

Available online at www.postmodernopenings.com

e-ISSN: 2069-9387; ISSN-L: 2068-0236

Postmodern Openings

2016, Volume 7, Issue 2, December, pp. 25-41

Pornography as a Biopolitical Phenomenon

Aura-Elena SCHUSSLER

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/po/2016.0702.03>

Covered in:

EBSCO, CEEOL, DOAJ, Erih Plus, Index
Copernicus, Ideas RePeC, EconPapers,
Socionet, Ulrich Pro Quest, Cabel, SSRN,
Appreciative Inquiry Commons,
Journalseek, Scipio.

©2016 The Authors & LUMEN Publishing House.

Selection, peer review and publishing under the responsibility of LUMEN Publishing House.

How to cite: Schussler, A-E. (2016). Pornography as a Biopolitical Phenomenon. Postmodern Openings, 7(2), 25-41.
Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/po/2016.0702.03>

Pornography as a Biopolitical Phenomenon

Aura-Elena SCHUSSLER¹

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to approach the pornographic field from the perspective of the Foucauldian biopolitical system, of biotechnologies and the digital sphere, where sexuality represents the area of manifestation for the new power games, within the limits of a global and technological capitalism. The general objective seeks to approach the issue of sexuality and pornography from the perspective of posthumanism and postgender as new forms of knowledge-power, of the shaping and supervision of the individual, where biomedicine and pharmacy are the key to the standardization of the body and its sexual performances, through technological immersions. The theoretical objective is aimed at demonstrating the fact that, in the current conditions, the pornographic world is going through a major shift in paradigm due to the virtual space of biodigital machinery, together with artificial intelligence. This is how it is possible to shift from the utopic world of pornography (pornotopia), to the dystopic world of pornography, which is governed by technology and the technologization of human nature. The methodology used is argumentation and Foucauldian philosophical criticism, Deleuzian deconstruction and argumentation, based on the philosophy of Derrida and Žižek, in the approach of a perverse biopolitical system.

Keywords: pornography; sexuality; biopolitics; biotechnology; posthuman; biodigital; postgender.

1. Introduction

With the development of technological society and information, pornography has begun to leave the illicit land of primary body orgasms and to make its way to the land of science and philosophy. Therefore, the concept of pornography I refer to throughout this study excludes child pornography. The original contribution of this article involves a transdisciplinary approach to pornography and biopolitics, seen as a new method for the manipulation and control of human nature, through a perverse mechanism of collaboration between the two, whereby pornography gets to become a biopolitical phenomenon by establishing new

¹ Associate Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of History and Philosophy, “Babeş-Bolyai” University, Str. Mihail Kogălniceanu, 1, Cluj-Napoca, 400084, Romania; hiphi@hiphi.ubbcluj.ro.

sexual standards which include the biomedical and pharmaceutical maximization of sexual performance, the desexualization of the phallus, and the technologization/digitization of intimate areas. The critical stand towards the Foucauldian (1978; 2003; 2008) literature results from the Derridarian (1981; 2001; 1988) deconstructivist methodology, Deleuzian (2000; 2003) argumentation and Žižek-based arguing (2004), to which I add my own points of view. These support pornography as a biopolitical phenomenon, possibly by cancelling gender/sexual differences and the reproduction functions of genitalia, in the name of performance, production, computational language and the digital area. The evolution of human nature in the direction of a technological symbiosis entails a series of changes, leading to its reconstruction and rethinking into the most subtle details and structures. Concepts such as 'posthuman' or 'postgender' are only a validation of the new norms of individual elaboration, under the auspices of biopolitics. Thus, according to philosopher Rosi Braidott (2013), (who was influenced in her theories by Deleuzian philosophy, feminism and post-structuralist theories); post-humanism is a concept which, in the philosopher's view, is the result of the decline of humanism, an impairment of the old traditions and limitations of human nature, through a process of redefinition, which has received a full contribution from the capitalist system, seen as an environment for, and interdependence between, human and non-human, through the new technologies, globalization and biopolitics (Braidott, 2013, pp. 13-54). Nevertheless, Braidott (2013, p. 188) stated that the posthuman subject is not postmodern, because it is not based on any anti-foundationalist premises and is also not poststructuralist, because it does not work within the linguistic or deconstructionist limits. Another perspective, from Donna Haraway (1990, pp. 127-179), in her book, *A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century*, is where she defined the concept of posthuman as a mixture between human and robot, namely a cyborg, which brings into question the theory of liberal humanism (through the separation of human nature from the mind/body dualism). This perspective, which pushes Braidott's (2013) view to the edge of an ontology, of human dualism (which Jacques Derrida focused on in a metaphysical system of opposites) leads us to the concept of postgender. Postgender is a social and political movement, which was analyzed in depth by Haraway (1990) in the same paper, where she attributed the postgender nature to the cyborg. This new posthuman species, whose ontology is aimed at an androgynous individual and which transcends the

