INCLUSIONS

Federico Chicchi
Università degli studi di Bologna

Antonio Tucci
Università degli studi di Salerno

The paradigm based on the conceptual dichotomy between inclusion and exclusion – which has affected the modern era of political and legal thought – is definitely ineffective in portraying assets and institutions as well as political and social forms that currently frame the neoliberal governmentality.

From the widely discussed assumption that sovereignty and governmentality are two modalities of government (though different, not alternative), it is necessary to re-think, or at least re-problematize, the conceptual couple of inclusion and exclusion, with a particular emphasis on the first of the two poles, around which would converge, with an inexhaustibility of both contradictions and ambivalences, the most relevant questions of philosophy and the social, political, and legal theory.

For instance, the whole tradition of rights, symbolically summarized in the Marshallian analysis, is based on the inclusiveness of citizenship which is inextricably bound to the spatial-geographical category of nation; a long process (emancipationist as well as progressive) of gradual recognition and extension of civil rights at first, then of political and social rights, within the undisputed framework of state sovereignty. This political-theological project was realized through powerful strategies of exclusion which are based on national belonging and outlined in terms of ethnic-racial, cultural, and gender identity.

The global emerging of figures and forms of subjectivation escapes the identity criterion of citizenship and designs alternative and exceeding perspectives and ways of living. Therefore, the adhesion of the model itself to reality is particularly complex.

The current scenario is, indeed, delineated by an extremely different logic which is, by its very definition, oriented towards inclusion. A tendency for the inclusion of everyone that, unlike the state model, is not founded and legitimized by exclusions. Although these exclusions are inevitably produced (often even as heterogenesis of ends) in the name of security, protection, and empowerment; the new flexible walls and the permeated boundaries ambivalently select – in all their physicality and hardness as well as symbolically – those who must be kept out and those who must be taken in, marking differences, otherness, inequalities and exclusions. In short, we are witnessing forms and modalities of selective and differential inclusion, or better yet, forms of "excluded inclusion" and perhaps softer, less bloody, and in any case non-definitive forms of selective inclusion.

In summary, this ambivalence creates differentiations and grades the levels of inclusion and marginalization; it is a weak normativity that confirms the Foucauldian lesson: this normativity rather than being based on expulsion or assimilation, it is made from on the transformation and adaptation of all the forms of life. Basically the norm normalizes, selects, and marginalizes without disdaining even violent forms of exclusion. Furthermore, in pursuing the goal of eliminating inequalities, overcoming or enhancing differences the rights mark limits as well as cultural and identity borders that are difficult to negotiate. This has a very high price both for those who are included and for those who live in the margins, but above all for those who are excluded because of being conceived as oversupply or even wastes.

From this perspective a well-known literature has questioned, starting from the centrality of the political and juridical categories of humanity and person, the limits of an alleged universalism that is inevitably translated into essentialist – and, therefore, inclusive and excluding – forms of identity through methods and strategies linked, in accordance to the contexts and theoretical frameworks in which they mature, to soft and hard conceptions of politics and law. Several studies, particularly on postcolonialism, have proceeded to attempt a deconstruction of this process within the objective universality, has been unveiled.

This all in the name of a humanity that, in fact, excludes a large part of individuals from the enjoyment of the same rights that are recognized to them: included, but often just formally.

What is particularly prominent in these discourses is that formal categories such as humanity and person are translated in fact – in the name of the ambivalence and overlapping of the logics we have mentioned above – into powerful devices of selection and

thus further exclusions. On the contrary, when all this escapes the softer ways of managing power, strong and repressive conceptions of power (walls, fortifications, border protection) are imposed, to mark the differences between inside and outside, to highlight the gap between normal and abnormal, in the name of security and protection. The limits, boundaries and barriers are defined in a precarious, unstable and porous way despite their rigid and impermeable stretches.

Recent governmental studies show a substantial deterritorialization of the modern security imaginary: a re-reading of the border, of the identity spaces as a discursive realms of protection and increase, which therefore does not only focus on repression but also refers to agency forms, perhaps ordered and normalized, for the sake of the porosity and flexibility of the geographical, political, cultural limit.

