

『人文科學』 제102집  
2014년 12월

# **Biopower and the Contemporary Novel: Writing the Objectification of the Animal**

Anne Simon  
(CNRS / EHESS)

## **I . Introduction**

This article deals with the “ecopoetic” aspect of my current research. Accordingly, at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Paris), I run an international program called “Animots: Animals and Animality in 20th and 21st Century French and Francophone literature<sup>1)</sup>”, supported by the French National Research Agency. I would first like to bring your attention to the term “Animots” (“mots” meaning “words” in French), a neologism coined by the philosopher Jacques Derrida in his 2006 essay *L'Animal que donc je suis* (*The Animal that therefore I am*). This term suggests that our relationship to animals is often linked to a linguistic

---

1) See <http://animots.hypotheses.org/> and Anne Simon, “French Literary Studies and The Animal Question: A Contemporary Perspective”, *Through the Cultural Prism: Thinking about Animals from a French and Francophone Perspective*. Louisa Mackenzie et Stéphanie Posthumus eds.: Michigan Press, 2014.

deficiency, and that our own use of language tends to deny animal diversity and uniqueness in the real world. Research on animality in literature can manifest itself in incredibly diverse ways. One researcher may be interested in the question of Darwinism or Spencerian themes in Proust, while another will consider the animalization of the victims or the savagery of the executioners in Holocaust literature. Yet another scholar can focus on the relationship between gender and animalization, another on butchery in contemporary poetry. Thus, the question of literary animality may seem trivial at first, but it should not be confused with the study of “theme” of the pussycat in Colette’s work or the symbolism of the fox in Chinese tales. It touches on ways to consider not only animals but also the human identity, an identity that falls under different definitions depending on whether or not it is placed in opposition with animality in general. Paradoxically, it is just as difficult to define “the animal”, as it is to define the hypothetical “nature” of human beings. Raising the question of the animal also leads to an innovative vision of literary writing as a medium engaged in contemporary social issues. These issues may not seem very “poetic”, but many contemporary writers have considered the act of creation to be a social act demonstrating the effect biopower has on both animals and humans. While I specifically have North American, British and European writers in mind, as these are the ones I know best, it would be interesting to consider Asian authors in order to allow for a comparison of the emergence, the treatment, or the absence of the literary question of the animal in both cultural spheres.

In this article, I would like to show how literature broaches what philosophers Catherine and Raphaël Larrère call the contemporary

objectification (“réification” in French)<sup>2)</sup> of animals. This paper will work towards an understanding of the linguistic processes written works use to address the relationship between animal suffering and dehumanization, and the end of the millennial-long link between domestication and human evolution.

## II. A Literary Tradition

The peak in pollution in France and Korea in the Spring of 2014 was the direct result of several different factors. We know that the gas produced by factory farming is the major cause of the greenhouse effect. On the one hand, this phenomenon is a consequence of chemical fertilizers and deforestation brought on by the enormous amount of food required to nourish billions of livestock animals; on the other hand, it is caused by the incredibly poor living conditions of these animals digesting food they are not naturally programmed to eat.

The aforementioned themes have an important literary tradition in the United States and in Europe. In the first half of the century, Upton Sinclair (*The Jungle*, 1906), Alfred Döblin (*Berlin Alexanderplatz*, 1929) and Georges Duhamel (*Scènes de la vie future – America, The Menace: Scenes from the Life of the Future –*, 1930) took up the issue of assembly lines in slaughterhouses and the overall transformation of the living being into food for mass consumption. They wrote significant social novels presenting a humanity that loses itself because “the same goes for man’s life as it does

---

2) Catherine and Raphaël Larrère, “Actualité de l’animal-machine” (“Updating the Animal-Machine”). *Sens public* (20 septembre 2004), 12. Online.

