



## THE DEVELOPMENT DEVICE

Received: 09/04/2022

Accepted: 02/11/2023

Sandro Luiz Bazzanella<sup>1</sup>

Cintia Neves Godoi<sup>2</sup>

Jairo Marchesan<sup>3</sup>

### Resumo

O presente trabalho parte do conceito de dispositivo em Agambem, com as contribuições de Foucault, para a compreensão da lógica do desenvolvimento como processo ideológico que se organiza a partir da modernidade e chega à contemporaneidade. Para tanto, foram analisadas as propostas dos autores em questão, tanto sobre o conceito de dispositivo quanto sobre conceitos de biopolítica e dessubjetivação, para apoiar o entendimento do processo histórico de relações de poder e controle das sociedades, a partir do Estado, das instituições constitutivas da modernidade e de sua racionalidade política, econômica e jurídica, que incide sobre a forma-de-vida de indivíduos e populações. Como metodologia, o estudo se apresenta em análise qualitativa e reflexiva, com levantamento teórico-conceitual para o entendimento dos processos históricos e posterior comparação aos aspectos da contemporaneidade. Como resultados, se apresenta o entendimento de dispositivo como conceito, e o desenvolvimento compreendido como dispositivo constituído historicamente, mobilizando ideias, teorias, instituições e considerando que este se assenta na contemporaneidade como concepção ideológica neoliberal.

**Palavras-chave:** Dispositivo. Modernidade. Desenvolvimento. Forma-de-vida. População.

### Abstract

The present work starts from the concept of device in Agambem, with the contributions of Foucault, for the understanding of the logic of development as an ideological process that is organized from modernity and reaches contemporaneity. In order to do so, the proposals of the authors in question were analyzed, both on the concept of device and on concepts of biopolitics and desubjectivation, to support the understanding of the historical process of relations of power and control of societies, from the State, the constitutive institutions of modernity and its political, economic and legal rationality, which affects the way of life of individuals and populations. As a methodology, the study presents itself in a qualitative and reflective analysis, with a theoretical-conceptual survey for the understanding of historical processes and subsequent comparison to aspects of contemporaneity. As a result, the understanding of the device as a concept is presented, and the development understood as a device historically constituted, mobilizing ideas, theories, institutions and considering that it is based on contemporaneity as a neoliberal ideological conception.

**Keywords:** Device. Modernity. Development. Lifeform. Population.

1 PhD in Interdisciplinary Human Sciences (UFSC). Professor at the University of Contestado, Canoinhas – SC, Brazil. Email: [sandro@unc.br](mailto:sandro@unc.br)

2 PhD in Geography (UFG). Professor at the Alves Faria University Center, Goiânia – GO, Brazil. E-mail: [cintia.godoi@unialfa.com.br](mailto:cintia.godoi@unialfa.com.br)

3 PhD in Geography (UFSC). Professor at the University of Contestado, Canoinhas – SC, Brazil. Email: [jairo@unc.br](mailto:jairo@unc.br)

## Introduction

The development question about people, countries, regions or localities is a theme of modernity<sup>4</sup> in its social, political, economic and legal foundations. Considering events that were presented, especially in western Europe, among them, the demographic increase, the constitution of cities and urban life, the mobility of people and capital, through the development of new agricultural techniques, manufacturing production and, as a result of the increase in commerce, the circulation of money, formed the foundations of what after the bourgeois revolutions<sup>5</sup>, which began in the 16th century in England, became known as the “modern state”.

The modern State is constituted from the bourgeois demands for the institution of a social order, which would ensure the domain of private property<sup>6</sup>, the production and circulation of products and merchandise, the extraction of natural resources and the expropriation of socially produced wealth through labor exploitation intensifying surplus value. Under such assumptions, the State presents itself based on the interdependence of its powers, its institutions, as well as the fact that it holds the lawful use of violence, becoming the manager of natural resources and “human resources” under the assumptions of social liberal order. “The new ideology characterized men as essentially selfish,

---

4 The modernity concept used for reading, interpreting and analyzing the object in this paper has its contours defined chronologically from the 16th century to the mid-19th century, a period in which significant transformations took place in western Europe. Among them, we can mention: the great navigations and the contact with new lands and peoples; redefinitions in the European productive and economic dynamics, the birth of capitalism; scientific discoveries and technological advances in the most diverse areas; founding of modern state; political and cultural revolutions. All these events have epistemologically and ontologically marked Westernity, converging in what is conventionally called the modern project, whose main characteristics can be defined through the strengthening of a certain rationality, the exercise of subjective freedom as a condition for an autonomy and ethics exercise that permeates social relations, in the democratic rule of law, which seeks to guarantee the nation’s equal participation within the limits established by law, in guaranteeing access to private property, the basis of economic dynamics of production and consumption, and in the dissemination of culture, as a condition of exercise of reflexivity (BAZZANELLA, 2010, p. 78).

5 The great revolution of 1789-1848 was the triumph, not of “industry” as such, but of capitalist industry; not of liberty and equality in general, but of middle class or liberal “bourgeois” society; not of the “modern economy” or the “modern state”, but the economies and states in a given geographic region (part of Europe and some parts of North America), whose center was the rival and neighboring states Great Britain and France. The transformation of 1789-1848 is essentially the twin upheaval that took place in those two countries and which from there spread throughout the world. (...). It is equally relevant to note that they are, in this period, almost inconceivable in any other form than that of the triumph of bourgeois capitalism (HOBSBAWN, 1977, p. 16).

6 The grand and chief object, therefore, of uniting men in commonwealth, and placing themselves under government, is the preservation of property.” Chapter IX – From Purposes to Political Society and Government (LOCKE, 1973, p. 88).

cold, calculating, indolent individuals and, in a general way, independent from the society to which they belonged [...]. According to this philosophy, it was up to governments to exclusively assume functions that supported and encouraged profitable activities” (HUNT; SHERMAN, 1996, p. 69).

Under such assumptions, a state and governmental rationality was established capable of articulating a set of knowledge and practices in relation to the natural and human resources available to the State and, as a result of the bourgeois interests that gradually became hegemonic and controlling natural goods and humans exploitation. In this sense, political economy<sup>7</sup> is constituted, as a science capable of interpreting natural order phenomenals, as well as the behavior of individuals and human groups, necessary for States, but also for entrepreneurs and investors, for decisive and economic scenarios elaboration in decision making.

In the same direction, statistics<sup>8</sup> also starts to present itself as a State science, because it allows projections<sup>9</sup> on population dynamics on their birth rates, death rates, number of economically active, inactive, pensioners, among countless other variables. Statistics applied to population constitutes a new scientific field – demography. Modernity allows to develop technologies for interpreting individual and social phenomenal, taking the biological body from the population as an object of

---

7 [...] the expression “political economy”, you see it, between 1750 and 1810-1820, oscillate between different semantic poles. Now it is a question of aiming, through this expression, at a certain strict and limited analysis of the wealth production and circulation. Now by “political economy” is also understood, in a broader and more practical way, every method of government capable of ensuring the prosperity of a nation. And, finally, [the] political economy – by the way, it is the term that you see used by Rousseau in his famous entry “Political economy” of the Encyclopedia –, political economy is a kind of general reflection on the organization, distribution and limitation of powers in a society. Political economy, in my view, is fundamentally what made it possible to ensure the self-limitation of governmental reason (FOUCAULT, 2008a, p. 18-19).