human species, as a result of the immersion of human nature into biotechnology and biomedicine, is designed, not only to eliminate the ontological division of gender, but also to permute, or eliminate them, from the equation of a dual ontology through the presence/absence of sex afferent to a material-semiotic body (Haraway, 1990, pp. 127-149). The influence of Jacques Derrida's (1981; 2001; 1988) philosophy, which we also find in Haraway's theories (1990), starts from the theory of phallogocentrism, the metaphysical system of opposites, which brings together two distinct concepts: logocentrism and plallogocentrism. Therefore, logocentrism – represented by Logos, is masculinized, as a consequence of the Greek *paideia* – and identified with plallogocentrism, based on the Freudian concept that the Phallus is the Law (symbolized by the Father) and the masculine voice, in a patriarchal system is specific to the Western world (Derrida, 1981, pp. 1-61). That is why postgender, or posthuman, concepts are designed to eliminate dualisms and borders between species, genders or between human and technological entities.

However, these movements and theories are nothing else than the consequence of globalization and biopolitics, where the sexual field represents the area of manifestation for the new power games. Thus, biopolitics is the area of fusion between biology and politics, in view of claiming sovereignty over life and death, in the advanced conditions of a global neoliberal capitalism. According to the Foucauldian (2003, pp. 239-265) theory, this biopolitical mechanism (or biopower mechanism, as he calls it in the beginning of his paper, *Society Must Be Defended*), exercises its power over the physical and political body of the population, by disciplining the body and regulating the population. In the first volume of *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Foucault (1978, pp. 133-161) used the concept of biopolitics to emphasize the role that the sexual field has, together with its disciplining and monitoring, in the development of biopolitics, through the access it provides to the species and the body of the individual. This is precisely the direction I wish to take in this paper. In this context, human nature is deconstructed, both at ontological level and at material level (body, flesh). Thus, one of the methods for the separation of the mind/body dualism takes place through a redefinition of human sexuality, where pornography is the way of access to the ontological, political and biological control and desacralization of human nature in a shift in the nature-culture relation paradigm.

2. Pornography and Sexuality

Pornography, as an underlying element of sexuality, which is constructed around the power-desire dialectic, is what makes power and desire become linked by an interconnection, which allows them to work under the sign of the mechanism for the deconstruction/reconstruction and manipulation of the body and the human species. Thus, according to Michel Foucault (1978, p. 140), the mid-18th Century represents the period when a shift in the paradigm occurred between the two opposite poles – life/death, under the sign of biopower. If the time before the 17th Century was dominated by power, within the limits of the concept of sovereignty, which bestowed the sovereign with the power and right to *take life* or *let live* (Foucault, 1978, p. 136), the 18th Century started to emphasize a form of power which was meant to preserve and control life. This form of power over life is centered around two concepts – *the body as a machine* and *the species body* – meaning around the power as a means of body disciplining, in the name of production (biopower), namely of power as a means of control over the population's biological processes (biopolitics) – (Foucault, 1978, pp. 135-140). Subsequently, starting with the 19th Century, this power mechanism, constructed around biopolitics as a genealogy system of verditional regimes, imposed itself around the sexuality device, which was seen as a technology of power, centered on the practice of confession, direction on conscience, medical or psychoanalytical report (Foucault, 2008, pp. 35-36). This apparatus, or device of body and the life of the species, which is constructed *knowledge-power*, is centered on sexuality, and grants access to the life of the machine around political operations and economical interventions developed in the progress of capitalism. This makes sex the central element of body disciplining, as well as the mechanism for regulating populations at the global level (Foucault, 1978, p. 136). However, the increase of investments in reproductive technologies has led to a new economic and cultural frontier of biodigital capitalism, where artificial sex defines the new trends of power in the cybernetic era (Parisi, 2004, p. 4). This fact is joined by the integration of sexuality in the political system of the law, through its panoptic mechanism of supervision. In such a process, the political systems of repression and control operated under the sign of power had the effect of increasing the manifestation and development of sexuality and did not repress its materialness. This happened because of this underlying effect of sexuality that is pornography. Although, at first glance, pornography appears