for the life of a livestock animal: when one dies, the other dies as well<sup>3</sup>)” (Döblin). That is to say, the way in which a man raises and slaughters animals has an effect on the way he treats his own humanity: “As the flanks are so atrociously lifted, a man helps the beast to die. [...] He pounces on the beast, on the body, on both legs, standing over it, making it flow, pushing on the entrails, rising and falling, the blood must come out faster<sup>4</sup>)”(Döblin). (“venir en aide”, here translated as “helping the beast to die” actually means “to kill atrociously”: the language loses its original point of reference). Humanists of the nineteenth and early twentieth century had no shame using this style of discourse: Michelet, Hugo, Schœlcher, Zola, Pergaud and many others have understood that a general concern for the living reinforces a more specific concern for man. They have also seen how assembly line food factory workers are just part of the herd of animals, even if they are the killers. *The Jungle* caused such a scandal at the time that the U.S. President, Theodore Roosevelt, implemented reforms to ensure factory workers’ well-being. Although they were fundamentally inadequate and animals were not directly involved, they reflect a time when literature could still change society. Although this time has passed, it is clear that a number of contemporary writers still have faith in the power of words; in his 1994 satirical novel *What a Carve Up!*, for example, Jonathan Coe imagines an agro-food industry magnate slaughtered like the animals in her own factories.

But do not believe that those who rhyme animality and narrativity

---

3) Alfred Döblin, *Berlin Alexanderplatz. Histoire de Franz Biberkopf (Berlin Alexanderplatz: The Story of Franz Biberkopf)* [1929]. Trans. Olivier Le Lay. Paris: Gallimard, « Folio », 2009, 185.

4) *Ibid.*, 193-194.

wallow in pathos; a whole section of modern and contemporary literature is mesmerized by the beauty and nobility of meat. That is to say, meat, not gristle<sup>5</sup>). The beast that once had a life, not a cybernetic machine whose performance has been optimized for financial gains. The animal that is ritually sacrificed, not cattle slaughtered en masse to protect the agro-food industry. Both the erotic 1988 novel *The Butcher* by Alina Reyes and the philosophical 2012 text *Comme une bête* (which could be translated as “Like a Beast”) by Joy Sorman glorify the aesthetics of meat and highlight the simultaneously marvelous and strange link between human and animal flesh. Today, however, the industrial and scientific aspects of the anthropozoological divide jeopardize this link, that is, the link between human and animal flesh, and breed trouble and disorder in animal – and human – identities. (I am borrowing the term “trouble” here from Judith Butler, who uses it in a positive sense in regard to gender in her seminal book *Gender Trouble*<sup>6</sup>), published in 1990). Indeed, this community of men and animals has been forming since the implementation of domestication in the Neolithic period; while domestication has undoubtedly contributed to human evolution<sup>7</sup>), in less than a century, the entire structure has collapsed. This collapse affects not only the bodies of animals and of men, but also

---

5) Cf. Fabrice Nicolino, *Bidoche. L'industrie de la viande menace le monde (Gristle. The Meat Industry Threatens the World)* [2009]. Arles: Actes sud, “Babel”, 2010.

6) *Trouble dans le genre. Pour un féminisme de la subversion (Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity)*, 1990). Trans: Cynthia Kraus. Paris: La Découverte, 2005.

7) Cf. Catherine and Raphaël Larrère, “L’animal, machine à produire: la rupture du contrat domestique”, *Les animaux d’élevage ont-ils droit au bien-être?* (“The Animal: a Machine to Produce: The Rupture of a Domestic Agreement”, *Do Livestock Animals have a Right to Well-Being?*). Dir: Florence Burgat and Robert Dantzer. Éditions de l’INRA, 2001, 9-24. For a clear application of this theory, see Jonathan Safran Foer, “The First Problem” and “The Myth of the Myth”, *Eating Animals*, New York: Back Bay Books, 2009, 99-100.

language itself, seen most visibly through the linguistic standardization of naming animals. This anthropozoological divide may have had its epistemological foundations in philosophy, stemming from the Cartesian period, but it has now become a major ideological challenge of the agro-food industry's rhetoric. The American novelist Jonathan Safran Foer's ability to write fiction was so overwhelmed by society's hubris that he became an essayist in his book *Eating Animals*. Later, we will see how he was required to invent a new layout and use an updated typography in order for him to appropriately reflect the excess of biopower.

