanding of “modern” intellectual and moral values in the world politics. These include the doctrines of social justice and human rights, which have contributed to the unification of people, the establishment of equality and freedom. At the same time, human values are based on ideas about human nature, which are represented by fundamental biology. In particular, the values contained in modern theories of evolution, where we are talking, in particular about the dichotomy of nature and education, consciousness and will (Pettman, 1981), are analyzed.

We emphasize that M. Foucault and A. Negri study the resistance of biopower to disciplinary authority and disciplinary regime. While R. Pettman raises the issue of social justice in the global context through the introduction of modern intellectual and moral values in world politics. Issues of social justice at the global level are raised by other scholars interested in biopolitical issues, including M. Cage.

### **Biopolitics/international relation/globalization**

M. Cage explores the relationship between biopolitics and international relations in the context of globalization. She notes that today there are almost no works on the “health of the world’s population” that would fit into the discourse of international relations. Does she wonder why political and economic institutions have long ignored this question? In fact, one of the few studies is the work of D. Robert, which is devoted to reformulating the idea and practice of security within global governance. The goal is to implement a norm that protects human security. This issue is important for modern international relations because it concerns the issue of survival. According to M. Cage: “The best way to achieve this goal is an approach that combines common and individual interests through a biopolitical perspective because this is necessary in order to reformat regulatory institutions for better governance” (Cage, 2010).

M. Cage believes that global governance should aim to meet the basic physiological needs of the most vulnerable individuals in order to give them a chance to survive: “Universal human nature does not exist, just as there are no objective methods by which the above can be appreciated” (Cage, 2010). Accordingly, biopolitical reasoning is not based on a universal moral basis that enshrines the inviolability of human life, and does not take the position that “engineers of human

suffering” should be held legally responsible for their actions or omissions (Cage, 2010). However, according to the researcher, international norms should be developed to protect a large number of the poorest sections of the population: “All that needs to be done is to change the rules of conduct, the language of management, and technical redistribution of resources” (Cage, 2010).

Note that M. Cage, in contrast to, for example, A. Vlavianos-Arvanitis, who protects the bios as a whole, insists on protecting the poorest and most vulnerable around the world. According to the researcher: “Western democratic standards are not able to overcome the asymmetry of power, and therefore it is necessary that modern international relations put people at the head of the corner and for this, the first thing to do is to remove the institutional approach in political science, which is soulless” (Cage, 2010).

In general, the so-called “humanization” of politics is the leitmotif of almost every biopolitical study, regardless of the direction of research chosen by a particular scientist. The researcher notes that: “Endemic to Western culture is the view that security is achieved through growth” (Cage, 2010). This is true, but: “This growth is achieved through the forcible removal of man from the Earth. This situation can be overcome by the existence of autonomous, non-state, non-governmental capitalist means of subsistence, by eliminating the deficit of democracy that underlies the asymmetry of power and social inequality” (Cage, 2010). M. Cage says: “Politics in its democratic form came about because we had no choice, but there is a risk that we export alienation as a model of salvation, so we should not just feed the hungry, but allow them to earn a living and everything necessary for life, otherwise they will have to share responsibility for their plight” (Cage, 2010).

Once again, the focus is on human security, because the norms embodied at the international level are aimed primarily at protecting people and ensuring the survival of human society. In this case, it may be a useful biopolitical approach to international relations in the context of globalization.

Note that the need to change the format of existing international relations is analysed when considering such a phenomenon as biodiplomatics, which aims to integrate the international community around the conservation of biodiversity and education of the younger generation in the spirit of ethnic tolerance, respect for diversity of nations, languages, cultures and religions.

### **Biopolitics/global evolutionary approach/technologies of controlled evolution**

The fourth approach is represented by the publications of V. Cheshko and O. Kuz, which analyze the “co-evolution of scientific and technical developments of the High Hume class and socio-cultural/political context in the process of anthropo-socio-cultural genesis” (Cheshko, Kuz, 2016, p. 1). Researchers insist that in the process of technological evolution, which affected all spheres of human life, there were specific technologies of the High Hume class: “Which can equally be called technologies of controlled evolution” (Cheshko, Kuz 2016, p. 1). This fact determines the relevance of the concepts of biopower and biopolitics among political scientists, philosophers, sociologists, etc. Scientists not only integrated the phenomenon of biopower “into the general scheme of a stable evolutionary strategy of man-made civilization,” but also substantiated “the transformation of biopolitics into a major factor in the global evolution of self-organized human systems, including the biosphere as a whole” (Cheshko, Kuz, 2016, p. 1).