to take a backseat to sexuality, given that that it includes it, the new currents are going in the direction of biotechnology, technologization of human nature and posthumanism result in the modification of this initial relation. Thus, pornography ends up representing the dystopic element of sexuality, through the hypothesis, according to which pornography has the opportunity to deconstruct sexuality. The dystopic hypothesis of pornography results, firstly, from the immersion of technology into the individual's life. According to Martin Heidegger (1977, pp. 5-6), if we look at technology from an instrumental and anthropologic point of view, technology is a human activity. However, Heidegger (1977) says that the more human nature wishes to control and to master technology, the greater the risk for technology to sneak into the control of human nature: *We will, as we say, "get" technology "spiritually in hand. We will master it. The will to mastery becomes all the more urgent, the more technology threatens to slip from human control* (Heidegger, 1977, p. 5). This can generate dystopia. If the utopic world of pornography was that of 'pornotopia' – a “fantastic” world where every individual, regardless of their gender, is permanently ready to face any sexual challenges (Marcus, 2009, p. 273) – its dystopic world is that where technology intervenes, as a manipulative element of human nature and where it is assimilated, or even replaced by technology. Thus, a first difference between the utopic/dystopic worlds of pornography is the presence through absence of gender. This presence through absence of gender, constructed around dialectic of technological manipulation, is designed to divide the norms of cultural-historical tradition and Western metaphysics, to a perverse biopolitical system. That is a mechanism of recognition-power of the new media for processing and abstracting the existence of human nature. That is why, if we start from the hypothesis according to which sex is natural, which refers to the individual's genetic and biological state, of being a man or woman, gender is a cultural convention, which has led to the formation of the ontological dualisms of male/female. A second hypothesis, which kind of completes the first one, is that where, according to a Saussurean (1966) semiotic interpretation, we can place the distinction between sex and gender to the relation between *signifier* and *signified*. Thus, if we view gender, as we already determined, as a cultural category, we can associate it with the signified. On the other hand, we associate sex with the signifier, if we view it as a biological phenomenon, as determined by the first hypothesis. In a third hypothesis, which comprises the first two, we can place gender in the digital, artificial (accordingly) of

cultural codes and sex in the analogical, (accordingly) natural and biological. The circle of meanings around which these arguments revolve, starts from illuminist thinking. It begins from the biological foundations regarding reproduction and the sexual organs and creates an epistemological shift in regard to the concepts of man/woman, which along the way materialize in what we now call the male and female genders. However, this relation of binaries of sex/genders originates, as stated in the beginning of the paper, in Derrida's (1981) concept of phallogocentrism. Logocentrism, the basic concept of Western metaphysical philosophy, is found between the limits of a philosophy of determination, where the Logos as the supreme (a priori) and masculine truth is in opposition with the written word (a posteriori), which, according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's (2009) position, appears as an indefinite, as a supplement or a substitute to the spoken word, as a secondary, therefore, feminine element (Derrida, 1981, pp. 1-61). Derrida's (1981) deconstruction of the metaphysical position of Rousseau's (2009) logocentrism was performed from the perspective of the logos as a metaphor of determination, viewed as a consequence of the heritage of Plato's philosophy, which privileges the living word, the spoken word, which also signified the dominant and patriarchal position of the male gender, as Law (Derrida, 1981, pp. 1-61). Thus, in Plato's interpretation, Derrida used the Freudian psychoanalytical philosophy, which assigned this aspect (the spoken word identified with the Father as Law) to the Oedipal complex of castration (Derrida, 2001, pp. 246-292). According to this interpretation, the written word caused the anguish of castration because, as it is identified with the female gender, it can lead to the phenomenon of castration of the Western metaphysical philosophy, meaning to a philosophy for another, a philosophy of alterity, including one of radical alterity, under the sign of textuality, hence, femininity (Derrida, 1988, pp. 95-192). In exchange, phallogocentrism places the phallic instance under the sign of masculine, patriarchal power. That is why the phallus is a signifier, which symbolizes power and grants power to its owner, while the penis is only an organ. This important difference between phallus and penis gives the pornographic device the opportunity to generate dystopia because, within the limits of a dystopic pornographic world, we are dealing with the phallus as a signifier, and not with the penis as a signified, as we do in the utopic world of pornography (pornotopia). In pornotopia, the penis, the male virile member, is a "supernatural" and "omnipotent" object, to which human nature is attached as an extension (Marcus, 2009, p. 272). The penis, in the utopic