Without taking into account all the nonfiction writings such as essays or investigative reports, nearly every year, France produces a novel or novella treating one of the following subjects: the unspeakable sufferings that humans inflict on other species, "Industry" professionals' negligence, and the need to "reinvent the [broken] link"<sup>8)</sup> ("reinventing the link" is the subtitle of a work by the zoological technician and sociologist Jocelyne Porcher, who works at the INRA, the French National Institute for Agronomical Research). A non-exhaustive list of such texts may include: Joël Egloff, *L'Étourdissement* (*Stunning*; in French, "étourdissement" also means "thoughtless", "daft", "jolly", "light-headed", "featherbrained", etc.), 2005; Sylvain Tesson, "Les porcs", *Une vie à coucher dehors* ("The Pigs", *A Lifetime of Sleeping Outside*), 2009; Olivia Rosenthal, *Que font les rennes après Noël?* (*What Do Reindeer Do After Christmas?*), 2010 ; Jean-Christophe Bailly, "Du côté des bêtes", *Le Dépaysement. Voyages en France* ("On the Animal Side", *Disorientation. Travels in France*), 2011 ;

---

8) Jocelyne Porcher, *Éleveurs et animaux. Réinventer le lien* (*Farmers and animals. Reinventing the link*). Paris: PUF, "Partages du savoir", 2002.

Joy Sorman, *Comme une bête (Like a Beast)*, 2012 ; Isabelle Sorente, *180 jours (180 Days)*, 2013 ... The common point of all these works is the ability to articulate what we make the “animal part”<sup>9)</sup> of our humanity undergo, *through* what we make animals undergo – *through* what happens when animals in so-called “Tie Stalls” are cut from what they have, until recently, shared with us: the arche<sup>10)</sup> – the ground, the Earth, the primordial covenant (remember that “arche” in Ancient Greek means “beginning”, “origin”, or “first cause”).

I will now show by what stylistic and graphic means written works may use to express our multiple ways of fashioning our dwelling, our oikos, our home. Up until recently, social phenomena such as domestication, livestock farming, slaughtering, cooking, the preservation of species in zoos, and animal experiments in scientific laboratories were “minor” or non-existent topics. In previous works, the presence of these themes is marginal or allegorical (such as the feast symbolizing social decay in Zola). However, these social phenomena have recently become legitimate literary motifs, pretexts for structuring a work, symbols of the disruption of everyday language and opportunities to renew the forms and performativity of poetic language. In this article, I will focus mainly on the latter, concentrating on the processes regarding enumerations, ellipses, collages of texts, innovations in typographies, and a mixture of discursive genres.

---

9) Yves Bichet, *La Part animale (The Animal Part)*. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

10) Cf. Edmund Husserl, “L’archè-originaire Terre ne se meut pas. Recherches fondamentales sur l’origine phénoménologique de la spatialité de la nature” [1934], *La Terre ne se meut pas*, traduit de l’allemand et présenté par Didier Frank, Jean-François Lavigne et Dominique Pradelle, Paris: Minuit, 1989 (“Foundational Investigations of the Phenomenological Origin of the Spatiality of Nature: The Originary Ark, The Earth, Does Not Move?”. Trans. Frederick Kersten. Eds.: Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston, *Husserl: Shorter Works*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981, 213-221).