8 [...], the wisdom that will be required of the one who governs is precisely this knowledge of things, of the objectives that can be reached, that one must do so that they can be achieved, the “disposition” that must be used to achieve them, it is this knowledge which will constitute the wisdom of the sovereign. [...] government apparatuses, [...] knowledge that developed since the end of the 16th century and which acquired its full amplitude in the 17th century, essentially this knowledge of the State in its different data, in its different dimensions, in the different factors of its power, and that was precisely what was called “statistics” as a science of the State (FOUCAULT, 2008b, p. 133-134).

9 La práctica totalidad de las técnicas que se explican en un libro introductorio de análisis de los datos (en concreto Sánchez Carrión, 1999) fueron inventadas o, cuando ya estaban inventadas, aplicadas a lo social e a lo largo de un período de tiempo inferior a un siglo. Cien años es el tiempo que transcurrió desde eu Quetelet (1835 aplicó la media, la desviación típica y la distribución normal (entonces denominadas error probable y curva de los errores) a datos de tipo sócio-demográfico, y el año en que se publicaron los libros de Fischer (1925, 1935, donde se mostraban el análisis dela varianza y los diseños experimentales. En este período se desarrollaron todas las técnicas básicas de la estadística, construidas sobre la base del recuento prévio de la población, que es uma actividad que se fue legitimando progressivamente como fuente de conocimiento, al margem de su papelpara reclutamiento de soldados o para la recogida de impuestos, a partir del trabajo de los llamados aritméticos políticos (siglo XVII) (CARRIÓN, 2000, p. 49)

state policy. It subjects the biological bodies from the individuals and the biological body from the population to use disciplinary and normalization techniques, to greater efficiency and effectiveness, demanded by the production and accumulation logic from the capital in that context.

This cosmovision was is constituted in modernity, through the aforementioned multiple events, but also from scientific, technological, productive and institutional advances, concomitantly putting in motion a set of knowledge and power techniques, which mobilized strategies that aimed efficiency and effectiveness in management of individuals and societies. In the core of these movements, but, above all, as justification discourses, legitimation and/or questioning of this worldview, and more specifically in the Marxism perspective, currents of thought, including Enlightenment, Liberalism, Positivism<sup>10</sup> and Darwinism, safeguarding the theoretical due, conceptual and also practical differences, they all bet in scientific progress, political and economic reason<sup>11</sup> in Western European societies.

The 19th century presents itself as the peak of the bourgeois bet on the reason, science and technology empire, on which the device of progress is based. All that was needed was to properly interpret the laws that determine human and social behavior and adjust them (or order them), based on techniques for disciplining and normalizing bodies, so that necessary conditions for human and people progress could be established. In this direction, in the political and economic plan, it was enough just to respect the laws of the market for the full nation and State progress.

The setbacks that devastated the liberal assumptions of the progress device in the first half of the 20th century, including the First World War (1914-1918), Russian Revolution (1917), the market crisis of free capitalism in 1929, and the World War II (1939-1945), generated a way of thinking dispute,

---

10 Thus, positivism and developmentalism are fruits (together with Marxism) of the great historical change identified by Hegel as the spirit of "Modernity", which symbolically inaugurates itself in the French Revolution, with the desacralization of divine right and the condemnation of kings to the guillotine. , an act that brings with it the assumption of the assumption of French citizens as subjects of history (FURTADO, 2000, p. 9 apud FONSECA, 2015, p. 27).

11 In the 1860s, a new word entered the world's economic and political vocabulary: "capitalism." (...) the most important work of the most formidable critic of capitalism, Karl Marx's Capital (1867), was published at this time. (...). It was the triumph of a society that believed that economic growth rested on the competition of free private enterprise, on the success of buying everything cheaply on the market (including labor) and selling it at a higher price. An economy thus founded, and therefore resting naturally on the solid foundations of a bourgeoisie composed of those whose energy, merit and intelligence raised them to such a position, would - it was believed - not only create a world of full material distribution but also of increasing enlightenment. , reason and human opportunity, for the advancement of science and the arts, in short, a world of continuous material and moral progress (HOBSBAWM, 2019, p. 21).

organizing, controlling and operationalizing States rationalities. From this crisis, an appropriation of planning elements to strengthen a capitalist-oriented ideology, and elements of social rights and the reduction of inequalities were incorporated, such as the development device. From the end of the 1940s of the 20th century an entire recipe for development achieving was propagated, especially among peripheral peoples, in the capital dynamic. Development was imposed as the ultimate goal to be achieved by peoples and countries. Unlike the device of progress, which was verified exclusively by the economic growth of the nation, the development device is now checked from dimensions (human, social, sustainable) and scales (local, regional, territorial).

This paper is a bibliographical research based on reflections on the concept of device present in texts by the French philosopher Michel Foucault and, above all, by the Italian philosopher and jurist Giorgio Agamben. In this direction, it is an invitation to think and question the logic of development as a device that permeates modernity and reaches contemporaneity, mobilizing ideas, theories and institutions as practical pretensions of human, social and sustainable development, which intends to consider the effective power of the development device in political and scientific productions of discourses and social anxieties that, facing the pretense of reaching the “promised land” as development of peoples, disregards the side effects, the contradictions, the paradoxes, if not the destruction of life and the world, in belief the scope of this manifest destiny – development.

### **Modern State, Rationality and Development**

First of all the concept of device be outlined, from which we will analyze development as a characteristic device of political, legal, economic, scientific and technical rationality, constitutive of modernity. Thus, the concept of device that is presented in this analyzes, comes from the philosopher and jurist Giorgio Agamben. In his text “What is a device” (2009), the aforementioned thinker considers, in the text’s initial argumentative movements, the importance of conceptual definitions for the adequate understanding and societal phenomena that we intend to understand. The philosopher argues that “Terminological questions are important in philosophy. As a philosopher for whom I have the greatest respect once said, terminology is the poetic moment of thought.”

The device concept in Agamben is related to device concept present in several moments of Foucault’s work. In this perspective, it is important to consider that Agamben, in his work “Homo

sacer: o Poder Soberano I” (2002), announces his intention to carry forward Michel Foucault and Hannah Arendt researches, starting from the observation that the aforementioned authors do not take the intensity of their analyzes to the last analytical consequences. This public positioning of the Italian thinker points his dialogical connection with Foucault and Arendt and, more specifically, the object under analysis in this paper with the French philosopher.

And it is precisely these difficulties that are probably due both to the fact that, in *The Human Condition*, the author curiously does not establish any connection with the penetrating analyzes that she had previously dedicated to totalitarian power (from which any and all biopolitical perspectives are absent), as for the circumstance, also unique, that Foucault never shifted his investigation to areas par excellence from modern biopolitics: the concentration camp and the structure of the great totalitarian states of the 19th century (AGAMBEN, 2002, p. 12)

Initially, Agamben highlights the importance that the devices concept assumes in Foucault’s work and, above all, investigates the constitutive trajectory of the concept articulated by the French philosopher, going back to his reading of the text “Introduction à La Philosophie de l’histoire de Hegel”, authored by Jean Hyppolite, professor and interlocutor of Foucault in the late 1950s and early 1960s of the 20th century, and who assumed significant ascendancy over Foucault’s thought. From that text, Agamben identifies the genesis on the concept of device articulated by Foucault in Hegel’s thought.