world of pornotopia, is a “body without organs” – as viewed by Deleuze’s *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (2000, pp. 9-16) – with the role of constructing a diagram of the sexual scheme, composed of overlapped bodies, body parts, limbs and organs (Marcus, 2009, p. 274). That is why, according to Slavoj Žižek (2004), the phallus is an “organ without a body” within the symbolical limits, where the phallus is perceived as a badge of power, as a mask, which the male gender has attached to its body, without the phallus ever becoming an organic part of the body (Žižek, 2004, p. 87). That is why the one who is equipped with a symbol of power (the phallus-signifier) is endowed with power, and he wears it to exercise power, the reason for which the phallus is placed within the limits of determination. However, when sexuality is expressed by the ‘Logos’ (the spoken word) – as we see in BDSM perversions, in video-chat practices or in artificial intelligence programs – this aspect leads to a desexualization of the attitude towards sexuality and to the induction of an instrumental attitude towards sexuality. In this mechanism, the phallus takes the dimension of a signifier of castration, in Žižek’s perspective, which makes it an “organ of desexualization”, due to its capacity to be a signifier without being signified (Žižek, 2004, pp. 90-91). For Žižek (2004), this desexualization of the signified took place when the element representing the universal sexual signification, meaning the phallus, is reduced to a signifier. This makes it the element putting the sexual signification in brackets, by reducing sexuality (and not sex), as signified, to an empty signifier. In exchange, in this context, the penis – organ of pleasure – is located, from a symbolic point of view, in indeterminacy. In fact, this is the perverse game the pornographic device manifests in the dystopic world of technology, where the impact it has on sex in the virtual space, is the recoding of alterity through the dissolution of human and species related differences, together with the avatarization of the ego. The manifestation of pornography as biopower in this reference system is made through a standardization of ontological mutations in nature/culture-natural/artificial, with the purpose of submitting the mind-body dualism to artificialization and digitization. This is the result of blurring borders between species and genders, in view of an anthropomorphic and polymorph individual. That is why the role of the phallus as a “desexualization” is not granting the female gender the possibility to invest itself with the badge, with the symbol of male power, through a Strap-On (sex toy), for example, but to create a system of sexual stratification. That means creating a symbolic system of representation, to make the transition

from the real sexual-biologic (the penis as an organ) to the virtual of the phallic signifier. This transition will allow the existence of a modulation between man and machine, between man and animal, where what matters is not the recurrence of the phallic signifier, but the new diagram of power represented by the biopolitical panoptism of technological globalization, through the deconstruction of the human ontological dualism (mind-body), towards an heterogeneous connectivity composed of the posthuman world of artificial intelligence, of partial bodies, of fluids and desires (Weinstone, 2004, pp. 71-74). In this context, the prolongation of sexual pleasures beyond the pleasures of the body, in a posthuman body, leads to a modification of identity and reality, through a series of codes meant to determine the alternation of the real/virtual representation. The liberation of sexual pleasures from the flesh-body, together with the limits of the natural, deconstruct the cultural-biological difference between gender and sex, artificializing them through the dissolution of sexual identity, through the presence/absence of sex. This artificialization equips the individual with the ability of simultaneity in act and in presence, of sexual couplings, an equation where, through avatarization, the individual has the possibility of a permanent gender change (real), together with the cancellation of sexual differences and reproductive functions of the genital organs, through “desexualization”. That is why, according to Žižek (2004), the phallus is in a paradoxical position, which only allows it to be universalized through “desexualization”, only by submitting it to some sort of transubstantiation, where it changes into an additional connotation, which could be neutral or asexual. We, therefore, are witnessing a postgender era, shaped by the variability of (a)sexual identities. The transgressiveness of the sexual couplings/relations brings to the virtual space and deconstructs the Baudrillardian (1998) concept of “recycling” in postmodernism and transforms it into a sexual trans-substantiation. It consists of the transformation of sex as an act, which involves the presence of real bodies into an act which dissipates the need of the flesh-body and replaces it with the avatarial iconicity of artificial intelligence, such as operating systems with voices or simulacra of human bodies. At this level, we can speak of an (inter)human deletion through the dissolution of natural relations between humans, respectively, with their artificialization through the technologization of the intimate area. In this context, sexuality is placed somewhere outside biopolitics as a power of administration, supervision and monitoring of the body as a machine and the species body, and is subscribed to the biopolitics