Ultimately we are dealing with government techniques that do not formally exclude anyone; they rather include selectively on the basis of compatibility with criteria that vary depending on the objectives for which the exercise of government is implemented.

This implies a reflection on the connotations that the agency takes, and hence on the placement and positioning of the subjects in relation to the plural incarnations and articulations of power and constructions within which individuals are placed and act. These are constructions which invent new forms or reproduce the old ones, giving them unusual connotations: citizenship, public space, border, etc.

Thus, a relational and procedural, hereby inclusive, approach is supported by the power that marks all the transfer and displacement from purely vertical-repressive and inclusive-excluding conceptions, towards forms of progressive immanency of the norm; even though these forms "transfigure" the institutions, the subjects and the places of law and politics, they maintain all the problems that derive from the neoliberal "promise" of the progressive and potential inclusion of all. On a theoretical level, this entails an inevitable rethinking of the techniques and practices of government, which find their definition intersected between disciplinary and governmental logics – as masterfully written by Deleuze in the "Postscript on the Societies of Control" – but there are still evident "impure" statements of sovereign powers. The dichotomous relationship between ruler and ruled is evidently shifting towards a connotation oriented to subjectivation and subjugation.

This issue of *Soft Power* essentially revolves around a question, as essential as it is open to plural and different answers and declensions: How can we reconsider the categories of political and legal philosophy, or of social sciences as a whole, that examine issues whose topic we are discussing here?

Regarding this, the contributions provided by the authors can be traced back to some fundamental core themes. An initial core theme puts the disciplinary and governmental devices into traction: In their essay Dardot and Laval show the relevance, in the neoliberal society, of inclusive type of public policies, without them ending up to threaten the overall coherence of its operating devices, (because of) fundamentally based on governmental techniques of individualization. Bazzicalupo, from his standing point and in continuity with the analysis of Dardot and Laval, highlights a tendency in neoliberal governmentality towards unlimited exclusivity which is regulated and made selective through the universal law of competition. However, both on the subjective level and on the level of complex political formations, we are witnessing the translation of the processes of inclusiveness into identity instances that produce new and unprecedented infra-governmental territorializations.

Through the undeniable awareness of a "triangulation" between sovereignty, discipline, biopower, as a criterion for reading the dynamics of contemporary power, Chignola analyzes, referring to Deleuze, the theme of control that is outlined in the double form of "biopolitics algorithms" and of the standardization; they capture forms of life at the service of capitalism by means of the selection and processing of big data and information packages, produced incessantly in and on the network by social activity.

The essay by Campesi, Donadio, Pannarale, Pupolizio, like those of Marceno and Barbara Henry, are placed within possible reformulations of the inclusive/excluding paradigm that focus attention on the forms of discrimination and ethnic/racial and gender oppression. The first essay starting from the empirical case of the reception system for asylum seekers in Italy shows how this paradigm is graduated from a maximum of exclusion to a maximum of inclusion, concluding that even the best reception practices have an irreducible ambivalence between reception and integration. In the essay by Barbara Henry, the concepts of self-mastery, intersubjectivity, asymmetry and recognition assume a fundamental role in the critique of the subversive dynamics inscribed in the binary logic and male/female dichotomy, on by which the discourses produced by patriarchal power are marked. The theme of resilience, which in Marcenò's essay works as a matrix of neoliberal processes of subjectivation, takes on a particular connotation when it is read in relation to the concept of empowerment. Whether it is women or people in poverty, empowerment needs the categories of vulnerability, security, and care in order to be brought into focus.

