Introducing South Asian Governmentalities

<Deana Heath and Stephen Legg

I write things which seem usable. In a word, usable in a different way, by different people, *in different countries in certain cases*. Thus, if I analyse something such as madness or power and that serves some purpose, then that’s enough, that’s why I write. If someone uses what I write differently then that’s not disagreeable to me, and even if he [*sic*] uses it *in another context* for something else, then I am quite happy.

(Foucault 1978 [2013], 111 emphasis added)

In his now classic lecture at the Collège de France on February 1, 1978, Foucault examined governmentality as a type of power, discussed the pre-eminence of governmental power over time, and analysed the governmentalisation of the state. He also outlined what he saw as three main types of government, which were related to different registers: that of self-government, which was bound up with morality; that of governing a family, which was a matter of economy; and that of ruling the state, which was a political concern (Foucault 2007, 94). All of these encompassed what Foucault termed ‘governmentality’. A form of power ascendant in Europe beginning in the sixteenth century, though with much older antecedents, governmentality emerged in apparatuses that combined sovereign, disciplinary and governmental power, each of which in isolation had their own ends: for sovereignty, submission to the law; for discipline, to normalise the behaviour of individuals; and for government to employ tactics that alter individual behaviour in order to manage populations (Foucault, 98-99).

While there has been a tendency among Foucauldian scholars to examine each of these forms of power in isolation, as Foucault made clear in his *Security, Territory, Population* lecture series (2007), it was instead possible to ‘speak of a sovereign governmentality, a disciplinary governmentality or equally a governmentality that was dominated by the new *dispositif* of power with which that year’s lectures were concerned, security’ (Brown 2014, 7-8). Enacted through institutions (such as the family or school), discourses (such as medicine or criminal justice), and procedures and analyses (such as surveys and statistics), the aim of governmentality is to maintain a healthy and productive population. Although Foucault analysed many facets of what he termed ‘modern’ power over the course of his writings and lecture series – not all of which, notably, he tied effectively together (Elden 2016; Dean 2013; also Heath, this volume) – governmentality remained the central focus of his later work, and came to include a focus on conduct, liberalism, truth-telling, and the subject of critique (Foucault 2008).

Scholars of South Asia have, for over 30 years, been at the forefront of global efforts to test and apply Foucault’s research to new places and periods. This volume aims to further broaden the debate on governmentality in South Asia through, in part, a critical engagement with the lecture series that Foucault gave at the Collège de France from 1971 until his death in 1984. Over the last decade almost all of these have been published in English translation and they shed important new light on the intellectual genealogy of governmentality as a concept and of the operation of governmentalities in practise. The lectures also reveal Foucault’s thinking on issues that he has been widely critiqued for failing to consider, not least the ethics of self-formation, traditions of critique as new ways to approach the hackneyed question of ‘resistance’, and trans-historical practises of colonialism.

Existing research has positioned Foucault within postcolonial studies in various ways. Some works explore the significance of colonial and post-colonial worlds in Foucault’s biography (Young 2001, 395-411). Others analyse the constitution of Foucault’s historical subjects by colonial and imperial forces, and detect traces of these historical realities in Foucault’s theories (Stoler 1995), while another approach (including most of the chapters in this volume) is to apply and adapt Foucault’s mostly ‘European’ work to ‘non-European’ contexts and, in so doing, show how ‘European’ governmentalities were always a product of colonial and imperial entanglements.

Stuart Elden (2017, 8) has reminded us that Foucault moved to Tunisia in 1966 on a three-year secondment; it was here that he was politicised by student activism in March 1968 not, like many French academics, on the streets of Paris in May 1968. Indeed, Foucault’s ‘colonial’ world was a French world, focused on North Africa and South-East Asia, rather than the geographical foci of much Anglophone postcolonial scholarship. Incidents in these arenas continued to charge his political writings, such as a piece on Vietnamese refugees from 1979. Here Foucault (1979 [2015]) equated the refugee situation to the continual ‘occupation’ of Vietnam for over a century by French, Japanese, and American military powers, which had led to internal tensions and divisions within the broader post-colonial context of recently decolonised countries retaining the state boundaries and apparatuses of their colonial masters. In regard to the many Jews who had fled Nazi Germany and been refused sanctuary in other European countries, Foucault asked: ‘Forty years have passed since, and can we again send 100,000 people to their deaths?’

While this issue did not figure in Foucault’s published work, the lecture courses have added further incremental evidence that the colonial world did, on occasion, enter into Foucault’s world view. During a lecture in Rio in 1973, for instance, he alluded to the process through which ‘. . . Europe violently imposed its dominion on the entire surface of the world’ (Foucault 1973 [2001], 40). However, as he revisited his earlier interests in madness and regulation during his mid-1970s turn to studying productive power, he discussed colonial contexts as sites not just of violent domination but of ‘disciplinary microcosms’, as in the case of Jesuits in South America (Elden, 2017, 124). He described seventeenth century Guarani republics in Paraguay as full disciplinary regimes, which included: statutory schemas of working hours, meal times, and rest time; permanent supervision through dwellings without window shutters that were patrolled day and night; and individualisation through allotting accommodation to people, not families (also see Foucault 2006, 69, 106, 108). The model and terminology of colonialism was then used by Foucault, with and through those he was analysing in the nineteenth century, to study practises back in Europe itself. While he did not pursue these examples at length, Foucault did, tantalisingly, suggest that they could well have been as central to his exploration of discipline and docile bodies as the modern institutional spaces we know of. As he observed in *Discipline and Punish,* ’I shall choose examples from the military, medical, educational and industrial institutions. Other examples might have been taken from colonization, slavery and child rearing’ (Foucault 1977, 314).