of globalization and neutralizing of the identity of alterity and of the radical and self-multiplying alterity (Weinstone, 2004, pp. 104-107). The dystopia generated by the pornographic device short-circuits the phallogocentrism of Western metaphysics and opens it to a philosophy of the written text, of computational languages, which lack the materialness of human nature and are structured on the higher level of textuality, of signs generating avatariar-pornographic and biodigital programs. Thus, the relation between Logos and Writing goes through a shift in paradigm. From Derrida's (2001, 1988) position, according to which any spoken word has a metaphorical meaning – unlike the written word, situated within the semiotic limits of a signifier/signified meaning, within the limits of a difference of semantic indetermination – we reach a determination of the written words, to identification with the self, which is possible through digitalization and the virtual space. According to Luciana Parisi (2004), when this is applied to the sexual field, this equation makes the desire-power relation reach a critical point by releasing sex from the limitations of reproduction. This release, subsequently, produces a mutation in the desire-power relation, which, until now, has been concentrated on the biophysical and biocultural variables of content and expression of matter (Parisi, 2004, p. 129). The mechanism takes place in capitalist-panoptic societies, defined by investing biodigital machines with the power to capture the system of sexual and reproductive variables through a selection of the potential of information. These systems are equipped with artificial intelligence and induce the mechanism of sexual reconstruction, redefinition and recoding, as an aggregate of desire and power in the process of sexual stratification. This process delimits a dystopic proposal between the proliferation of coded information and the capitalization of their potential through virtual control. This is how the transition from sexuality, as a system of reproduction and penial orgasm, to pornography, as a mechanism for the deconstruction of biological sexuality and its reconstruction within the biodigital limits, between organic and non-organic, genetic engineering, non-genital sex and the cyborgization of the body is done. Thus, the pornographic virality represents a phenomenon through which sex is propagated, defying censure. The sexual transgressiveness, in this case, constitutes a phenomenon of communication and promotion of a consumer-based ideology. But, unlike the postmodern consumer concept, – where the uselessness of the gadget is designed to restore man's lost relation with things (Baudrillard, 1998, pp. 99-129) – contemporaneity makes the viral phenomenon of pornography into an

environment designed to transform this relation into an anachronistic one, in the desire to deconstruct the unilateral ideology of consumerism (man-thing), where the virality becomes bilateral.

3. Pornography as a biopolitical mechanism in the field of medicine and pharmacy

The political, biological and technological management of the body, of sex/sexuality and of the individual, under the careful supervision of the global capitalist biopolitical system, was achieved through the dynamics of technocapitalism, mass-media and worldwide digitization, together with the immersions of technologies and biodigital machines in the post-industrial era. Within the limits of Foucauldian (2008) biopolitics, sex and sexuality were transformed into governmental agencies for the control and standardization of life, through which we define, as a manner of manifestation and manipulation of power, either within the limits of a discourse, or with those regarding the techniques for monitoring sexual identity. If in postmodernism this was achieved through mass media and television, contemporaneity brings forth the digital era. The globalization of the virtual space in an information society facilitates the manipulation, docilization and reconstruction of the individuals and their needs. The referential dystopic models of cyborgs or human avatars push human nature to the outskirts of metaphysical ontology and gradually replace it with a posthuman dimension. Thus, in modernism/postmodernism, perversions, sexual deviations or masturbation have represented an incrimination of the individual's weaknesses and a need to supervise them at the global level, through the technique of confession, of psychoanalysis, or of discourse. However, in this system, in contemporaneity, what makes the sexual biopolitical mechanism go beyond its mere social, political or individual role is pornography. Pornography has the possibility to break out sex and sexuality from the incidence of the biological and the pathological, but also to transform them into coercive and dystopic elements of nature (or the natural). Thus, we proceed in analyzing pornography at the biopolitical level of a bioculture, where the privatization of organs under the sign of production perfection, under the incidence of a "body without organs" generates the new concept of Overman. Far from following Nietzsche's (2006) concept of the Overman as the definition of strong will, morality, culture or aristocracy, the contemporary Overman is artificialized, gutted and repudiated from nature, being recycled on the components that (re)define