At the same time, V. Cheshko and O. Kuz note: “The triple spiral of biotechnology-bioeconomics-bioenergy as a material substance of the life of technological civilization is reflected in the ideal world as a triad of ticket-biosociology-biopolitics” (Cheshko, Kuz, 2016, p. 1).

The problem of technogenic evolution raises the problem of human security in the new global technogenic world, the problem of his self-perception. Researches suggest a future model of human organization – it is a self-organizing system, which are most consistent with the concept of biopolitics and biopower.

### **Biopolitics/globalization/personality**

The fifth approach is devoted to the biopolitical basis of the formation of civil society. Again, a study begins to study the impact of the biopolitical component on all spheres of society. S. Kostyuchkov: “Characteristics of a promising model of civilizational competence of the individual in view of the continuous change of living conditions and the presence of real threats-challenges of the globalized and internationalized world” (Kostyuchkov, 2015, p. 2).

The biopolitical basis of S. Kostyuchkov’s concept of civil society is connected with the thesis that: “Improvement of man, optimization of his position in society are possible provided it is adequate to certain human

intentions of society, for which the sovereign personality, the citizen is a basic element of the structure and a necessary condition for existence” (Kostiuchkov, 2015, p. 6). As S. Kostyuchkov notes: “The formation of an interdisciplinary biological-political direction is the result of the interaction of biological and social knowledge. The production of new educational concepts, strategies, paradigms is impossible without a deep understanding of human nature, without taking into account the complex processes of the relationship between man and the biosphere as global biosocial systems” (Kostiuchkov 2015, p. 7).

Let us emphasize once again the peculiarity of the biopolitical approach, which is characterized by attention to the individual and his well-being, as well as to raising issues of globalization threats and, consequently, human safety.

### **Biopolitics/territoriality/post-nationalism**

S. Vaiier also draws attention to the biopolitical problems associated with globalization in the context of the study of the refugee crisis. The researcher’s approach is interesting because he talks about the interaction of people (bodies) and borders in the postnational world. S. Vaiier: “The so-called refugee crisis in Europe is a crisis of borders... In the post-national world ... bodies do not cross borders, but borders cross bodies. The identification of bodies with territories, inherited from the national paradigm, has been partially destroyed by the post-national paradigm and the specific distribution of power” (Vaiier, 2016, p. 1).

Thus, according to the scientist: “It is studied how the crisis of refugees “and the persecution of people without permits by Europe determine new biopolitical realities” (Vaiier, 2016, p. 1).

In addition, according to S. Vaiier: “This crisis is analyzed as symptomatic on the way from biopolitics, which no longer relies on contempt due to visual stigmatization and phenotyping, but instead introduce control regimes based on the expansion of postnational border areas” (Vaiier, 2016, p. 1). The researcher concludes: “The so-called ‘refugee crisis’ is actually a ‘border crisis’ because the ‘refugee’ operates in the context of borders created by changing epistemological, ethical and biopolitical regimes of presence in the transition from nationalism to post-nationalism” (Vaiier, 2016, p. 1).

Indeed, globalization seems to erase the borders and boundaries between modern countries, contribute to the formation of posthuman, post-

industrial state and post-nationalism, but at the same time, we see a surge of national identity, including in Europe, which makes it impossible to implement basic biopolitical principles of freedom and transformations in the global dimension.

### **Biopolitics/global evolution/evolution of political reality**

One of the promising areas of research today is the consideration of the political process in the context of the theory of global evolution, which is represented by the works of D. Huxley, K. Lorenz, G. Wallmer, W. Callebaut. In particular, the latter explains the fundamental difference between the conceptual apparatus of biological evolutionism and the principles of global evolutionary theory as follows: “While the most important for Darwinism are the provisions on copying, hereditary genetic information, variability through mutations and gene recombination, differential reproduction, global evolutionary theory is characterized by more general but less specific principles of transmission, variability, selective storage and selection” (Callebaut, 1987, pp. 3–55).

### **Conclusion**

Thus, the analytical accents of the biopolitical interpretation of globalization are systematized, which is embodied in the following directions: 1) analysis of the impact of globalization on the state of the individual, its relationship with the concept of bios; 2) introduction at the international level of the doctrines of social justice, protection of each individual from any manifestations of intolerance; 3) implementation of security practices within global governance, protection of human and civil rights at the global level; 4) study of potential socio-political consequences of the development of biotechnology and genetic engineering in the global dimension; 5) introduction of new biopolitical models of power, governance and international relations; 6) analysis of the theory of global evolution, where evolution is seen as a global process that combines organic and cultural evolution.