According to Agamben, in the interpretation of Hegel’s thought, Hyppolite notes that the term positivity is presented, from which Hegel draws attention to the historical condition in all its architecture of rules, institutions, rites, beliefs and values that are imposed on the individual, shaping their subjectivity. From certain perspectives, Foucault appropriates the Hegelian concept of positivity, as a comprehensive strategy from the ways in which individuals are circumscribed in historical context, from which power relations and modes of subjectivation are established.

If “positivity” is the name that, according to Hyppolite, the young Hegel gives to the historical element, with all its load of rules, rites and institutions imposed on individuals by an external power, but which becomes, so to speak, internalized in the systems of beliefs and feelings, then Foucault, borrowing this term (which will later become “device”), takes a position in relation to a decisive problem, which is also his most specific problem: the relationship between individuals as living beings and the historical element, understanding by this term the set of institutions, processes of subjectivation and rules in which power relations are concretized. Foucault’s ultimate aim, however, is not, as with Hegel, reconciling the two elements. And not even to emphasizing the conflict between these. For him, rather, it is about investigating the concrete ways in which positivities (or devices) act in relationships, mechanisms and power “games” (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 32-33).

Under such assumptions, device in Foucault is characterized as “an absolutely heterogeneous set that implies discourses, institutions, architectural structures, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions” (FOUCAULT, *Dits et écrits*, v. III, p. 299-300 apud AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 28). Therefore, device assumes, in Foucault, a strategic condition within the ambit of social, political and economic formations, within which power relations are constituted and articulated, shaping subjectivation processes.

Agamben considers the strategic importance of device articulated by Foucault in the interpretation and analysis of power relations and subjectivation processes as modernity characteristics, but deepens the genealogical investigation around the concept, with the aim of expanding its analytical spectrum in the context of relations between sovereign power, life and politics in the western, modern and contemporary tradition. In this sense, Agamben will locate it in the Christian theology of the first centuries, within the debates that involved theological *oikonomia*, in which the question of unity from holy trinity in the figures of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit was debated. The debate was divided into two segments: the monarchists, who defended the unity of God, seeking to get rid of any threat of polytheism, and the theologians, who sought to defend the principle of trinity based on two distinct and complementary arguments: the first argument was based on the logic that God, as Being, was unique and undivided; the second argument was based on the assumption that God, as an *oikonomia* – way of administering the world –, his work of creation would consist on three persons in a single person. In this way, “The term *oikonomia* was thus specialized to signify in a particular way the incarnation of the Son and the economy on redemption and salvation (for this reason, in some Gnostic sects, Christ ends up being called “the man of economy”, *ho anthrōpos tes oikonomias*)” (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 36-37).

It is on the debate of theological *oikonomia*, therefore, that the theologians involved will use the term “device” to signal the fracture that articulates God in his being and the divine praxis from which he governs the world. “The term apparatus designates that in which and through which a pure activity of government is carried out without any foundation in being. Therefore, devices must always involve a process of subjectivation, in other words, they must produce their subject” (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 38).

Contemporaneously Agamben also finds in Heidegger the use of device, especially on “The question of technique”, in which the term is used to designate the kind of relationship that man

establishes with the world, with nature placed at his disposal, as a condition of raw materials deposit, and as a consequence of the social and economic of full production and consumption mode, generating millions of waste tons currently underway. In this sense, the term device assumes the condition of an element inherent to Agamben's philosophical reflection and originality, which will be required as a condition of its contribution and analytical validity about the contradictions and paradoxes experienced in the contemporary subjectivation and desubjectivation processes.

Generalizing the already quite broad class of Foucauldian dispositifs, I will literally call dispositif anything that somehow has the capacity to capture, guide, determine, intercept, model, control and ensure the gestures, conduct, opinions and discourses of living beings. Not only, therefore, prisons, asylums, the Panopticon, schools, confession, factories, disciplines, juridical measures, etc., whose connection with power is in a certain sense evident, but also the pen, the writ, literature, philosophy, agriculture, cigarettes, navigation, computers, cell phones and – and why not – language itself, which is perhaps the oldest device, in which thousands and thousands of years a primate – probably without realizing the consequences that would follow – had the unconsciousness to allow himself to be captured (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 41).

From this device conception, Agamben announces the fact that we are inserted in societies demarcated by the economic, political and legal management of life. They are societies enlisted by the multiplication of institutional, technical, discursive, conceptual, economic and legal devices, which daily capture life, causing the proliferation, in an overwhelming way, of de-subjectivation processes that are difficult to compare with other moments from Western civilization. In this sense, the author states that:

It would probably not be wrong to define the extreme phase of capitalist development that we are experiencing as a gigantic accumulation and proliferation of devices. Certainly, since the appearance of homo sapiens there have been devices, but it would be said that today there is not a single moment in the lives of individuals that is not modeled, contaminated or controlled by some device. How, then, can we deal with this situation, what strategy should we follow in our daily melee with the devices? It is not simply a question of destroying them, nor, as some naive people suggest, of using them correctly (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 42).

The definition of device articulated by Agamben points out that, in the current societal conditions, it is verified that the myriad of devices that impose themselves on individuals imprison them in pre-established molds of desires and happiness, presented as ideal models of life in the countryside of individualized<sup>12</sup>, non-subjective societies. The power of devices resides in the

12 This terminology makes reference to the title of the book by the Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, entitled "The individualized society: lives told and stories lived" (2008). In this work, there is the following passage that



condition of individuals' impotence in face of the de-subjectivation procedures that contemporary society imposes on them, that is, if in modern societies<sup>13</sup>1010 the devices performed strategies of subjectivation, of conformation of subjects disciplined and normalized for a stable reproduction in the context from liberal societies of capitalist social relations of production, in contemporary societies of neoliberal conformation<sup>14</sup>11, in which capital submits work to situations of precariousness, if not abandonment, it is a question of considering the processes of desubjectivation promoted by the devices, to which they are subjected the subjects once reduced to mere individual producer and

---

characterizes the individualized societies in which we find ourselves inserted: "(...) the denial of public and collective vehicles of transcendence and the abandonment of the individual to a solitary struggle for which the majority of we don't have the necessary resources to run it alone. Political apathy and the colonization of public space with the intimacies of private life, the "fall of the public man" mentioned by Richard Sennett, the rapid disappearance of the old art of tying social ties and making them last, fear/desire schizophrenic of separation and being left alone (...), the burning passions that accompany the desperate search for communities and the fissiparity of those that are found; the undying demand for new and improved punitive regimes with which to torment the bodies of the scapegoats, united paradoxically with the cult of the body as "the last line of trenches" to be defended tooth and nail, and the source of an endless series of increasingly pleasurable sanctions to absorb and process stimuli on offer;" (BAUMAN, 2008, p. 13).