him in ubiquitous performance of surplus value. Thus, in with regard to the male gender, increasing sexual performance through the use of potency enhancing drugs, along with temporary penis enlargement surgery – through the use of special vacuum pumps, medications and herbal supplements, or permanent surgery (enlarging the penis' girth by injecting fat followed by liposculpture, or the use of silicone implants, along with dorsal penile elongation through the deinsertion of the fundiform ligament and the suspensory ligament) – are just some examples for pornography as biopolitics and biotechnology. Regarding the female gender, aesthetic surgery and rejuvenation of the vagina by injecting stem cells from fat in the labia majora (Labiaplasty) and toning, or narrowing and tightening of the vagina, along with the consumption of contraception drugs to avoid pregnancy, are other examples in the direction of pornography as biopolitics and biotechnology. Even if these practices became normal for the common individual, so they are part of the congenital reality of the individual, I will uphold these arguments, because pornography is the cause of it, by being the referential system for human sexuality. Moreover, the global pornographic industry represents the new biopolitical surveillance of the sexuality system because it moves the biological and corporal sexuality in the digital sphere, which is much easier to control. This leap, which is achieved through pornography, from the realm of reality to the virtual realm, triggers a panoptic surveillance system, which is only one click away. The individual is, not only, framed, monitored and modeled by cyber panoptic system through the pornographic industry's genres and subgenres, but also through the viral phenomenon of pornography, which was meant to redefine human sexuality. As we stated previously, the new sexual models and pornographic genres are created through medical and pharmaceutical biotechnologies. What was initially presented under the cloak of the utopia of pronotopy, suffered an implosion with the technological immersion. This is because, under these conditions, pornography deconstructs human nature to its biological carnality and reconstructs it in the posthuman dimensions of digital machines, which push the ontological duality of genders and sex towards postgender. This is why the field of contemporary pornography is responsible for the creation of the third gender (Hunt, 1996, p. 59) – both within the posthuman and postgender limits and the images of prostitutes, pornographers and the sodomized in the context of the 17th and 19th centuries – and for what we call the 'privatization of organs', through the anus, which is genderless (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, p. 113). The anus is an

undetermined organ, because it does not have the properties of a set organ. It is transitory and polyvalent, which makes it both a waste eliminating and a sexualized organ. This pornographic product, which leads us within the limits of a “body without organs”, to the “desiring machines” of production, materializes in the dystopic world of pornography under the sign of the “paranoid machine”. This “paranoid machine” consists in the opposition of the production process of the “desiring machines” and the unproductive state of the “body without organs”, centered by the projection of your own body and on the genital organs (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, p. 8). But the anus is not a sexual organ, it is a sexualized organ, which places it with the necessity of alternating forces (cultural, artistic, medical, technological), which act upon it, and places it under one incidence or another (Deleuze, 2003, pp. 44-55). Just as Deleuze and Guattari (2000) underlined in *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, the individual as a whole disappeared, being replaced by a series of organs, such as breasts, vagina, anus, lips, penis, etc. which looked to attach themselves, just like parts, to objects which they called “desiring machines”. Thus, each machine ends up representing a particular piece in the form of the machine – breast/anus/vagina/penis/lips, such that the functionality of the production given through milk/droppings/sperm/saliva to be guaranteed by the resistance pieces, which compose these “desiring machines”. But the importance of the anus in the dystopic world of pornography is the same as the capital, which is the “body without organs” of the capitalist individual (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, p. 10), it produces surplus value which determines its privatization. The procedure does not only take place through sodomising, or the droppings fetish, but through the abstractization of the anus by transferring it from the libidinal sphere of production to the one of biotechnological biopolitics. In other words, using the poliform character of the anus in order to functionally and symbolically disseminate it within the limits of the “desiring machines”. Pornography uses the immersion of technology in the biology of the human body, in order to standardize the human body and sexual performance. Compared to the penis – which can be viewed, in first instance, as a detached organ, which generates an absence of both genders in the construction process of the Oedipal triangle – the anus is actually the one that detaches the penis, the one that eliminates and sublimates the penis in some sort of abrogation, which will alter, or constitute the phallus (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, p. 113). In this context, the pornographic industry aligns itself with the medical and pharmaceutical fields to enhance