### III. Trouble in domestication, trouble in designation

Mad cow disease, scrapie, and the avian flu are harsh realities that show that we are in the era of globalization. They are also an illustration of strange acts of magic, or rather, borrowing a phrase from Jonathan Safran Foer, of “wizardry”.<sup>11)</sup> Today, the food industry uses language like a magic wand, as words are used to describe fictional or inappropriate referents: horses turn into beef (I am referring France’s 2013 scandal in which the company Spanghero transformed Romanian horsemeat into frozen food labeled “pure beef”); cattle are made into cannibals, then transformed into smoke (here, I am referring to bovine spongiform encephalopathy, the result of a meat diet fed to Britain’s cattle, and the country’s eradication of its herd of livestock, starting in 1996); rare wild ducks and other low-grade fowl (not the billions of chickens on modern farms) are accused of spreading global pandemics. As for the researchers working in scientific laboratories or zoos, they also continue to transform reality through a falsification of language that can only be noticed by specialists of the proper and precise word: writers.

Indeed, animals today undergo an incredible genetic metamorphosis and become chimeras that even Ancient, Homeric, or Ovidian mythology could not have imagined. It is, therefore, appropriate that the first page of *What do reindeer do after Christmas?* by Olivia Rosenthal begins with a list of names of animals that Adam could not have said at the beginning of Genesis. And for good reason: God did not create these animals.

---

11) Jonathan Safran Foer, *op. cit.*, 109.

Ligers, leopons, pumpards, jaglions, tignons, liards, leonards are not only rare words but also beings of flesh and blood, born in animal facilities under the surveillance and aid of researchers committed to assuring the survival of large predators.<sup>12)</sup>

This quote establishes what will constitute one of the major themes of the novel – our relationship to animals and our identity today – even though it is not easy for a writer to know what exactly an animal is nowadays: it may prove to be difficult to imagine a world of a caged, bottle-fed jaglion, or that of a python in an apartment like in *Gros-Câlin* (which could be translated as “Big Hug”) by Émile Ajar, published in 1974<sup>13)</sup>. Comically, and perhaps to stress the bizarre aspect of these infertile hybrids “invented” by man, Olivia Rosenthal includes a name (“léonard”) that does not exist in order to characterize a hybrid that does exist, the “lepjag” (“léguar” in French), the offspring of a male leopard and a female jaguar.

As you can see, novels continue to revolve around the *ontological* problem of animal: Éric Chevillard’s *Palafox* from 1990 and Marie Darrieussecq’s *Le Musée de la mer* (*Sea Museum*) from 2009 both create hybrid characters that oscillate between different species that are constantly transforming. It has been quite a while since the animal has been seen as an enigma in the West. (I do not know how it is in Asia, but in the West, one of the explanations for this is that the most visible part of our culture is built upon the Judeo-Christian and philosophical break with the animal.)

---

12) Olivia Rosenthal, *Que font les rennes après Noël? (What Do Reindeer Do After Christmas?)*. Paris: Verticales, 2010, 13.

13) See Romain Gary, *Gros-Câlin (Big Hug)*. Paris: Mercure de France, 1974, 31, wherein the lovesick protagonist projects his tenderness on his python, although the latter has but one desire: to strangle and devour.

However, the more contemporary texts no longer discuss the enigma once provoked by the animal's regard, its evasive nature, its wilderness, or the Open; nor does this enigma exist in the same way it had been presented to us in *Moby Dick* by Herman Melville, *La Dernière Harde (The Last Herd)* by Maurice Genevoix, *Le Lion (The Lion)* by Joseph Kessel, *Les Bêtes (Beasts)* by Pierre Gascar, or Rilke's *Duino Elegies*.