13 Even if it is not specifically the object of analysis in this paper, it is worth recognizing some differences between the progress device that manifested itself between the 18th and 19th centuries and the development device, which manifested itself throughout the 20th century and which continues to manifest itself in these first decades of the 21st century. The progress one is articulated in modernity around the belief in reason, in the advancement of science and techniques that, integrated into institutions such as the modern State, the school, the army, the hospital, the insane asylum, which put in place techniques for disciplining and normalizing ways of life in a horizon of meaning and purpose of reaching a scientifically evolved humanity, free from pain, hunger, misery and premature death. It was the manifestation of the scientific device of order and, necessarily, of progress. In turn, the development device appears, more specifically (considering that its first manifestations occur among the physiocrats, with Adam Smith, among other economists in the constitution of modern political economy) in the second half of the 20th century, especially in western capitalist societies, manifesting itself, on the one hand (and not in hierarchical order, but concomitantly), as a yearning for development on the part of peoples called underdeveloped, whose condition is determined by direct comparison in the institutional, scientific, technical and productive scope to which they are subjected their populations, with the so-called developed peoples. On the other hand, as a prescription (disseminated by the UN, the OECD, the G7, the G20, the Davos Forum and also imposed by the IMF) of political, legal and economic reforms to be followed by "underdeveloped" peoples, as a condition for achieving development. The development device marks the limits of the optimism characteristic of the utopia of progress, but maintaining that certain discursive and scientific optimism around the development of localities, regions, peoples and countries, even considering the political, economic and environmental limits in which the contemporary societies.

14 This terminology makes reference to the title of the book by the Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, entitled "The individualized society: lives told and stories lived" (2008). In this work, there is the following passage that characterizes the individualized societies in which we find ourselves inserted: "(...) the denial of public and collective vehicles of transcendence and the abandonment of the individual to a solitary struggle for which the majority of we don't have the necessary resources to run it alone. Political apathy and the colonization of public space with the intimacies of private life, the "fall of the public man" mentioned by Richard Sennett, the rapid disappearance of the old art of tying social ties and making them last, fear/desire schizophrenic of separation and being left alone [...], the burning passions that accompany the desperate search for communities and the fissiparity of those that are found; the undying demand for new and improved punitive regimes with which to torment the bodies of the scapegoats, united paradoxically with the cult of the body as "the last line of trenches" to be defended tooth and nail, and the source of an endless series of increasingly pleasurable sanctions to absorb and process stimuli on offer;" (BAUMAN, 2008, p. 13).

consumer, tied to the “Procrustean Bed”<sup>15</sup> of everyday debt.

What defines the devices with which we have to deal in the current phase of capitalism is that they no longer act so much through the production of a subject as through processes that we can call desubjectivation. A desubjective moment was certainly implicit in every process of subjectivation (...); but what happens now is that processes of subjectivation and processes of desubjectivation seem to become reciprocally indifferent and do not give rise to the recomposition of a new subject, except in a larval and, so to speak, spectral form. In the non-truth from the subject there is no longer any truth (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 47).

Agamben invites us to consider the desubjectively constitutive power of devices today. Institutions, norms, laws, theories, ideas, discourses, local and global ideologies capture individuals, removing them from the sphere of public debates and the possibility of establishing public agreements around the preservation of public space as an irreplaceable locus for recognition of their condition as a historically, socially and politically committed subject with the promotion of public interests. Every day, the infinity of devices in circulation throw individuals inside the individualized societies in which they live, in the discursive void of private interests and risks. Deprived from politics as a sphere of common action around the construction of political utopias for a common world, it remains for the desubjectified individual to accept the neoliberal suggestion of trying to become an entrepreneur, transforming himself into an entrepreneur of himself, of constituting at most a thinking about social rights linked to international agendas, seeing their social movements captured and institutionalized, accompanying debates on social rights, and collectivity, linked to efforts of a possible left, and to demand a minimal State in relation to the regulation of market economy dynamics and a maximum State in relation to the security of contracts and public security services.

Contemporary societies thus present themselves as inert bodies traversed by gigantic processes of de-subjectivation that do not correspond to any real subjectivation.

---

15 “[...], Procrustes, son of Poseidon – in Greek mythology he was considered the god of the sea – was one of the darkest and most hideous characters known in Greek mythology. He lived in the Eleusinian hills near Attica. To attract travelers who passed on the road near his home, Procruste behaved hospitably, offering them a good meal and a comfortable bed to rest. After the guest slept, Procruste tied him to his iron bed and gagged him. If the guest was bigger than the bed, Procruste cut off his legs so that he could be the same size as the bed. In case the guest was smaller than the bed, he would stretch it to make it the same size. In either situation, his victims always died. Procrustes had two beds, neatly constructed in different sizes so that no one could fit perfectly in them. He took great pleasure in offering the bed that was not suitable for the size of his guests. Larger guests were directed to the smaller bed, while smaller guests were offered the larger bed.” Available at: <https://www.culturaerealidade.com.br/arquivo/www.culturaerealidade.com.br/noticia/o-leito-de-procusto-6273.html>.

Hence the eclipse of politics, which presupposed real subjects and identities (the labor movement, the bourgeoisie, etc.), and the triumph of oikonomia, that is, of a pure activity of government that aims only at its own reproduction. Right and left, which alternate today in the management of power, therefore have very little to do with the political context from which the terms come and simply name the two poles – the one that unscrupulously bets on de-subjection and the other one that would like, at the same time, to on the contrary, of covering it with the hypocritical mask of the good democratic citizen – from the same governmental machine (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 49).

The extensive network of devices that multiplies on a daily basis and imposes itself, establishing the necessary way of life for each individual within the individualized society, finds itself in this context, according to Agamben, facing an uncomfortable paradox. On the one hand, the most distinct societies integrated by the capture and control devices from individualized forms of life reached a degree of immobility, social apathy, violent control of possible insurgencies and conformity with precarious imperatives, established by the logic of capital by middle on the debt economy, that there is no longer room for political actions with continuity and for any utopia proposal. In another direction, however, there are manifestations of a violence explosion, exercised by individuals without a consistent cause, as well as the proliferation of human refuse scattered through the streets of the city and of refugees, desperately seeking to enter the territories of developed countries. In this direction, the philosopher argues:

From here, above all, the singular restlessness of power exactly at the moment when it finds itself facing the most docile and fragile social body ever constituted in the history of humanity. It is only an apparent paradox that the innocuous citizen of post-industrial democracies (Bloom, as it has been effectively suggested to be called), who punctually carries out everything he is told and lets his everyday gestures, such as his health, the his entertainment, his occupations, his food and his desires are commanded and controlled by devices down to the smallest detail, he is considered by power – perhaps precisely for this reason – as a virtual terrorist (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 49).

It is in this context that the development as a device is presented in all its effectiveness, as one of the countless devices that justify the corporate order established by the ongoing oikonomic, administrative, legal and governmental machine. It is a polysemic disposition, with ideological and operational spatial characteristics and, by extension, mobilizer of ideas, institutions, non-governmental organizations and individuals on several fronts, with proposals for local, regional, territorial, human, social, global and sustainable. Likewise, it is a device that gives sustainability

to the governmental machine, which operates on the administrative management on the bodies of individuals and the population, on the deep emptiness of the oikonomic machine that submits the world and life in its totality and multiplicity, to forms for the surplus value extraction and the expropriation of life and socially produced wealth.