After the shift from interests in discipline to the assorted interpretative concepts of governmentality, Foucault’s references to colonial topics and themes became less regular, but did not die out. He considered the Norman Conquest of England, for example, in terms of race and colonisation (Foucault 2003, 100), as well as the ‘boomerang’ effect of colonial experiences back in the metropole (see Legg 2007b). He launched the *History of Sexuality* project with a (much criticised) summoning of the *ars erotica* (erotic art) of the East (Foucault 1976 [1979], 57), while his governmentality project alluded to the pastoral tradition of the East (taking in Egypt, Assyria, Mesopotamia and the Hebrews). As Stephen Legg argues in his analysis of two of the lecture series, Foucault’s exploration of the relationship between empires, the formation of subjectivities and the politics of truth offers useful tools with which to re-analyse the governmentalities of colonial and post-colonial India.

## **From discourse and discipline to governmentality and ethics**

Little of this work had been available to, or has since been used by, scholars of South Asia, who were amongst the first to take up Foucault’s work and tailor it to the histories and geographies of colonial and post-colonial worlds. The object of this volume is decidedly *not* to unearth the true, authentic, or essential Foucault, as buried in the texts and footnotes of his lectures. Nor is it to suggest that existing South Asian Foucauldian scholarship has in some way been wrong or under-informed. Rather, we hope to engage newly translated material and ongoing (re)interpretations of Foucault’s work, suggest new avenues of research, and make available for a wider audience the astonishing richness of work in and on South Asia that Foucault has inspired. Different genres of Foucault’s work have been used by some of the most influential strands of South Asian scholarship, from work on governmentality and the effects of bureaucratic classifications, to work on subjugated knowledges and subalternity, to more textual work on identity and nationalist discourse.

 Indeed, the ‘Foucauldian turn’ in South Asia began much earlier than in many other regions (including Europe, claims Samaddar 2013). It was, initially, motivated by shifts that had emerged by the early 1980s in the writing of national histories generated by the emergence of ‘history from below’ and the conception of nations as ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson 1983). This spurred an interest in how popular insurgency and working-class and indigenous cultures shaped nationalist movements, in contrast to the traditional focus on the role of the state and elite politics – a shift that meant, as David Ludden puts it, that ‘Nations and states were separating like oil and water’ (Ludden 2002, 8). Motivated by studies of national and global issues and anxieties, for South Asia scholars issues such as why nationalism had generated revolution in South-East Asia (in countries such as China and Vietnam) but not India or how oppressed peoples could seize political power had become pressing concerns.

The Subaltern Studies Collective sought to explore such concerns through examining peasant insurgency as autonomous from both elites and the state and generating a distinctly ‘South Asian’ model of subalternity. By the mid-1980s, the collective had evolved, incorporated new members and responded to critiques – about, for example, the group’s conception of colonialism as a single, homogenous structure of power, its binary understanding of power (between elites and subalterns) and its construction of the subaltern as what Rosalind O’Hanlon termed the ‘unitary self-constituting subject-agent of liberal-humanism’ (O’Hanlon 1984). It hereafter turned increasingly to scrutinising epistemologies, deconstructing the power of culture and discourse, re-envisioning the nature and possibilities of resistance, and analysing the nation in terms of fragments and diffuse moments. Foucault was central to this project (see, for e.g., Guha, 1985; Chatterjee, 1986, 1993).

But more than just a shift to new understandings of power and how it operated, the Foucauldian turn of subaltern studies also heralded a broader shift in South Asian studies to the analysis of colonial constructions of power, in particular to the nature of, as well as responses to, colonial modernity (Nandy 1983; Cohn 1987 and 1996; Niranjana and Sudhir 1993; Chakrabarty 2002). This Foucauldian turn generated analyses of a wide range of topics, including: colonial and indigenous discourses and texts (Viswanathan 1989; Haynes 1991; Irschick 1994; Chatterjee 1995; Naregal 2001); law, prisons and policing (Arnold 1986; Yang, 1986; Singha 1998); caste, communalism and religion (Pandey 1990; Dirks 2001); gender, sexuality and the body (Sarkar 2001; Vanita 2002; Mills and Sen 2004); medicine and science (Philip 2003); hegemony and dominance (Guha 1997; Singh 1998); the nature of colonial archives and the possibility of recovering the subject (Spivak 1988); and the writing of history (Chatterjee 1993; Schwarz 1997; Chakrabarty 2000; Rao, Shulman and Subramanyam 2003). South Asia scholars also began to consider the legacies of colonial power in South Asia, the nature of post-colonial modernities, and the creation of diasporic public spheres (Bhabha 1994; Appadurai 1996; Srivastava 1998; Puri 1999). Central to much of this scholarship that emerged between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s was a focus on discourse, particularly the subject-producing nature of colonial and elite indigenous discourses. The subjects thus produced, however, were fragmentary and elusive; they emerged between the ruptures and silences of discourse. As Gyan Prakash remarks, the aim of such an approach was not ‘to unmask dominant discourses but to explore their fault-lines, in order to provide different accounts, to describe histories revealed in the cracks of the colonial archaeology of knowledge’ (Prakash 2011, 87).