The problem today is that authors feel they can no longer readily accomplish this once simple act: that is, intuitively and naturally recognizing what an animal is. We can identify two main reasons for this change. The first reason, and I will come back to this point later, is that animals were removed from their territories that had been specifically tailored to their unique species in every aspect<sup>14)</sup> (I am referring to the analyses of Jakob von Uexküll, Gilles Deleuze and Maurice Merleau-Ponty). The second is that the animal that has been chimerized and standardized for our consumerist or scientific needs can no longer offer a new openness to the world. The trying books *La Part animale (The Animal Part)* by Yves Bichet and *180 jours (180 Days)* by Isabelle Sorente ("180 days is the time between the birth of a pig and its death in the slaughterhouse"<sup>15)</sup>) both pose the questions: what kind of "openness" is present when one pig or obese turkey is picked out among hundreds of others to be masturbated by a human? Or when a rooster becomes a "rapist" and a female-killer because of the agro-food industry's biological selection?<sup>16)</sup> If the animal is so

---

14) This specific link to the territory is not contradictory to the animals' ability to invent new modes of relation to it.

15) Isabelle Sorente, *180 jours (180 Days)*. Paris: Éditions Jean-Claude Lattès, 2013. Book jacket.

16) This discusses the "secondary effect of *selecting a unique characteristic*, which consists of cross-breeding one or two desirable traits in chickens." (Grandin, Temple. *L'Interprète*

literary today, it is likely due to its disappearance, its uniformization, or its tragic and grotesque metamorphoses that transform it into an object of multiple and contradictory discourse, an object that is verbal and babelian, signifying an unfathomable referent. Literature seizes these camouflaging words and tries to return performativity and accuracy to language.

The implication is therefore that the ellipsis and the litote parasitize the very definition of what is or is not alive. In factory farming as well as biological experimentation, “being alive” does not automatically mean “living”. The breeder in *Animal Part*, eventually “looks at turkeys in the same way one watches an ordinary row of umbrellas<sup>17)</sup>” – these turkeys are not living beings, but examples of an industrial product with a label, a brand. “The Douglas Turkey” was created using “international research” to be “fully conformed to consumer demand<sup>18)</sup>”. It could then be presented on platters for Christmas, “a tuft of lousy feathers stuck to the back of it, certified ‘farm-fresh<sup>19)</sup>’”. Even our phenomenological intuition of what a turkey is – at one time, considered to be a very beautiful bird – is destined to disappear. One of the characters in the novel dreams of dedicating “an experimental unit to fowl without lousy feathers<sup>20)</sup>”, as the creation of such plumage absorbs thirty percent of the allocation of protein.

The fusion of discourses and the intersection of genres are also major processes underlying the objectification of the living. Olivia Rosenthal includes extracts from eyewitness testimonies or legal documents in her

---

*des animaux* (*Animals in Translation*). Paris: Odile Jacob, 2006, 87); as she logically clarifies, “if, in nature, roosters were to kill hens, there would be no chicks”, 85.

17) Yves Bichet, *La Part animale* (*The Animal Part*). Paris: Gallimard, 1994, 52.

18) *Ibid.*, 20.

19) *Ibid.*, 166.

20) *Ibid.*, 71.

novel, alternating them with completely fictional paragraphs. A neutral voice therefore notes that,

in regulatory and scientific vocabulary, “manipulated product”, “supply”, or “hardware” can indicate manufactured objects as well as living beings that have been reduced to the status of guinea pigs<sup>21)</sup>

and also that the French League for animal rights is advocating for animals to no longer be “mentioned in the classical category of ‘material’ but to be integrated into a new sector called ‘biological models’<sup>22)</sup>”. Finally, similar to the point in *180 jours* when Isabelle Sorente broaches the subject of castration<sup>23)</sup>, she informs the reader that tail docking is an “intervention” that “contributes to the so-called ‘care of the piglets’<sup>24)</sup>”. For my last example, I will turn your attention to American Jonathan Safran Foer, who, in his text *Eating animals*, combines survey, fiction, and testimony to tackle the issue of factory farming. He takes all players into account, giving voice to the edifying discourse of food industry tycoons, to an animal welfare defense lawyer, to a traditional farmer (there are less than 1% left in the United States), and of course to his own ideas. These voices are often differentiated by an intentional use of italics, shown in his transcript of American Frank Reese’s testimony, the account of “the Last Poultry Farmer”<sup>25)</sup>. This author also uses typographical resources to support his argument. He reproduces page after page of “Influence/Speechlessness”,

---

21) Olivia Rosenthal, *op. cit.*, 138.