Henceforth, under development device logic, it is up to the region or territory (the choice of geographical specialty of the concept can be left to the taste of the researcher) to find its vocation, identify its potentialities, economically exploit the peculiarities, transforming everything into merchandise, whether they historical heritage, human resources or natural resources, promoting local, regional and/or territorial development. Perhaps one could even consider that at the end of history was not linked to the fall of Soviet socialism, but rather to the rise of the ideological development device as a totalitarian strategy for governing individuals and the population.

### **The development device<sup>16</sup>**

The development device is linked to the relationship established between sovereign power, politics and life, in other words, the development device is inserted in the context of nationalization of individuals bodies and the population, a phenomenon that occurs specifically on modernity and that is analyzed by Foucault under the concept of biopolitics. In this direction Foucault states in the first volume of the work "History of Sexuality: the will to know I" (1988) that "Man, for millennia, remained what he was for Aristotle: a living animal and, moreover, capable of political existence; modern man is an animal, in whose politics his life as a living being is in question" (FOUCAULT, 1988, p. 134).

Foucault, intends to demonstrate that modernity is the stage for profound changes in the exercise of power forms and, concomitantly in knowledge forms, which has as its epicenter the nationalization of individuals biological life and the population. In this perspective, we find in Hobbes arguments that mark the change of focus in relation to the exercise of sovereign power, which in the past, in absolutist states context, was characterized by the right to kill or let live, to a

---

16 Among other aspects related to the development device, already highlighted in previous passages of the paper, it is also a question of considering that, unlike the progress device, which was verified exclusively by the economic growth of the nation, the development device is verified from dimensions that make the concept more fluid, varying according to economic, political and social demands and discourses in human, social, sustainable, for example, and scales (local, regional, territorial). This variable condition allows capturing ideas, ideologies, social desires, among other aspects, making fluidity an element that conditions plasticity, guaranteeing its permanence in different historical periods.

sovereign power, which in the context of constitutional states, makes live and lets die, that is, the preservation of life becomes part of the calculations of sovereignty exercise. In this sense, argues Hobbes in chapter XXXVIII entitled “On the meaning of eternal life, hell, salvation, the world to come and redemption in the Scriptures”, contained in his work “Leviathan or matter, form and power of an ecclesiastical and civil state”:

The preservation of civil society depends on justice, and that justice depends on the power of life and death, as well as other lesser rewards and punishments, which belong to the holders of state sovereignty, it is impossible for a state to subsist if any other, other than the sovereign, has the power to give rewards greater than life, or to apply punishments greater than death (HOBBS, 2004, p. 325).

To Foucault, this change in the assumptions of the sovereign power exercise in which “It can be said that the old right to cause death or let live has been replaced by a power to cause life or return to death” (FOUCAULT, 1988, p. 130), is part of the apprehension of the biological individual life and population in calculations of the modern State that holds the monopoly of violence (Weber) in the exercise of sovereign power. The change in the techniques for exercising sovereign power requires the reformulation of legal principles that affect the old excessively punitive procedures of Ancien Régime. Thus, the Habeas corpus appeal is created, the inquiry is instituted as a procedural element, during which the principle of innocence presumption is observed, the course of process and, at the end with the final and unappealable decision, the definition of penalty to be carried out (in most states) in institutions (prisons and/or penitentiaries) created with the aim of preserving the life of the convict, as well as “re-socializing” him and returning him to social and productive participation<sup>17</sup>14. In the development modernity, a set of knowledge strategies that affect the bodies of individuals and, by extension, the population.

Concretely, this power over life developed from the 17th century onwards, in two main ways; which are not antithetical and constitute, on the contrary, two poles of development interconnected by an entire intermediary flow of relationships. One of the poles, the first to be formed, it seems, centered on the body as a machine: on its training, extension of its aptitudes, extortion of its forces, parallel growth

17 “The extreme point of penal justice under the Ancien Régime was the endless shredding of the regicide’s body: a manifestation of the strongest power over the body of greatest criminal, whose total destruction makes crime shine forth in its truth. The ideal point of the penalty today would be infinite discipline: an interrogation without end, an inquiry that extends without limit in a meticulous and increasingly analytical observation, a judgment that is at the same time the constitution of a never-ending process, calculated softening of a penalty linked to the relentless curiosity of an examination, a procedure that is at the same time the permanent measure of a deviation from an inaccessible norm and the asymptotic movement that works to find it in the infinite” (FOUCAULT, 2014, p. 218).

of its usefulness and docility, on its integration in effective and medical control systems – all this ensured by procedures that characterize the disciplines: human body anatomy and politics. The second, which was formed a little later, around the middle of the 18th century, focused on the species-body, on the body permeated by the mechanics of the living being and as a support for biological processes: external, births and mortality, the level of health, duration of life, longevity, with all the conditions that can make them vary; such processes are assumed through a whole series of interventions and regulatory controls: a biopolitics of the population (FOUCAULT, 1988, p. 131).

From such perspectives, Foucault demonstrates how biological life<sup>18</sup> becomes part of the strategies and calculations of sovereign power of disciplining bodies, in their individualizing movements, as well as controlling the biological body of population, understood and managed as a productive human resource to sovereign power disposition, determinant in conformation of economic, political and juridical structures of the bourgeois liberal societies controlled by the dynamic force of capital. Under these conditions, a reason of State called governmentality by Foucault is established, whose characteristics “Society, economy, population, security, freedom: these are the elements of new governmentality, whose forms, it seems to me, we are still familiar with in their contemporary modifications” (FOUCAULT, 2008b, p. 476). Or, as later argued by the French philosopher,

[...] the new governmentality [...], will have to refer to a domain of naturalness that is the economy. You will have to manage populations. It will also have to organize a legal system that respects freedoms. It will finally have to equip itself with a direct but negative instrument of intervention, which will be the police. Economic practice, population management, public right articulated in respect for liberty and liberties, a police force with a repressive function (FOUCAULT, 2008b, p. 476).