In order to discern the notion of inclusion, it is necessary a reference to the issue of the public space and political agency. By definition indeed, democracy performs itself as

a 'the' place of inclusion, even when, as in the Athenian experience itself, it's built on exclusion devices. Palano fits into the debate on the Western liberal democracy, assuming the idea of a cultural theory of democracy, which is able to reinstate conflict in the core of politics as a main criterion for a definition of democracy; repositioning in this way the excluded – "who has no-part" as Ranciere says – in the core of definition. Exploring the nexus between autonomy and citizenship as "constitutive elements of democracy", Lalatta Costerbosa provides an inclusive definition of democracy, supporting, in the wake of Arendt, a vision of the public space as a gradual contraction of the spaces of exclusion. Finally, Ana Hounie and Federico Chicchi suggest to set in tension and investigate the relationship between political and clinical space. The current practices of psycological intervention show us clearly how neoliberal practices of government operate, engaging the subject in a market-like logic, obeying to a principle we can call, quoting Lewkowicz: "de haber subjetivación o sujeto, entonces que haya lo máximo posible de eso". Therefore, according to the authors, rethinking the space of "the clinic" in connection with the space of "the politics" (and vice versa) can help open a new tension field of ethic construction for social bonds, able to face in a new way the present, increasingly porous and uncertain openings between social inclusion and exclusion.

The "Notas y Discusiones section" of this issue of *Soft Power* deals with the analysis of an important volume published by Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, in English for the Duke University Press (2014) and then in Italian for the Mulino (2014) entitled *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. The volume focuses on some core themes of the mentioned issue in an extremely original and meaningful way. In particular, the discussion is composed of three contributions that in different ways, even if mostly convergent, provide some important keys for interpreting the volume of Mezzadra and Neilson. The first contribution, proposed by Niccolò Cuppini and Margherita Grazioli, examines critically and analytically the volume structure, highlighting for each chapter the theoretical context and the contents within which it is constituted. In this sense, Cuppini and Grazioli interpret *Border as Method* as a huge and complex archive, within which "The density of the theoretic profiles sometimes becomes a vortex". One of the most interesting points of their analysis concerns the discussion around the concept of differential inclusion, a topic that occupies the second part of the volume and which, as the authors of the note underline, represents one of the most generative contributions of the book. Cuppini and Grazioli's study of the differential inclusion captures, in particular, the inhomogeneous temporality of the migrant condition and the convergent action of diverse differential exclusion regimes. It is a fundamental theme of

Border as Method which, on one hand, describes the way in which capitalism extends its influence on the social and productive world, intensifying and continually transforming the processes of exploitation, while at the same time emphasizing how that same plan is incessantly crossed by multiple and heterogeneous subjectivities whose conflictual action and struggle helps to guide the outcomes and organizational forms of capitalism. This latter theme is also at the center of the dense and stimulating point of discussion proposed by Adalgiso Amendola on the volume. The heart of his reflection appears to us as revolving around one of the concepts that support the theoretic definition of the border as a method: the axiomatics. The axiomatic is used here in Deleuzean sense by Mezzadra and Neilson to underline the peculiarity of the capitalistic field, which if today even though today on one hand it is made up of plastic limits whose characteristic is that of never closing within rigid symbolic codes or homogenizing synthesis, on the other hand it is constantly crossed by irreducible heterogeneities which are opposing them. In particular, Amendola focuses on the way in which the two authors use the concept of translation to give further substance to their method. The "translation, in their sense, does not want and cannot be a normative model to draw an ideal scheme of political organization. But this is a way of thinking through concatenations and assemblages, rather than equivalence and difference, which has the merit of not reducing to abstract questions to satisfy political subjectivities, but always to grasp them as 'subjects in transit' and in transformation". Consequently translating means "experimenting with a lingua franca" that allows to generate new connections between heterogeneity and to support unforeseen practices of institutionalization of connections. Thus it refers to the production of subjectivity on a battlefield, an open challenge where what will happen on a political level is not constituted ex-ante. Finally, Giorgio Grappi focuses on the third analysis of the suggested volume, particularly on the relationship between the dimensions of logistics and the profound transformations of spatiality in globalization. In other words, Grappi tries to verify how much and in what way the redetermination of borders can today influence the formation of new political spaces. In fact, the financialization of capital and the global transformations of production "have not only unbalanced the relationship between work, time, borders and production, but also encouraged the formation of heterogeneous political spaces". These changes in economic and social relations, which additionally characterize the extraction of value in contemporary capitalism, certainly establish new modes of spatial connection and temporal control, whose dimensions the volume of Mezzadra and Neilson contribute to define and understand it through its new configurations.