22) *Ibid.*, 139-140.

23) *180 jours*, *cit.*, 236.

24) *Que font les rennes après Noël ?*, *cit.*, 182.

25) Jonathan Safran Foer, *op. cit.*, 110.

playing with the several connotations of “influence” (“authority”, “domination”, “mastership”, but also “influenza”, “disease”), in order to show readers that pandemics like the Spanish flu of 1918, phenomena directly linked to the way in which we raise animals, pose a major threat to society and that there is a certain taboo around this issue (a caption specifies that “on average, Americans eat the equivalent of 21,000 entire animals in a lifetime – one animal for every letter on the last five pages”<sup>26</sup>). Finally, to signify the “war”<sup>27</sup> humans have waged on fish, there is a drawing of fishing line as tangled as our actions, stating “All or Nothing or Something else,” with the caption reading, “Modern industrial fishing lines can be as long as 75 miles – the same distance as from sea level to space.”<sup>28</sup>)

These approaches that reformulate the genre of the novel by reconnecting itself to other discursive genres are what allow authors to give shape to that which has no natural form: the animal dwelling. The zookeeper in *What Do Reindeer Do After Christmas?* notes that an animal’s “resting” area, no longer called a “cage”, must be “fitted with either single bars of a maximum spacing of 7 cm, or an inflexible mesh screen 25 x 15 cm, or a mesh grid of 10 x 10 cm.”<sup>29</sup> As for Isabelle Sorente in *180 Days*, we are reminded that “the ratios of the European Commission on animal welfare set a minimum of 0.65 square meters per pig in their final phase. [...] Space shrinks as they fatten”<sup>30</sup>). The two novelists’ decision to keep the figures encrypted in their administrative brutality emphasizes precisely that which inhibits the animal from being an animal; a point that

---

26) *Ibid.*, 121.

27) *Ibid.*, 33.

28) *Ibid.*, 19.

29) Olivia Rosenthal, *op. cit.*, 74-75.

30) *180 jours*, *cit.*, 325.

writer-hunters have observed for centuries. A point that stresses the same idea that philosopher Jean-Christophe Bailly brings to light in *Le Versant animal (The Animal Side)*<sup>31</sup>: that the animal is not only a living being, but being whose life is dependent on its ability to elude and feign – elusive and feigning animals were perhaps at the root of the invention of narrative and human writing, according to Carlo Ginzburg<sup>32</sup>). But that's another story ...

#### IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, linguistic objectification of the living caused by the speeches and guilty silence of the agro-food industry wreak havoc on language, and therefore on literature. Our contemporary relationship to animals is no longer a “domestication”, seeing as etymologically, *domus* in Latin refers to the area of the household, including humans and pets or farm animals. Instead, the current domestication not only destroys animal's ethological modes of existence, but, through a process of recovery revenge all too familiar to anthropologists<sup>33</sup>), dehumanizes mankind and the language that characterizes his condition. When animals become “meat

---

31) Jean-Christophe Bailly, *Le Versant animal (The Animal Side)*, translated by Catherine Porter. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011). Paris: Bayard, 2007.

32) The relationship between hunting and the invention of writing and narration is developed by Carlo Ginzburg, “Signes, traces, pistes. Racines d'un paradigme de l'indice”. *Le Débat*, 6 (novembre 1980), 3-44. “Clues: Roots of a Scientific Paradigm”. *Theory and Society* 7.3 (1979), 273-288. Online.

33) For more on the archaic idea of an animal vengeance on men through means of domestication, see Frédéric Keck, *Un monde grippé (A World Seized by the Flu)*. Paris: Flammarion, 2010, 36 and 70.

machines”, the only thing that “breathes” is the “tool” with a capital T<sup>34</sup>): this is the final image at the end of Isabelle Sorrente’s novel *180 Days* as well as the end of the previously clear relationship between animality and the breath (“*anima*” in Latin) of life.