The focus on discourse met with considerable critique, at the root of which were concerns about the limitations of discursive analysis to reveal the nature of colonial power or its relationship to the history of global capitalism. A particular source of contention was the homogeneous model of colonialism thus produced; although much of the new scholarship on discourse focused on the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, colonialism emerged from such studies as a largely homogenous process. As Sugata Bose has observed, this amounted to ‘an argument about early colonialism that finds the roots of certain trends in the late pre-colonial period and a few buds of the full flower of colonialism that bloomed only in the late colonial period’ (Bose 2003, 136). Although some South Asia scholars had begun to address such concerns by extending their Foucauldian framework to engage with discipline and governmentality (see, for example, Kaviraj 1992; Chatterjee 1993; Appadurai 1993), as Nivedita Menon has revealed much of the early scholarship on South Asian governmentalities sought to revisit older debates about the impact of colonialism on identity formation in India (Menon 2009). While one school of thought held that technologies of governance introduced by the colonisers, such as the census, served to generate new, religion-bound understandings of community (Kaviraj 1997; see also Kaviraj 1992; Appadurai 1993; Chakrabarty 1995), for the other ‘the colonial state only took over and took further, existing ways of constituting the self’ (Menon 2009; see also Bayly 1994; Singha 2003; Guha 2003). Such a debate is, perhaps, more apocryphal than real, since scholars who hold the first position, rather than arguing that colonialism heralded the birth of modernity in South Asia, largely regard it as having introduced new technologies of governance, while the evidence put forward by those who hold the second position tends to undermine their argument by revealing the transformative nature of colonial modernity in South Asian identity-formation (Menon 2009). For Menon the root of the debate is differing ideas about the agency of indigenous communities in the face of colonial power, with the concerns of the ‘continuity’ school focusing on the ways in which the ‘rupture’ school valorise indigenous communities in opposition to the rationalist colonial state (Menon 2009). Sumit Sarkar illustrates the concerns of the latter in his contention that for the former ‘”The polemical target is no longer the state as related . . . to class rule, exploitation, and forms of surplus appropriation, but rather, the modern state as embodying Western (mainly rationalist) values – against which indigenous communities need to be valorized”’ (Sarkar 2003, 187; cited in Menon 2009).

Such a debate thus reveals not only the ongoing resonances of the Subaltern Studies project, but the need to think further about the subject-producing nature of governmentality and of resistance to such a form of power. According to the ‘continuity’ school, to posit the transformative nature of the colonial state deprives indigenous peoples of agency. But since it is impossible to escape power, the identities of both those who resisted or embraced the forms of classification created by the colonial state were shaped by colonial governmentality (Menon 2009; Foucault 1982). As David Scott argued in his seminal article on colonial governmentality, what is vital to explore is ‘*the nature of the terrain* available for the colonized to produce their responses’ to such a form of power (Scott 1995, 198, emphasis added). For Scott the question to ask was how did the colonised articulate their resistance to a form of power that aims not only to transform subjects but to compel them to transform (i.e. ‘improve’) themselves, and which both constructs and works through civil society? Answering such a question required paying attention to ‘the discontinuities *within* the colonial’ wrought by the emergence of different projects and configurations of colonial rule (Scott, 195, emphasis in original). This included understandings of the distinctiveness of colonial rule; while what Partha Chatterjee termed the ‘rule of colonial difference’ may, for Scott, have marked the particularity of colonial rule, it could not have operated the same way throughout the colonial era. For Scott (196), the key question about race is ‘when and through what kind of political rationality it becomes inserted into subject-constituting *social practises*, into the formation . . . of certain kinds of ‘raced’ subjectivities’. What needed to be elucidated, therefore, were the ‘historically constituted *complexes of knowledge/power* that give shape to colonial projects of political sovereignty’ (what Scott termed ‘political rationalities’); the *targets* of colonial power (namely the point of application of power, its objective, and the technologies it uses to achieve its aims); and the *field of operation* of colonial power (Scott, 193; emphasis added).

What Scott made clear, therefore, is that we cannot talk about governmentality in the singular. We need, instead, to delineate the multifarious governmentalities that have emerged in South Asia at different points of time, their targets, and the ways in which they were articulated and implemented. Moreover, Scott insisted, rather than elucidating the distinctiveness of colonial power, what was vital was to explore the emergence of ‘*modern* power in its colonial career’ (emphasis in original), namely of the advent of a form of power in colonial regimes ‘which was concerned above all with disabling old forms of life by systematically breaking down their conditions, and with constructing in their place new conditions so as to enable – indeed, so as to *oblige –* new forms of life to come into being’ (Scott, 193). According to Scott the distinctiveness of modern power is not its relation to capitalism, but ‘its *point of application*’, which is the ‘*conditions* in which [the] body is to live and define its life’ (Scott 199, emphasis in original). Such an approach placed new light on the differences between the forms of modern states that had emerged in Europe and the colonial state; since there was no such thing as ‘*the* colonial state’ what needed to be explored, instead, were the diverse political rationalities and configurations of power that emerged in colonial regimes at various points in time (Scott, 197, emphasis in original).

Since the publication of Scott’s article a growing body of scholarship has emerged that has analysed the political rationalities of colonial rule through exploring a range of colonial governmentalitising projects in fields such as the governmentalisation of the state (Prakash 1999; Kalpagam 2013; Saha 2013), law and punishment (Chatterjee 1999; Sen 2000; Hussain 2003; Birla 2008; Kolsky 2010; Brown 2014), medicine and science (Arnold 1993 and 2000; Prakash 1999), city planning and architecture (Glover 2007; Legg 2007a) and the environment (Sivaramakrishnan 1999). Scholars have also examined the subject-producing nature of colonial projects (Dube 1998; Dirks 2001; Seth 2007), and the emergence of indigenous governmentalising projects (Alter 2000; Gupta 2005; Heath 2010; Berger 2013). A rich body of scholarship has also emerged on post-colonial governmentalities (Sunder Rajan 2003; Zamindar 2007; Chatterjee 2011). While much of the early work on governmentality in South Asia was written by scholars based in South Asia and in South Asian diasporic locales (particularly North America), most of whom are historians and political scientists, the discussion of governmentality in South Asia has widened in terms both of subject matter and of the range of contributors and their areas of expertise. Their decision to use Foucault raises the never-absent questions of: epistemic violence; the power-knowledge relations of the global university system; and not ‘how do we de-centre Europe’ but ‘how did Europe affect other provinces’?

## **Eurocentrism**

Well before the birth of postcolonial or subaltern theory, South Asian thinkers, activists and politicians had been launching critiques of what we now call Eurocentrism (for some varients of this term, see Seth 2014). Sociologists such as Benoy Kumar Sarkar critically unpicked colonial reliance upon assumptions about Occidental Reason (see Goswami 2012), ‘economic nationalists’ criticised the operation of financial and monetary systems that centralised European exchange rates and coffers (Chandra 1969), while Gandhi famously attempted not only to criticise European civilisation, but to wean Indians from constituent and inherently European notions of self, in terms of gender as much as politics (Nandy 1983). It was in part, however, through analysing such achievements that postcolonial theory in general, and subaltern studies in particular, picked out the much finer and more insidious effects of Eurocentrism.