the performance of the body and the sexual/sexualized organs, in order to enhance productivity, thus gaining a surplus value. The mechanism does not stop with the sexual organs such as the vagina/penis, but it transcends this biological limitation and stops at the anus, which is seen as an asexual and sexualized organ, subject to depigmentation, rejuvenation or tightening interventions in the same direction of perfection and performance. The changes that have occurred as a result of globalized capitalism, are characterized not only by transformations that have occurred in terms of sex/sexuality, sexual identity, reproduction or pleasure, as stated in Foucauldian (2008) theory regarding biopolitical control systems, but also through new biotechnological progress. Even if medical and pharmaceutical practices such as vaginal rejuvenation, penis enlargement or anal bleaching seem, at first glance, only a series of private practices which are unrelated to the concept of biopolitics, things are not really like that. The link is one between the collaboration of the pornographic industry (which encourages such medical and pharmaceutical practices) and the new perverse biopolitical system which accepts this pornographic industry and the sexual norms it imposes not only on the industry, but also, indirectly, on the consumer, who, in order to maintain their connection to this world, submit to its sexual norms. This link is given by the fact that, once the pornographic industry became involved in the individual's intimate life through magazines, films and especially through the virtual space, it led to the transgression of sexual interdicts. Once this was achieved, it moved on to the next level, namely the deconstruction of biological sexuality, through biotechnologies in medicine and pharmacy. Just like the phenomenon of contraception, for example, or the monitoring of natality, these practices are aimed at creating and monitoring a new category of individuals. It involves a new form of docilization, shaping and submission of the body as a machine, in the name of profit. The less prevalent existence of these practices, or their private function doesn't exclude them from the perverse sphere of the new biopolitics, because, through the exceptional state they have, through the pornographic industry, they represent an economic category specific to global neoliberal capitalism. Although at first sight there are no social, political or biological implications of these individual practices, and only at a private rather than a public level, they are imperatively presented in pornography, and influence the access to the life of the body as a machine and the species body. How? Because of the fact that they influence a series of political operations and economic interventions that exist in the capitalist

progress of capital gain by the mere fact that the pornographic industry is a public and real institution, even if the consumption is mostly private. Thus, through the medical and pharmaceutical interventions associated with these practices (for the aestheticization of genitalia or in the name of increased performance), there is a perverse relationship between the pornographic industry, medicine, pharmacy, economics and politics. How is this relevant for biopolitics? This world of pornography, where these practices exist, and which applies only to sex and sexuality, constitutes a form of power. This new form of power-knowledge, which the sexual sphere reveals itself in terms of the pornographic industry, incites the individual and his or her body as a machine, to transgress a series of interdicts in the species body. For example, contraceptives grant the possibility for monitoring and controlling natality, the increase of male sexual performance (through penis enlargement, together with erection stimulation) make the penis-organ an end in itself and not a means for procreation (in Kantian terms). It's the same for the aestheticization of genitalia, through rejuvenation or bleaching; they are aimed at performances and at inciting interest in body objectification. More accurately, as Heidegger (1996) suggests, the presence of the Being tends to disappear in the transparency of its utility as a handiness, the essence of technology reduces the entity of the Being to an order calculation (Heidegger, 1996, pp. 62-67), meaning that, as *The forest is a forest of timber, the mountain is a quarry of rock, the river is water power, and the wind is wind* "in the sails (Heidegger, 1996, p. 66), - *our masculinity is transformed into testosterone, our erections into Viagra, and our fertility/sterility into pills* (Preciado, 2013, pp. 34-35). These are the landmarks and models, which the global biopolitical capitalist system has achieved through the dynamics of technocapitalism, mass media and global digitalization. However, the technological immersion, such as artificial intelligence or cyborgs, renders these biotechnological interventions at the human level insufficient. The dystopic direction of a radical otherness using the cyborg as a front, does not only suppress inter-human relationships, but it also suspends them at a political-digital level. The thirst of human nature to achieve perfection and to continue its interdependency with the biotechnologies, the biodigital machines and the artificial intelligences place the individual within the limits of a ontological desacralization, renouncing the postmodern physical body and adopting a transubstantiation, created by technological variations. The importance of pornography in this process is that the phallus is viewed as a "desexualization organ" and the penis as a "body without organs" under the