---

18 It is enlightening the contribution of the researcher Iván Andrés Torres Apablaza in his article Genealogy and actuality of biopolitics in contemporary philosophical thought (2017, p. 145). “Para Foucault, los primeros objetos de esta biopolítica no serán sino decisiones acerca de las condiciones de vida de un conjunto de vivientes: la mortalidad, la natalidad o las condiciones sanitarias al interior de la ciudad. Por ello, será preciso conocer la vida y sus procesos. La serie de investigaciones anteriores a *Il faut défendre la société*, le permitirán advertir que el fenómeno biopolítico no es sino el resultado de una progresiva “estatización de lo biológico”, a propósito de la emergencia, desde el siglo XXII, de un conjunto de saberes y tecnologías microfísicas acerca del comportamiento de los individuos. Sin embargo, se trata de saberes orientados a la normalización y maximización de las fuerzas corporales, aquello que el mismo año en *La volonté de savoir* nombrará como anatomopolíticas. En cambio, la biopolítica hará de la estadística, la demografía y la epidemiología los modos de saber fundamentales con los cuales podrá controlar y anticipar decisiones acerca de las condiciones de vida de una multiplicidad de vivientes: ya no la vida del cuerpo-individuo, sino aquella de la especie. En el curso *Sécurité, territoire, population*, Foucault aclarará que esta multiplicidad es la población. Junto a la biopolítica – explica, la historia moderna verá nacer a un nuevo sujeto, un nuevo “ser viviente” compuesto de procesos colectivos que será necesario conocer, regular, incitar, limitar, administrar, en suma, “intervenir en el nivel de las determinaciones de esos fenómenos generales”, para asegurar su regularización. Este “nuevo ser viviente” es de una naturaleza muy singular, puesto que, de un lado, tiene la textualidad de la especie humana, y del otro, lo que desde el siglo XXVIII se denomina como público. Es decir, la población considerada desde el punto de vista de sus opiniones, comportamientos, hábitos, temores y exigencias: “la población es todo lo que va a extenderse desde el arraigo biológico expresado en la especie, hasta la superficie de agarre presentada por el público”. Bajo el primado de la biopolítica, la vida pierde así la cualidad de fenómeno natural u originario, para emerger como objeto de calculabilidad y gestión política.”

Continuing the investigations around the biopolitical phenomena presented by Foucault, but distancing himself from them with regard to the manifestation of biopolitics, Agamben argues that all politics has always been biopolitics, that is, the moment an animal unwittingly allowed itself to be captured by the device of language<sup>19</sup>16 and was included in the sphere of the human (and, by reverse, excluded from its animality), entering the polis its life was captured by the sovereign power. “[...] the devices are not an accident that men fell into by chance, but have their roots in the same process of “hominization” that made “human” the animals that we classify under the rubric homo sapiens” (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 43). Biopolitics demarcates, since its inception, the relationship between sovereign power, politics and life. Under such prerogatives, according to Agamben,

[...] what characterizes modern politics is not so much the inclusion of the zoe in the polis, in itself very ancient, nor simply the fact that life as such comes to be an eminent object of the calculations and predictions of state power; decisive is, above all, the fact that, side by side with the process by which the exception everywhere becomes the rule, the space of bare life, originally situated on the margins of the order, progressively comes to coincide with the political space. , exclusion and inclusion, external and internal, bios and zoe, law and fact enter a zone of irreducible indistinction (AGAMBEN, 2002, p. 16).

Agamben argues that biopolitics demarcates the fullness of political, administrative and legal management of biological individuals life and the population by sovereign power. “Agamben makes an epistemic incursion into law and politics through the lens of human life. [...] tries to capture (and it captures (and it captures)) a very little perceived tension by which western law and politics exist in a way correlated with the capture of human life” (RUIZ, 2012, p. 4).

The management of human life in its biology, by the sovereign power, requires the production of a split in the conception of life<sup>20</sup>17. It is, above all, about submitting life in its qualitative dimension, arising, above all, from the common (political) action that constitutes the public space as the locus par excellence of human dignity recognition and human power constitutive of the most distinct forms-of -life in mere bare life, deprived of action, its political rights and, above all, sharing in a politically debated, promoted and preserved world. “3. The political power we know is always based, on the

19 “[...] language itself, which is perhaps the oldest of devices, in which thousands of years ago a primate – probably without realizing the consequences that would follow – had the unconsciousness of allowing himself to be captured” (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 41).

20 The Greeks did not have a single term to express what we mean by the word life. They used two terms, semantically and morphologically distinct, although related to a common etymon: zoé, which expressed the simple fact of living common to all living beings (animals, men and gods) and bíos, which indicated the form or way of living proper to an individual or a group (AGAMBEN, 2002, p. 9).

contrary, in the last instance, on the separation of a sphere of bare life from the context of forms of life” (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 14).

Under such assumptions, Agamben’s analysis unveils the *modus operandi* of sovereign power, demonstrating that its action is constituted in an eternal movement of inclusion and exclusion of life within the polis. By including it, it submits it to the condition of a human resource necessary for the reproduction of material and immaterial conditions that justify the very condition of power and, consequently, excludes it from its potential condition, denying it the possibility of constituting forms-of-power. -life that transcend the biological reducibility from which it is administered. It is in this direction that one can sufficiently understand Agamben’s argument that “Life appears, thus, originally in law, only as a contrary part of a power that threatens death” (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 15).

The manageability of human resources (individuals and population) available to the State, capital and market is exercised by the sovereign power from the maintenance of the permanent state of exception. The state of exception device is the tacit expression of the constitutive and operational paradox of sovereign power in the form of “inclusion and exclusion”. The inclusion of human life in the city-community implies, on the part of the sovereign power, recognizing guarantees and rights and, at the same time, the possibility, according to the calculations of costs and benefits by the sovereign, of suspending rights and guarantees exposing human life to bare life condition, devoid of rights and, therefore, at the mercy of the interests and administrative procedures of the sovereign power. “The state of exception is, in this sense, the opening of a space in which application and norm show their separation and in which a pure force of law realizes (that is, applies by disapplying) a norm whose application has been suspended” (AGAMBEN, 2004 , p. 63). Or,

The state of exception is not a dictatorship (constitutional or unconstitutional) but an empty space of law, a zone of anomie in which all legal determinations – and, above all, the very distinction between public and private – are disabled. [...]. 2. This empty space of law seems to be, in some respects, so essential to the legal order that it must seek, by all means, to ensure a relationship with it, as if, in order to be founded, it must necessarily maintain itself in relation to it with an anomie (AGAMBEN, 2004, p. 78-79).

For Agamben, the constant production of bare life is the uncontested expression of the uninterrupted state of exception in which we find ourselves inserted on modernity and



contemporaneity. “Life, in the state of exception made normal, bare life that separates forms of life from their cohesion in a form-of-life in all areas” (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 16). Agamben clarifies that bare life cannot be confused with animal life, as it presents itself as a mere biological life, excluded from human interaction, ensured by those who have access to rights. It is a life exposed to violence and death, even if paradoxically and ideally full of rights based on universal declarations of universal human rights, international protocols and constitutional charters, however, concretely and daily devoid of any and all rights, especially the right of survival.

It is under such biopolitical assumptions<sup>21</sup>18 that Agamben claims that the paradigm of modern and contemporary Western societies is the concentration camp. The concentration camp<sup>22</sup>19 was the space in which the state of exception and the production of bare life at the mercy of the sovereign power’s manageability was fully realized. “Auschwitz” [...] is the ever-living proof, so to speak, that the *nomos* (the law, the norm) of contemporary political space – therefore, not only of the specific political space of the Nazi regime – is no longer the beauty (and idealized) construction of common city (*polis*), but the concentration camp [...]” (AGAMBEN, 2008, p. 9).

From the Agambenian perspective, the contemporary forms of life are reduced to the condition of bare life, subjected to the exclusively biological reducibility of their condition, which allows the individuals and populations lives to be the object of economic imperatives and sovereign power politicians. In this context, what we currently call politics is presented as a mere technique of governing biological life, and has its other constitutive pole in thanatopolitics. It constantly produces “bare life”, systematically includes and excludes, incorporates and abandons thousands of superfluous and undesirable lives, and the superfluous and undesirable can vary according to geopolitical, economic and other interests and circumstances.