In the 1980s subaltern studies had exposed the general triumph of elite (colonial, nationalist and academic) over ‘other’ forms of knowledge in the colonial archive. The 1990s saw this argument both up-scaled, to consider trans-continental networks of European knowledge formation, and re-focused on the discipline of history writing. Dipesh Chakrabarty’s 2000 book *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* most emphatically stated this position by showing that Europe remained the sovereign subject of history writing while all other national or local histories remained variations on the master narrative of European History (Chakrabarty 2009 [2000], 27). Europe functions as a silent referent in at least three ways in these histories: first, the asymmetric ignorance in which non-Westerners must read Western history and theory while Westerners can remain ignorant of non-Western works; secondly, the lauding of non-Western scholars for applying the genres and theories of the West to the non-West; and, finally, the position of Europe as the theoretical subject of all histories, such that Indian history must be understood through the (failed) transitions of class and capital, freedom and democracy (Prakash 1994, 1484).

Chakrabarty’s reading draws upon a detailed engagement with Marx’s writings to find an alternative to the triumph of an all-homogenising History(1), in which History(2)s of surviving traditions and difference are vital to understanding modernity, capitalism and postcolonial India. He also, however, drew heavily on Foucault, in terms of the latter’s understanding of the regulatory role of the discipline of history, by using Foucault’s genealogical method and its attacks on historicism (Chakrabarty 2009 [2000], xiv), and, later, through his explications of the way in which Enlightment rationalism depended upon the modern state and its accompanying institutions (‘governmentality in Foucault’s terms’ Chakrabarty 2002, 32). The attack on Eurocentrism was, therefore, being primarily executed using the thought of white, European men. But this was Chakrabarty’s point: criticising European Enlightenment rationality did not require its rejection, but a tracing out of alternative histories and modes of knowledge within it.

A similar point had been made by Gayatri Spivak (indeed, Morris 2010, 10, suggests that Chakrabarty's project was an extension of Spivak's campaign to locate the silent anti-modern in world history). Spivak’s (2010 [1988]) still controversial chapter ‘Can the Subaltern Speak’ sought to expose the history of Europe as Subject as operating precisely within the work of thinkers who were attempting to dislodge the sovereign subject of history themselves (notably a conversation between Deleuze and Foucault, in Bouchard 1977, 205-217). While their work in terms of its emphasis on heterogeneity and the Other was heralded, Deleuze and Foucault were critiqued for invoking Maoists and ‘workers’ as undifferentiated and geopolitically unlocated subjects, summoned through occulusion to perform ideological work for the Western academic. Where is the individual within the Maoist or working subject here? Crowded out by Foucault’s geometric vision and interest in radiating powers, Spivak (2010 [1988], 241) suggests: ‘. . . that radiating point, animating an effectively heliocentric discourse, fills the empty place of the agent with the historical sun of theory, the Subject of Europe’. Having replaced the invividual with a subject, Foucault (along with Deleuze) was accused of then speaking on behalf of the oppressed through the pretence of crafting an academic space in which they could speak for themselves. Spivak had earlier suggested that no one had better analysed the representation of Others in relation to the power of the Self than Foucault, but that his failure was in thinking the oppressed could speak for themselves. Rather than attempting to save the masses, Spivak queried, ‘On the other hand, how about attempting to learn to speak in such a way that the masses will not regard as bullshit’ (see Adamson 1986 [1990], 56)?

This is not the place to engage Spivak’s sense of the ‘representational realism’ through which Foucault interpretated the worker as inhabiting a concrete realm awaiting theory and interpretation (although see Elden 2017, 129, on Foucault's learning through campaigns with, amongst others, prisoners). What is significant, however, is Spivak’s continued use of Foucault in her writings, despite these criticisms and Foucault’s suggested blindness to the role of imperialism in crafting the European micro-spaces of power he studied (Spivak 2010 [1988], 45). The previous year Spivak had hailed the ‘ . . . uncomfortable advent of Michel Foucault’ (Spivak 1987, 92) in subaltern studies, since his archaeological work had forced its authors to address the subject who was reporting or recording in the colonial archive, and to read history as one might read literature (also see Grosz 1990, 4-5, on the importance of Foucault to her thinking). She would later engage his governmentality works in trying to think of how contemporary bio-power was crafting a new subaltern (Spivak 2000, 326). Between these two pieces Spivak had justified her ongoing engagements with Foucault, in the preface to a collection of writings including two chapters using him, as such: ‘I have long held that in the arena of decolonization proper, the call to a complete boycott of co-called Western male theories is class-interested and dangerous. For me, the agenda has always been to stake out the theories’ limits, construcitvely to use them’ (Spivak 1993, x). Speaking of her engagement with Derrida, Freud and other white, male thinkers, Spivak has more broadly insisted that knowledge emerges across difference not through sameness, and that we must be brave enough to attempt not just to know but to criticise the Other (see Legg 2016).