Let us emphasize that the biopolitical view of the processes of globalization has certain peculiarities. Researchers offer different views, different research emphases, and sometimes their views are very conflicting.

At the same time, none of them directly writes about the relationship between human security and globalization.

The article examines the impact of globalization on the well-being and safety of people in the modern world. We are also talking about resistance to disciplinary power, through the introduction of a new format of power and management – biopolitics and biopower; social justice in a global context through the introduction of modern intellectual and moral values into world politics; technogenic evolution, which raises the issue of human security in the new global technogenic world; the future model of the organization of human society in the form of a self-organizing system. Let us emphasize once again the peculiarity of the biopolitical approach, which is characterized by attention to the person and his well-being, as well as to the posing of the issues of threats to globalization and, as a consequence, human security. And human security should be a priority in the national and international policy of the XXI century.

### Bibliography

- Cage M. (2010), *With or without you: Biopolitics and International Relations*, A review of Global governance and biopolitics, London.
- Callebaut W. (1987), *Evolutionary Epistemology Today: Converging Views from Philosophy, the Natural and the Social Sciences, Evolutionary Epistemology: A Multiparadigm Program*, Reidel publishing company, Dordrecht.
- Cheshko V., Kuz O., *Tehnologiya biopolitiki i biopolitika tehnologii (metafizicheskoe i politiko-antropologicheskoe esse)*, [http://repository.hneu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/23396/1/Cheshko\\_V.T.%2C\\_Kuz\\_O.M.\\_stattya\\_2.pdf](http://repository.hneu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/23396/1/Cheshko_V.T.%2C_Kuz_O.M._stattya_2.pdf), 27.05.2021.
- Human security in theory and practice* (2009), <https://www.unocha.org/sites/dms/HSU/Publications%20and%20Products/Human%20Security%20Tools/Human%20Security%20in%20Theory%20and%20Practice%20English.pdf>, 20.05.2021.
- Kostiuchkov S. (2015), *Biopolitychne pidgruntia filozofsko-osvitnoi kontseptsii v umovakh hromadianskoho suspilstva*, Ailant, Kherson.
- Negri A. (2007), *The Labor of the Multitude and the Fabric of Biopolitics*, “Mediations”, vol. 23, no. 2, <https://mediationsjournal.org/articles/the-labor-of-the-multitude-and-the-fabric-of-biopolitics>, 25.05.2021.
- Pettman R. (1981), *Biopolitics and international values. Investigating liberal norm*, Pergamon Press, New York.
- Vaiier S. (2016), *Kryza «bizhentsiv» ta post natsionalni prykordonni zony: doslidzhieuiuchi novi biopoltychni realii Yevropeiskoho soiuzu*, vol. 279, <http://litstudies.chdu.edu.ua/article/view/84092/79550>, 20.05.2021.

## Globalizacja/bezpieczeństwo człowieka: perspektywa biopolityczna

### Streszczenie

Biopolityka skupia się na wpływie globalizacji na dobrobyt jednostki i społeczeństwa jako całości. W związku z tym podniesiono zagadnienia związane z kategorią bezpieczeństwa człowieka, zagrożeniami stwarzanymi przez globalizację oraz transycją od reżimu dyscypliny do reżimu zarządzania w skali globalnej opartego na demokratycznych wartościach i liberalnych normach. Z tego powodu zajęto się także kwestią sprawiedliwości społecznej i równości. Podkreślenia wymaga jednak kategoria bezpieczeństwa człowieka w systemie globalnego zarządzania. Dotyczy ona bowiem poczucia bezpieczeństwa jako podstawowej potrzeby ludzi. Ponadto dotyczy także konieczności zagwarantowania bezpieczeństwa globalnego dla przetrwania i reprodukcji gatunku ludzkiego. W studium zawarto możliwe społeczno-ekonomiczne konsekwencje rozwoju biotechnologii i inżynierii genetycznej w skali światowej. Zarysowany, bardzo szeroki zbiór zagadnień, należy skonkretyzować, usystematyzować i logicznie ustrukturyzować na podstawie analizy wpływu globalizacji na kondycję jednostki, jej relacji do koncepcji *bios*; wprowadzenia doktryny sprawiedliwości społecznej na poziomie międzynarodowym, ochrony praw człowieka i obywatelskich w wymiarze globalnym; wprowadzenia nowych, biopolitycznych modeli władzy, rządzenia i relacji międzynarodowych; oraz teorii globalnej ewolucji.

**Słowa kluczowe:** bios, biopolityka, biowładza, globalizacja, bezpieczeństwo człowieka, biotechnologia