Translated from French by Miranda Mueller

[Key words] animal, biopower, factory farming, novel, suffering

#### [References]

“Animots” Project: <http://animots.hypotheses.org/>

Bailly, Jean-Christophe, *Le Versant animal (The Animal Side)*, translated by Catherine Porter. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011). Paris: Bayard, 2007.

Bailly, Jean-Christophe, *Le Dépaysement. Voyages en France (Disorientation. Travels in France)*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2011.

Bichet, Yves, *La Part animale (The Animal Part)*. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

Butler, Judith, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Chevillard, Éric, *Palafox*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1990.

Coe, Jonathan, *What a Carve Up!* New York: Viking Press, 1994.

Colette, *La chatte*, Paris, Grasset, 1933.

Darrieussecq, Marie, *Le Musée de la mer (Sea Museum)*. Paris: Éditions

---

34) Last sentence of *180 jours*, cit., 62 and 460.

- P.O.L, 2009.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix. *Mille Plateaux (A Thousand Plateaus)*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1980.
- Derrida, Jacques, *L'Animal que donc je suis*. Ed. Marie-Louise Mallet. Paris: Galilée, 2006 (*The Animal that therefore I am*. Ed. Marie-Louise Mallet. Trans. David Wills. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008).
- Döblin, Alfred, *Berlin Alexanderplatz. Histoire de Franz Biberkopf (Berlin Alexanderplatz: The Story of Franz Biberkopf)* [1929]. Trans. Olivier Le Lay. Paris: Gallimard, « Folio », 2009.
- Duhamel, Georges, *Scènes de la vie future (America, The Menace: Scenes from the Life of the Future)*. Paris: Mercure de France, 1930.
- Egloff, Joël, *L'Étourdissement (Stunning)*. Paris: Éditions Buchet-Chastel, 2005.
- Gary, Romain, *Gros-Câlin (Big Hug)*. Paris: Mercure de France, 1974.
- Gascar, Pierre, *Les Bêtes (Beasts)*. Paris: Gallimard, 1953.
- Genevoix, Maurice, *La Dernière Harde (The Last Herd)*. Paris: Flammarion, 1938.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. “Signes, traces, pistes. Racines d’un paradigme de l’indice”. *Le Débat*, 6 (novembre 1980), 3-44. “Clues: Roots of a Scientific Paradigm”. *Theory and Society* 7.3 (1979), 273-288. Online.
- Grandin, Temple, and Johnson, Catherine. *L'Interprète des animaux*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 2006. *Animals in Translation*. New York: Scribner, 2005.
- Husserl, Edmund, “L’archè-originaire Terre ne se meut pas. Recherches fondamentales sur l’origine phénoménologique de la spatialité de la nature” [1934], *La Terre ne se meut pas*, traduit de l’allemand et présenté par Didier Frank, Jean-François Lavigne et Dominique Pradelle, Paris: Minuit, 1989 (“Foundational Investigations