What we can take, therefore, from these two bodies of work is that, firstly, thinking against Eurocentrism does not involve not using European (or even Eurocentric) thinkers and, secondly, that what *is* important is to be aware of Western theories’ limits, and to *use* them. The staking points of these limits could well be the aforementioned asymmetic ignorance of non-Western thought, the uncritical lauding of the export of Western theory, and the homogenisation of non-Western difference by the expansion of Western catageories of abstraction. We hope that the literature addressed in this introduction, and the authors collaborated with throughout, mark awareness of the first stake, and that the empirical richness and heterogeneity of the material covered in the chapters that follow addresses the third stake. This book, undeniably, marks the extension of a theory crafted primarily for the ‘West’ to the ‘non-West’ (which hopes to further expose the manufactured nature of the binary between the two). But we hope to do this in a manner that is historically aware of the imperial and colonial governmentalities that extended both the territory of European rationality in the past and the foundations for the utility of postcolonial governmentality theory today, while also acknolwedging that such a modern form of power was not entirely unique to Europe or the West, as Indrani Chatterjee suggests in her analysis of pastoral care in South Asia in this volume. The existence of aspects of such a form of power in South Asia is one of the many reasons why European governmentalities were translated and transformed in South Asia in endless ways, making South Asian governentaltiies irreducibly different from, if not unrecognisable to, their Western counterparts (which were also constituted, in insufficiently acknowleded ways, by them in turn – see Partha Chatterjee, this volume). The rest of this introduction will suggest some of the ways in which we might consider the differences of South Asian governmentalities, and how the following chapters address them.

# The Differences of South Asian Governmentalities

##  1. Before the British

 Following his 1978 lecture on governmentality Foucault went on to spend the rest of his lecturing and publishing life focusing almost entirely on the ancient, European world (see Legg, this volume). While there is growing evidence of Foucault’s thinking about the non-European world, he studiously refused to universalise governmentality and the subjective truth relations it produced. In terms of temporal delimitation, Scott (1995, 193) suggested that South Asian governmentalities were inaugurated by the insertion of Europe into the lives of colonial subjects. Can, therefore, we think of non-western, pre-colonial governmentalities, as Indrani Chatterjee proposes in this volume (also see Chatterjee, 2013), or even, as Spivak (2000, 329) suggested in passing, view the Marathas and Mughals as ‘proto-governmentalities’?

In the fullest overview to date of South Asian history viewed through a governmentality lens, Uma Kalpagam (2014) suggests that we can, but only through acknowledging the differences in terms of sovereignty and government between European (Christian), Hindu and Mughal (Muslim) political formations. As a contrast, she posits the two forms of royal power in Europe, absolutist or limited, as increasingly dependent upon new, productive forms of (bio-)power, though retaining the right over life and death. The East India Company had derived its political authority, as Edmund Burke had pointed out, both from Crown and Parliament in Britain and from the charters bestowed upon it by the Mughal Emperor in India. Its rapacious exploitation of the latter had distended this division, making it in, Thomas Macauley’s words, a ‘”political monster of two natures [–] subject in one hemisphere, sovereign in another”’ (1833, cited in Kalpagam, 2014, 30). In part, the Company succeeded by exploiting the uneven geographies of Mughal sovereignty that emerged between 1526 and 1750. While systematised in terms of its fiscal and monetary system, its ranking and its revenue assessments, the Mughal ‘state’ also lacked centralised or uniform bureaucracy and was dominated by the edicts and presence of the Emperor himself. As Prathama Banerjee points out in this volume, pre-colonial political power in India often did not transcend the social but was networked into the social constitution. However, looking beyond state sovereignty to knowledge formation and the ‘”governmentalization” of the state under Aurangzeb’s [1658-1707] reign’, Kalpagam (2014, 35-36) finds evidence of systematic information flows, collated correspondence, and population classification, though always within the frame of the royal cult and its singular sovereignty.

This was in contrast to the much more divided Hindu kingdoms, which predated Mughal and Company sovereignties but were often subject to them. Kingship here was imbued not with a ruler’s ‘divine right’, but with a divine responsibility to protect and tend to his people, and to become a model leader (Kalpagam, 2014, 31). As such, texts like the *Bhagavad Gita* can be considered classics on the science of government, for their emphasis on control of the senses and conquest of the self, as well as spiritual texts. As Kalpagam observes, ‘There is an art of herding human beings and the government and care of men is pre-eminently the sacerdotal function, but in so far as the royal function is delegated to a king, the latter can also be called a shepherd of men, as in some of the Indian texts where the king too is a *gopa* [cowherd]’ (Kalpagam 2014, 32). For the individual under this kingship, the responsibility was one of government of the self and while this forged a connection between subject and sovereign, this was not western divine right, but divine kingship.

Drawing attention to the religious genealogies that Foucault picked out in modern Europe, Indrani Chatterjee (2013) has recommended the study of ‘monastic governmentalities’ (focusing on institutional religious instruction) by scholars of pre-colonial South Asia. They would attend to the multiple religious lineages at play and to the geographically complex relationships between teachers and students in Buddhist, Jain, Hindu and Muslim traditions before the eighteenth century, many of which bear comparison to the parrhesiastic and self-care traditions that Foucault identified in European history. She draws attention to the specific traditions of initiation and gift-giving, to the tensions (though not ‘communal’ ones) between monastic governments amidst polycentric sovereignties, to the more pronounced role of women and households and how the disappearance of these governmentalities in the nineteenth century contributed to the formation of the more lay and homogenous communities that succeeded them. This succession also, necessarily, ran up against the colonial project’s long-running interest in pastoral power, that is, its interest in engineering a desire to be loved by Indians (P. Chatterjee 2011, 40-41). In this volume Chatterjee explores pastoral care and oeconomia to explore how pre-existing and colonial systems of care came into contact and, at times, into conflict, creating spaces for dissenting subjects. To view the simultaneous consolidation of ‘communities’ and the plurality of dissenters in late colonial India, this chapter concludes, it is necessary to begin with the concepts of pastoral care in non-Christian and pluralist households of the past and track their changes over the long durée in the subcontinent.

## 2. Colonial Difference

It is so**m**ething of a surprise, therefore, to discover that a persistent theme in colonial discourse until the earlier half of this century was the steadfast refusal to admit the universality of [modern] principles.