Under these assumptions, Agamben places us in front of the foundations of the economic and political governmental machine in full operation in contemporary times, and which has in the

---

21 “[...] com la biopolítica, es la existencia misma la que se vuelve objeto del poder, desde el momento en que se cuenta con las posibilidades técnicas y políticas de hacer proliferar y fabricar lo vivo y no tan solo protegerlo, maximizarlo o regularizarlo” (APABLAZA, 2019, p. 146).

22 “For Agamben, the totalitarian experience revealed the authoritarian trait that makes up modern democracies, an indelible mark of contemporary states, and the establishment of scientifically based management of life and death as a central technique of sovereign power, which took place in World War II. World Cup, would no longer retreat (BARSALINI; RAMIRO, 2020, p. 389)

development device one of its main operators. At the epicenter of this machine is the political void that resides in the hegemony of economy in the present time. The economy has become an end in itself, a transcendent power that governs, from an intricate juridical and bureaucratic apparatus, the life and death of human beings and things.

The governmental and economic machine, in full operation from its devices nowadays, operates in the emptiness of its foundation, capturing and restricting any and all possibilities of vital manifestations beyond the biopolitical scope. Articulating around techniques of surveillance and control, what is at stake is the atomization of individuals who are privatized in themselves and fully controlled in the dynamics of production and consumption of their biological lives.

Within the sovereign and biopolitical administrative logic in which communities, peoples and countries are inserted, there are constant suggestions that there would be nothing else to do, think or propose, surviving, in this context, only the development device. Its effectiveness resides exactly in the suggestion that, observing the neoliberal prescription of guarantees to the freedom of markets and to conditions of execution of the contracts, of labor reduction charges and withdrawals of state regulations of the economy and public services, “everyone” can reach the development.

This attempt brings together, according to different modalities and horizons, left and right, capitalist countries and socialist countries, united in the project – ultimately useless, however, which was partially realized in all industrialized countries – of producing a single and indivisible people. The obsession with development is so effective in our time because it coincides with the biopolitical project of producing a people without fractures (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 39).

From such perspectives, the effectiveness of the development device resides in its ability to produce discourses and ideologies that mobilize individuals, researchers, public and private institutions from a myriad of possibilities, if not promises, of human, social, environmental, economic development and sustainable. Even more, it is necessary to recognize the subtlety with which the development device constantly produces and feeds its own utopia, altering the scales of its realization.

This means that, if the global imperatives of the financialized economy undermined the possibilities of achieving national development (dreams and efforts of the underdeveloped countries of the 20th century), then the utopia of development can manifest itself at local, regional or even

territorial level. For utopia to materialize in these space-time dimensions, it is enough to improve the biopolitical management of territory's resources and of populations quantifiable by the most diverse indices, such as the GDP<sup>23</sup>20, the HDI<sup>24</sup>21, the HDIM<sup>25</sup>22 and the GINI Index<sup>26</sup>23, among others. "Only because in our time politics has become integrally biopolitical, it could constitute itself in a previously unknown proportion as totalitarian politics" (AGAMBEN, 2002, p. 126).

The development device refers to the utopian form of the ongoing biopolitical paradigm, marked by the uninterrupted production of de-subjectivation devices and, as a result of the nihilism of politics and the failure of public space, which implies recognizing by reverse "that it is a model with high political intervention" (ARAYA, 2014, p. 521). "And in a different, but analogous way, today the democratic-capitalist project of eliminating, through development, the poor classes not only reproduces in its interior the people of excluded, but transforms all populations of the Third World into bare life" (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 40).

The elimination of population to control bodies takes place with social, academic, business and institutional support, which produces and reproduces instruments and discourses for development, feeding databases and indicators, making uses for decision-making, for political action or inaction, supporting the capture of social movements, the discourses of entrepreneurship, among other ways to encourage de-subjectivation and induction to dynamics of engagement in the development device.

## Final Considerations

The analytical contributions of Foucault and Agamben, based on the concept of biopolitics as a modern phenomenon, from the perspective of the French philosopher, or even from the perspective of Agamben, as an original phenomenon, marked by the violence of device, of language that, by capturing

---

23 Gross Domestic Product – It is one of the most used indicators in the world economy. It represents the sum total of all goods and services produced by a given region, country or world in a given period.

24 The Human Development Index was created in 1990 by Pakistani economist Mahbud ul Haq, with the support and collaboration of Indian economist Amartya Sen. This index is composed of information on income, education and health.

25 The Municipal Human Development Index is a methodology adopted by Brazil since 2013, based on the UN/HDI. This methodology was adapted to Brazilian municipalities and, in addition to income, health/longevity and education indices, it comprises more than 200 municipal indicators.

26 Created by the Italian mathematician, statistician and demographer Conrado Gini (1884-1965), it is a methodology for measuring the inequality of a given distribution or concentration of income in a given group.

the human animal, it inserts him in the movement of inclusion/exclusion of homo sapiens, in the sphere of the polis (of the city-community), and allows us to verify and, above all, to put into debate the centrality of the development device in modernity and in the present.

Agamben demonstrates the centrality of devices in the affirmation of a societal order, capturing and shaping subjectivities able to accept and share the assumptions of a particular worldview that appears to be hegemonic in a given context. It is, in this case, the devices that shaped the worker, the boss, the teacher, the professor, the mechanic, the housewife, the house owner, the street dwellers and others. All subjects, subject, each in their own inserted way, based on disciplinary and normalizing biopolitical assumptions, in a way of being and acting in the reproducibility of the hegemonic production forces. In this context, we find, above all, the “national development” device, which demanded active and productive subjects as a sine qua non condition for national development.

Agamben, however, also demonstrates that the massive proliferation of devices today is closely linked to processes of de-subjectivation. Neoliberal imperatives, articulated to dynamics of a financialized economy at the global and local levels, require the formation of individualized societies and individuals viscerally committed to the dynamics of full production, full consumption and the debt that consumes their vital breath on a daily basis. In this context, the myriad of devices that are imposed on passive individuals promote an intense process of de-subjectivation.

Desubjectivation is presented as the foundation of individualized societies, in which the sphere of action, politics, public space, public goods and qualified life in public space no longer make sense or have lost their sense of collective, community belonging. In the governmental scope, it is a question of governing, of enhancing the biological life of individual producers and consumers, as well as transforming it into bare life, subjecting it to the violence of police action, or even to the violence of other individual producers and consumers, in a kind of war generalized civil action against flawed consumers, unproductive consumers, refugees and all luck or misfortune of human beings who do not correspond to imperatives, the expectations of contemporary biopolitical societies in progress.

Under the ongoing dynamics of de-subjectivation, the development device on a local, regional, territorial geographic scale or of human, social, environmental, economic, sustainable demand, among other possible demands, presents itself as the utopia par excellence today. However, unlike modern

utopias peopled with subjects, the utopia of development today appears to be de-subjectivated. Operates in the void, captures and manages the bodies of individuals and the population in their vital energies. It is an upside-down utopia, which proposes an impalpable future, but does not present a horizon of meaning, a finish line, an understandable goal to be reached; it only promotes the biopolitical techniques of government, the security state required by capital, the spectacularized society full of information and devoid of publicly knowledge debated.