- of the Phenomenological Origin of the Spatiality of Nature: The Originary Ark, The Earth, Does Not Move”. Trans. Frederick Kersten. Eds.: Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston, *Husserl: Shorter Works*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981, 213-221).
- Keck, Frédéric, *Un monde grippé (A World Seized by the Flu)*. Paris: Flammarion, 2010.
- Kessel, Joseph, *Le Lion (The Lion)*. Paris: Gallimard, 1958.
- Larrère, Catherine and Raphaël, “L’animal, machine à produire: la rupture du contrat domestique”, *Les animaux d’élevage ont-ils droit au bien-être?* (“The Animal: a Machine to Produce: The Rupture of a Domestic Agreement”, *Do Livestock Animals have a Right to Well-Being?*). Eds.: Florence Burgat and Robert Dantzer. Éditions de l’INRA, 2001, 9-24.
- Larrère, Catherine and Raphaël, “Actualité de l’animal-machine” (“Updating the Animal-Machine”). *Sens public* (20 septembre 2004). Online.
- Melville, Herman, *Moby-Dick; or, The Whale*. New York: Harper and Brothers; London: Richard Bentley, 1851.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, *La Nature. Notes. Cours du Collège de France (The Concept of Nature. Lectures at the Collège de France)*. Dominique Séglaud ed. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, “Traces écrites”, 1995.
- Nicolino, Fabrice, *Bidoche. L’industrie de la viande menace le monde (Gristle. The Meat Industry Threatens the World)* [2009]. Arles: Actes sud, “Babel”, 2010.
- Porcher, Jocelyne, *Éleveurs et animaux. Réinventer le lien (Farmers and animals. Reinventing the link)*. Paris: PUF, “Partages du savoir”, 2002.
- Reyes, Alina, *Le Boucher*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1988.

- Rilke, Rainer Maria, *Duineser Elegien (Duino Elegies)*. Insel Verlag: Leipzig, 1923.
- Rosenthal, Olivia, *Que font les rennes après Noël? (What Do Reindeer Do After Christmas?)*. Paris: Verticales, 2010.
- Safran Foer, Jonathan, *Eating Animals*. New York: Back Bay Books, 2009.
- Simon, Anne, “French Literary Studies and The Animal Question: A Contemporary Perspective”, *Through the Cultural Prism: Thinking about Animals from a French and Francophone Perspective*. Louisa Mackenzie and Stéphanie Posthumus eds.: Michigan Press, 2014.
- Sinclair, Upton, *The Jungle*. New York: Doubleday, Jabber, and Co, 1906.
- Sorrente, Isabelle, *180 jours (180 Days)*. Paris: Éditions Jean-Claude Lattès, 2013.
- Sorman, Joy, *Comme une bête (Like a Beast)*. Paris: Gallimard, 2012.
- Tesson, Sylvain, “Les porcs”, *Une vie à coucher dehors (“The Pigs”, A Lifetime of Sleeping Outside)*. Paris: Gallimard, 2009.
- Uexküll, Jakob von, *Milieu animal et milieu humain (A Foray Into the Worlds of Animals and Humans)* [1934]. Trans. Charles-Martin Fréville. Paris: Rivages, 2010.

[Abstract]

## Biopower and the Contemporary Novel: Writing the Objectification of the Animal

Anne Simon (CNRS / EHESS)

The goal of my article is to show how literary writing tackles the question, as previously developed in philosophy, of biopower and the contemporary objectification of animals. It will demonstrate the linguistic tools that literary works employ to discuss the relationship between animal suffering and dehumanization as well as the end of the multi-millennia link between domestication and human evolution.

These themes have a great literary tradition in the United States and in Europe, seen through social and political novels written by Upton Sinclair, Georges Duhamel, and Alfred Döblin who, in the first half of the century, turn their focus to assembly line slaughterhouses and the transformation of the living into food for mass consumption; French Humanists of the 19th century, from Victor Hugo to Émile Zola, have also tackled this question. Contemporary novelists take note of a radicalization of the anthropozoological divide and of a disappearance of the community that men and animals have been forming since the Neolithic period. They suggest that this collapse affects not only the body of animals and men, but also language itself, seen most prominently through linguistic standardization and the naming of animals. Industrial farming is thus a social phenomenon that has become a legitimate literary motif and an indicator of a disturbance of everyday language and identities. Under this pretext, we will examine which stylistic and typographical procedures authors use when attempting to restore precision and performativity to language.

[Key words] animal, biopower, factory farming, novel, suffering

논문접수일: 2014.11.10 / 논문심사일: 2014.11.13 / 게재확정일: 2014.12.10

[저자연락처] [simon.a@orange.fr](mailto:simon.a@orange.fr)