(Chatterjee, 1993, 16)

The ‘political monster’ of the East India Company was brought down not under the sign of Edmund Burke during the attempted impeachment of Warren Hastings between 1788 and 1895 in London’s Westminster Hall (which, as Nicholas Dirks has demonstrated (2006), was vital for purging empire of its scandalous origins and thus reinvigorating it) but under the sign of Emperor Shah Zafar in the Red Fort of Delhi during the tumultuous events of 1857-58. After the Mutiny/First War of Independence/Uprising, the disbanding of the Company and the establishment of the Government of India instituted 90 years of rule under undisputed sovereigns (the King-Emperor/Queen-Empress of India, the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy), but through disputed sovereignty (divided between Princely and British India, and between provinces, districts and municipalities). Imperially autocratic and with an endlessly inventive political geography, India *did*, however, now firmly resemble a modern state with ever greater triangulations of discipline, biopolitics and sovereignty. But how different was this *colonial* state to other *modern* states across the globe?

Partha Chatterjee (1993, 14), in asking this question, reminded his readers to read their Foucault, and described modern, productive power regimes as those that made social regulation an aspect of self-disciplining individualisation. But were these forms universal? Three answers have historically been given: that they were; that they were not, being specifically European and not exportable; or that they could be exported, but would have to overcome cultural and historical difference through training and education. *All* three positions involved the ‘rule of colonial difference’, with the primary difference of India usually being read as that of race.

Therefore, as the opening quote to this section suggests, until the early twentieth century, and for many until 1947, while colonial governmentalities spread throughout India, they did so not on the grounds of universalism, but of difference. Nasser Hussain (2003, 29) reminds us that the ‘race’ Chatterjee refers to spans eighteenth century cultural difference to nineteenth century racial difference (and twentieth century economic and communal difference, Zachariah 2005). Chatterjee devoted the rest of his book to examining nationalist responses to the identification of colonial difference (see the following section). But work over the last 20 years, much of which draws on the later Foucault, has attempted to follow Chatterjee’s (1993, 33) insistence that we study the specific history of the colonial state so as to reveal what is hidden in the universal history of the modern regime of power. Within these studies the question remains: how was colonial governmentality different? At least five answers can be located within the literature, focusing on the difference of (il)liberalism, violence, the social/political, the economy and the communal.

One tack at the question has been primarily discursive, though these discourses emerged largely out of (very often Indian) colonialism on the ground. This tack asked: how did liberalism (a set of ideas committed to political rights and self-determination) justify Empire (political domination)? This was, as Uday Singh Metha (1999, 7) put it, not a contradiction within democratic forms, but the confrontation of universal claims with unfamiliarity; i.e., with colonial difference. Liberalism for Mehta *was* universalistic because it upheld a view of human nature as having the *capacity* for political inclusion; it was the *conditions* which necessitated colonial exclusions (Mehta, 1999, 49). Foucault’s emphasis on the liberal subject as the material upon which modern governmentalities work has been used to explore these broader differences of colonialism via works on the ‘government of unfreedom’ (Hindess 2001) and the spatialisation of problem groups needing ‘despotic’ forms of liberal governance (Valverde 1996).

Another tack has been to explore the violence of the colonial state. In the African case Mbembe (2003) has suggested that it was more often colonial *necro*politics than liberal *bio*politics that marked a state that thrived on a founding, legitimating, and imaginary violence (Mbembe 2001, 25). Faced with civilised and organised ‘proto-governmentalities’ in India, however, colonial violence always ran up against a paradox: that in punishing ‘natives’ in the language they were thought to understand (violence) the coloniser came to resemble the violent barbarism of the imagined colonised (Rao and Pierce 2006, 2). Colonial difference was here punished through disciplinary violence, supposedly in the name of diminishing difference and increasing liberal sameness, both beyond and *through* the law. Yet as Heath argues in this volume, such violence was veiled by the pastoralism of the colonial state. In her analysis of the systematisation of torture as a technology of rule in colonial India during the course of the nineteenth century Heath examines the ways in which governmentality served as a mask for reducing torture victims to bare life and thus enabling them to be killed with impunity. Stephen Legg’s chapter also draws on debates about torture, although for the late-colonial period (namely the early 1940s). His concern is not physical violence, however, but the forceful production of truth through scientific interrogation. Both chapters reveal how, following Kolsky (2010), legal colonial violence was not the hackneyed violence of a sovereign power that somehow survived outside of governmentalities, but one that coursed through the capillaries and arteries of colonial governmentality: being legally structured and sanctioned by tiers of courts; through tolerated misconduct; through the racialized, biopolitical expertise of medical jurisprudence; and through the exceptional geographies of violence over plantation labourers. They also suggest, however, that colonial governmentalities also made possible forms of extra-legal violence that rendered colonial sovereignty exceptional (Mbembe 2003).

A third form of difference in colonial governmentalities was the nature of socio-political transformation, and the terrain over which such governmentalities sought to conduct conduct – although exactly what these transformations were and when they occurred has been hotly contested (see Kalpagam 2014, chapters five and seven). Nivedita Menon’s (2009) review of Indian governmentality scholarship has shown how one of these debates, over the extent of the break between pre-colonial and colonial India, takes place *within* the terms of South Asian governmentalities (whether they created modern community identities or elaborated existing ways of constituting the self). Key to emphasise, beyond this debate, is the epistemically violent intrusion of both colonialism and modernity into India’s social worlds; this demands that we find ways to study the ongoing violence of these social intrusions. We need to study, in other words, not just ‘subjective’ forms of violence that are enacted by clearly identifiable agents but, as Heath argues in this volume, objective forms such as structural and symbolic violence – as well as the interconnections between such forms. This entails paying attention to forms of interpersonal violence among the colonised, and to view these, moreover, as forms of colonial violence. One way of doing this might be to examine the nuanced violence of indigenous elite society, which operated not through murder or assault, but through reform, interventionist normalisation, and the linking up of local concerns to provincial, national, imperial or internationalist governmentalities. Stephen Legg (2014) has suggested, splicing Foucault with Giorgio Agamben, that we consider these processes of ‘civil abandonment’ in India as more aggressively racialized, as forcefully outsourced from the state to civil society, and as constituted by specific national and nationalist efforts to inclusively exclude certain fragments (here the prostitute) of the nation.