As an upside-down utopia, the device for the development of the world's biopolitical government mobilizes public and private agents, non-governmental organizations, institutions, universities, stricto sensu programs, researchers, individuals. In the field of the political spectrum, it mobilizes the ultra-right, the right and the left. It is about researching, studying, analyzing, debating and even transposing development experiences between regions, peoples and countries. Having built the state and its institutions to act in favor of specific interests, it is not possible on a national scale to act for the people; thus, it is about making the local and regional community responsible for the dynamics of its development. And like every utopia, the development device in the face of the political, discursive and social void of its promises makes use of strategies of justification and, above all, of blaming individuals, communities, regions and territories for not achieving the unattainable, or that is, if development has not yet arrived, it is because there is a lack of "management", competitiveness, entrepreneurship, initiative and willingness to take risks.

Analyzed from these perspectives, the development device is presented within totalitarian government proposals inherent in liberal market democracies, and, under these assumptions, Agamben's analytical perspective is intensified, present in the interview entitled "The endless crisis as an instrument of power: a conversation with Giorgio Agamben"<sup>27</sup>24, that in this context all governments in the world are illegitimate.

---

27 The interview entitled "The endless crisis as an instrument of power: a conversation with Giorgio Agamben" was translated and displayed on the Editora Boitempo website. To access the link: <https://blogdaboitempo.com.br/2013/07/17/the-endless-crisis-as-instrument-of-power-a-conversation-with-giorgio-agamben/>.

**Bibliographic References**

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **Homo Sacer**: o poder soberano e a vida nua I. Tradução de Henrique Burigo. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2002.

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **Estado de exceção**. Tradução de Iraci D. Poleti. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2004.

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **O que resta de Auschwitz**. Tradução Selvino J. Assmann. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **O que é o contemporâneo e outros ensaios**. Tradução de Vinicius Nicastro Honesko. Chapecó/SC: Editora Argos, 2009.

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **Meios sem fim**: notas sobre a política. Tradução de Davi Pessoa Carneiro. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2015.

APABLAZA, Iván Andrés Torres. Genealogia y actualidad de la *biopolítica* en el pensamiento filosófico contemporáneo. **MAPOCHO – Revista de humanidades**, Chile, n. 85, p. 136-160, primer semestre 2019. Disponível em: [file:///C:/Users/Dell/Downloads/Genealogia\\_y\\_actualidad\\_de\\_la\\_biopolitic%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Dell/Downloads/Genealogia_y_actualidad_de_la_biopolitic%20(1).pdf)

ARAYA, Adán Salinas. Biopoder y teología económica. Revisión crítica de las propuestas de Giorgio Agamben. **Seminário de história de la filosofía**, v. 31, n. 2, p. 507-542, 2014. Disponível em: [file:///C:/Users/Dell/Downloads/47580-Texto%20del%20art%C3%ADculo-79568-2-10-20150218%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Dell/Downloads/47580-Texto%20del%20art%C3%ADculo-79568-2-10-20150218%20(1).pdf)

BARSALINI, Glauco; RAMIRO, Caio Henrique Lopes. Uma voz de suspeita: Giorgio Agamben, o estado de exceção e a ciência como religião em tempos de pandemia. **Quadranti – Rivista Internazionale di Filosofia Contemporanea**, v. VIII, n. 1-2, p. 380-417, 2020. Disponível em: [https://www.rivistaquadranti.eu/riviste/10/17\\_Barsalini-e-Ramiro.pdf](https://www.rivistaquadranti.eu/riviste/10/17_Barsalini-e-Ramiro.pdf)

BAZZANELLA, Sandro Luiz. **A centralidade da vida em Nietzsche e Agamben frente à metafísica ocidental e a biopolítica contemporânea**. 2010. Tese (Doutorado Interdisciplinar de Ciências Humanas – DICH) – Programa de Pós-Graduação da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), 2010. Disponível no link: <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/94701> - Acessado em 14.05.2022.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **A sociedade individualizada**: vidas contadas e histórias vividas. Tradução de José Gradel. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed., 2008.

CARRIÓN, Juan Javier Sanchez. Sociología, orden social y modelización estadística: queteley el “hombre medio”. **EMPIRIA – Revista de Metodología de Ciências Sociais**, n. 3, p. 49-71, 2000. Disponível em: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=199644>. Acesso em: 14 maio 2022.

DARDOT, Pierre; LAVAL, Christian. **A nova razão do mundo**: ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal. Tradução de Mariana Echalar. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

FONSECA, Pedro Cezar Dutra. **Desenvolvimentismo**: a construção do conceito. Texto para discussão. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada. Brasília; Rio de Janeiro: Ipea, 2015. Disponível no link: [https://www.ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/TDs/td\\_2103.pdf](https://www.ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/TDs/td_2103.pdf). Acesso em: 14 maio 2022.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **História da sexualidade I**: a vontade de saber. Tradução de Maria Thereza da Costa Albuquerque e J. A. Guilhon Albuquerque. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1988.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Nascimento da biopolítica**. Tradução de Eduardo Brandão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008a.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Segurança, território, população**. Tradução de Eduardo Brandão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008b.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão**. Tradução de Raquel Ramalhete. Petrópolis, RJ: Editora Vozes, 2014.

HOBBSAWM, Eric J. **A era das revoluções: Europa 1789-1848**. Tradução de Maria Tereza Lopez Teixeira e Marcos Ponchel. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1977.

HOBBSAWM, Eric J. **A Era do capital, 1848-1875**. Tradução de Luciano Costa Neto. Rio de Janeiro; São Paulo, Paz e Terra, 2019.

HUNT, E. K.; SHERMAN, Howard J. **História do pensamento econômico**. Tradução de Jaime Larry Benchimol. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 1996.

LOCKE, John. **Segundo tratado sobre o governo** – ensaio relativo à verdadeira origem extensão e objetivo do governo civil. Tradução de E. Jacy Monteiro. São Paulo: Editora Victor Civita, 1973.

HOBBS. **Leviatã ou matéria, forma e poder de um estado eclesiástico e civil**. Tradução de João Paulo Monteiro e Maria Beatriz Nizza da Silva. São Paulo: Editora Nova Cultural Ltda., 2004 (Coleção Os Pensadores).

RUIZ, Castor M. M. Bartolomé. A Sacralidade da vida na exceção soberana, a testemunha e sua linguagem. (Re) leituras biopolíticas da obra de Giorgio Agamben. **Cadernos IHU**, n. 39, p. 4-50, 2012. Disponível em: <http://www.ihu.unisinos.br/images/stories/cadernos/ihu/039cadernosihu.pdf>

#### Links consultados:

<https://www.culturaerealidade.com.br/arquivo/www.culturaerealidade.com.br/noticia/o-leito-de-procuso-6273.html>. Acesso em: 5 jul. 2022.

<https://blogdaboitempo.com.br/2013/07/17/a-crise-infundavel-como-instrumento-de-poder-uma-conversa-com-giorgio-agamben/>. Acesso em: 7 jul. 2022.