incidence of the digital world and biotechnologies, which establish the existential referential human nature systems under the incidence of a posthuman sexuality.

4. Conclusions

The biopolitical character of pornography results, on the one hand, from the paradigm shift between the utopian world of 'pornotopia' and the dystopian world of technology, where both worlds, in order to be part of biopolitics, aim to monitor, supervise and socially and biologically control sexuality. In other words, a shift between the world of pornography, where the body is seen as a piece of meat, and the technological world of pornography, including artificial sex, avatars or the postgender. On the other hand, it results from the implosion of Western metaphysical tradition that suffers by shorting phallogocentrism through the desexualization of the phallus and the privatization of the sexual organs. That is, through the deconstruction of the phallus as a symbol of male power (Father-Law-Logos), along with the reproductive and biological nature of sexual organs in favor of a sexual computational language and artificial intelligence. Thus, pornography no longer deconstructs the sexual body, as did the postmodern culture, but reconstructs and re-encodes it. This is a consequence of the immersion of biotechnology, the bio-digital and the virtual in our incidence space. The reconstruction of the human body is made technologically and cybernetically, alongside the anthropomorphing of the body within the limits of posthumanity. Recoding is achieved by androgenizing sexual identity through the process of transubstantiation, alongside the avatarization of the gender, by creating a postgender individual. Within this system, pornography contributes to the dematerialization of the sexual body by setting aside the material nature of the physical body and the biological sexual identity, through the dystopic mechanism of presence through an absence of gender. The Foucauldian biopolitical argument starts from the thesis that sex and sexuality represent the power and the control device in terms of the population's biological processes. This thesis is deconstructed today by the pornography industry and the sphere of technology which is implementing new control rules and sexual standards, which move biological and physical sexuality in the digital area, making them much easier to control and surveil, which creates a new, perverse kind of biopolitics. This perversion results from a tacit collaboration between biopolitics, the capitalist economic system, technology, the pharmaceutical-medical system and pornography.

Thus the private consumption of pornography at a virtual level generates a gradual disappearance of real and direct contact between people, facilitated by the globalization of cyberspace and the existence of new sexual norms.

References

- Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Braidott, R. (2013). *The Posthuman* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Dissemination* (1st ed.). London: The Athlone Press.
- Derrida, J. (2001). *Writing and Difference* (1st ed.). London: Routledge Classics.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Of Grammatology*, (3rd. ed.). Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2000). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2003). *Francis Bacon: the Logic of Sensation*. London: Continuum.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the college de France 1975-76*, (1st ed.). New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, (1st ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the college de France 1978-79*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haraway, D. (1990). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York: Garland.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and Time*, (3rd. ed.). Translated by Joan Stambaugh. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Hunt, L. (1996). *The Invention of Pornography*, (1st ed.). New York: Zone Books.
- Marcus, S. (2009). *The other Victorians: A study of sexuality and pornography in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England*, (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Nietzsche, F. (2006). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parisi, L. (2004). *Abstract Sex, Philosophy, Bio-Technology and the Mutations of Desire*. London: Continuum.
- Preciado, B. (2013). *Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era*, (1st ed.). New York: The Feminist Press at CUNY.

- Rousseau, J.J. (2009). *Essay on the Origin of Languages*. UK: Dartmouth College.
- Saussure, F. (1966). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Weinstone, A. (2004). *Avatar Bodies – A Tantra for Posthumanism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Žižek, S. (2004). *Organs without Bodies*. New York: Routledge.