While this analysis approaches politics on the basis of sovereign capacities to include and exclude and to enact structural and personal violence, other work considers the process through which governmentalities craft the very boundary between the social and the political. In her elucidation of the disputes in colonial and post-colonial India over how the social and political were defined – disputes that led to a history of alternate mobilisations of the social and the political in colonial and post-colonial India – Prathama Banerjee (this volume) asserts that ‘If governmentality is a form of ‘rule by/of the social’ . . . then to say that Indian history exhibits a different dynamic between the social and the political is to also invite a rethinking of governmentality as a concept’. Banerjee proposes that ‘developmentality’ – as a way of understanding the ways in which the social has been both represented and transformed in South Asia – might function as such a concept.

A fourth difference was, of course, economic, namely the extractive nature of the colonial economy. Vast tomes of literature have considered this issue from most imaginable political and theoretical standpoints, considering the colonial economy from the perspective of: resource extraction; aggressive underdevelopment; the financing of the extra-Indian military; urban-rural investment; primitive accumulation in the countryside; patronage and collaboration in the city and the district; black markets; the informal economy; indentured, bonded, and slave labour; and, of course, class formation. Chakrabarty, as mentioned above, has perhaps most consistently pursued a postcolonial analysis of the functioning of the Indian economy, though more through a Foucauldian critique of historicist accounts of development than through studying economic governmentalities. Kalpagam (2000, updated in 2014, chapter four) provided an early outline of what this could involve and contribute, examining the creation of new economic relationships between resources, population and discipline through studying the modalities of measurement, accounting and classification which, ironically, provided the statistical armature for economic nationalist critiques of colonial power. Manu Goswami (2004), drawing upon Foucault and Lefebvre, has shown how the infrastructural and economic time-space compression of India helped produce the *Bharat* that would then assume cultural and national form.

Perhaps most comprehensive has been Ritu Birla’s (2009) study of the role of market governance in both colonial and nationalist debates over how to transform vernacular practitioners of capitalism into the new Indian Economic Man. Drawing extensively upon Foucault’s (2008) analysis of liberal veridiction, the legal object of the market in colonial India was studied as a supra-local project of governance, an abstract model for the public, and a stage (temporal and spatial) of cultural politics. Here, the economy/culture and public/private binaries, not those of the social/political, took centre stage. But these binaries were pursued through engagement with their vernacular and regional enactors: Guajarati bankers and traders; north Indian *bania* moneylenders; Punjabi *Khattris* traders; Madras *Chettiar* bankers; Sindhi international traders; and *Marwari* merchants from the Princely States (Birla, 2009, 18). In this volume, for Birla the representation at stake is not the social, but the legal. Birla turns her attention to liberal governmentality and the way in which it views civil society as a means of managing ‘economic men’ (Foucault 2010, 296) to analyse the ways in which law operated *as* economy, and conquest was coded as commerce. Taking examples from colonial economic liberalism in India she theorises a distinction and maps a play between law as universal sovereign command and juridical logic (or *logos*) and law as a historically-situated, embodied and temporally shifting convention (or *nomos*, at the root of term economy).

A final difference of colonial (as well as nationalist) governmentalities is the way in which religion was mobilised to produce communities. Gyanendra Pandey (1990) showed how religious communities were created in both colonial discourses (essential, timeless) and nationalist discourses (economic, recent), both of which came to accept that the Indian nation was religiously divided. This discursive work has been supplemented by later work on the ‘governmental roots of modern ethnicity’ (Chakrabarty 2002, chapter two). As above, colonial governmentality is here tracked through the census, maps and market statistics, to attempts to craft communal representation in the name of (an always manipulated) democratic proportionality. This book thus offers fresh insights into the ways in which communities were produced and transformed. Indrani Chatterjee provides innovative ways for us to approach the accepted communalism historiography by approaching religious communities and their interaction with the British through the lens of care, not of hatred. Partha Chatterjee reads partition as the inability to separate sovereign from the expected governmental functions of the state, miring the postcolonial transition in the negotiation of contested claims that merged sovereignty with governmentality. Sarah Hodges, finally, draws our attention to the negotiation of community difference both across and within religious communities through her study of waste pickers and the informal economies of plastic and hierarchy in the contemporary city.

*3. Derivative Governmentalities?*

As has become obvious in the above attempts to differentiate the differences of colonial governmentalities, this difference was often indissociable from the efforts and effects of social reform and nationalist movements. This was not just because they were stimulated into being by the vertical chains of imperial government (as the Cambridge School perspective was depicted in Guha 1982), but because colonial governmentalities were constantly forced to respond to nationalist articulations of difference, of cultural and later political sovereignty, of counter-rationalities and calculations, and of determinedly Other modes of self-relation and self-conduct. This was not just a case of ‘where there is power there is resistance’ or ‘power is only necessary because of resistance’ (as Foucault 1982, is often read). Rather, it brings us back to the question of universalism and Eurocentrism, and of how social reformers and nationalist activists could argue that India could foster a better society or nation without British support while accepting that European notions of the social and of nationalism were necessarily more practical than indigenous forms.

At an analytical level we also must ask: can we analyse anti-colonial nationalisms as governmentalities? If pre-colonial states and spiritualties were governmentalities, then why not the Indian National Congress? If the largest nationalist party had a governmentality, what about the Muslim League? The Communist Party of India? Or what about the Hindustan Republican Socialist Association, a ‘terrorist’ organisation whose popularity spread after the martyrdom of Bhagat Singh and which articulated a rival conjoinment of life, body, politics, death, self, sacrifice and Truth (Moffat 2013)?

Other than his lectures on internal struggles within the state in terms of race and the nation (Foucault 2003), Foucault doesn’t have much to offer us directly on nationalism, but Chatterjee (2011 139) has insisted that we cannot understand nationalism without considering modern governmentalities. Rejecting Benedict Anderson’s distinction of domains of everyday universals (such as citizenship, nationality, etc.) and of the ‘bound seriality of governmentality’ (finite totals of enumerable, ethnic and communal categories), Chatterjee insists that nationalism cannot be considered without the governmentalities that create the spaces of modern life in which it thrives. If we accept Chatterjee’s (1986) earlier suggestion that nationalist thought must be considered a derivative discourse (even if Gandhi rejected it and Nehru re-worked it), then we also have to study this imported discourse playing out across a heterogeneous social space that is fundamentally constituted by colonial governmentalities. Re-phrasing Chatterjee’s (1993, 5) question to Benedict Anderson, if the rest of the world chose its model of nationalism from Euro-American Subjects of History, and if the adopted form was then adapted to the space of colonial governmentalities, what was left to governmentalise?

Plenty, of course. Chatterjee suggested that anticolonial nationalism had created its own sovereign territory in which a modern nation would be crafted *before* taking political form. It was based on cultural projects such as language, schooling and the family, forming an inner ‘spiritual’ realm which could be preserved (while actually being created) while the ‘material’ realm could be ceded to westernisation (while actually being co-produced). Before becoming political, these projects could well be considered as nationalist governmentalities, linking conduct, senses of self, individual discipline and sovereign notions of territory. Only later did these regimes of truth, rationality, the body and the soul become nationalist political rationalities. Gandhi most clearly articulated this linking of individual and political self-rule (*swa-raj*), in the context of his broader negotiation of western biopolitics and eastern tradition (Prakash 1999; also see Hodges, 2008 on gender politics, Gandhi and contraception governmentality). As Legg’s chapter (this volume) shows, at the heart of the Gandhian mission was an explicit politics of Truth, which was used to justify projects that aimed at both independence and at disciplining the newly roused subaltern subject. While this disciplining of the self for the nation was taken up by nationalist politicians the question always remained as to whether Gandhi was a nationalist, or a universalist using the nation to pursue broader humanist ideals (Devji 2012).

If questions remain over Gandhi’s position regarding *nationalist* governmentalities, what hope then for smaller movements and lesser known figures? A nationalist governmentality need not, of course, extend across the scope of a nation; Foucault studied, in great depth, localised movements, domestic arrangements, private tuition, and ‘failed’ or short-lived projects as part of broader governmentalities. In this sense Subash Chandra Bose’s Forward Bloc of the 1940s, the Hindu Mahasabha of the 1930s, and Swadeshi Leagues of the 1920s, can be studied through a shared lens of nationalist governmentality in the sense that a railway company, the Viceroy’s Private Secretary, a missionary and a cartographer can be considered agents of colonial governmentality. But the subject being conducted, the Truth being articulated, the calculative rationality and the population and territory being visualised were radically different (see also Alter 2000).

Gradually, certain imaginations of the nation and the politics needed to create it began to cement their position within the ‘establishment’, both through periods of constitutional reform and of mass protest movement. Kuracina (2010, 17) suggests that we take Congress not only as a (periodically) radical nationalist party but as a pragmatic state-builder, operating a ‘parallel governmentality’ within the federal structure of the late colonial state. The dominant imaginary of this state was that of development (Zachariah, 2005), embedding a governmentality at the heart of the bureaucracy that was co-worked by colonial and nationalist politicians and civil servants and was transferred with power in 1947. In this volume Prathama Banerjee suggests that postcolonial governmentality in India must be considered as developmentality. This *represented* the social at the same time as *transforming* it and emerged out of engagements with subalternist and politically radical groups that made it specific to the post-colonial state’s use of both executive and governmental powers

## 4. Postcolonial Difference

Foucault’s later works have been widely used to explore different experiences of colonialism and imperialism across the globe, with substantial contributions from South Asian scholars, as evidenced above. The breadth and range of case studies produced make it one of the richest bodies of colonial governmentality literature in the world. But it is perhaps the research on the difference of India’s post-colonial modes of power and spaces of governmentality that marks out South Asian scholarship’s most unique contribution to the field. This contribution comes in two forms: the range of sites and moments to which governmentality theory has been applied; and the innovative reworking of that theory to account for spatial (south Asian) and temporal (post-colonial) difference. In terms of the former, this work has addressed (at least) post-colonial democracy, development, the new subaltern and urban governance.

Chakrabarty (2007) has analysed debates about disciplining the ‘multitude’ and the popular bases of sovereignty (from Foucault 2003) in early independent India. Colonial sovereignty had been acquired by force and destabilised by the nationalist insistence that its power was only dominance, not a mutually agreed sovereignty. Nationalism had provided a training ground of oppositional, subaltern politics; Nehru insisted, however, that civil disobedience tactics were not appropriate for a postcolonial democracy resting on instituted, legitimate sovereignty. Did nationalism as government, therefore, betray the potential of nationalism as movement?

Chatterjee (1998) acknowledged the achievements of India’s first 50 independent years, notably universal adult suffrage and the reordering of the federal state. This had, however, been orchestrated through a quantitatively expanded but qualitatively unchanged state. The result was that the population was penetrated by the state more intensively than ever before, in part in response to the need in a democracy to know and thus service the population. The information to service this discourse of rights (sovereignty) was provided through a discourse of policy (governmentality, on which more below in terms of political society). Whilst the British policy had been, where possible, to avoid direct interference with religious matters, nationalist social reformers had taken up these matters, leading to a spate of post-colonial legislation addressing religion, one of the many anomalies of the secular state of India (Chatterjee 1997, 241). In looking at many of the struggles that have ensued, Chatterjee (1997, 255) encouraged us to consider forms of sovereignty (especially those of rights) that are not encompassed by governmentality and which may be used as resources for pushing back against governmentality itself. Many of those who want to push back have found themselves either deserted by or targeted by postcolonial developmentalities (Agrawal, 2005; Legg, 2006). A rich body of work has used Marx alongside Foucault to understand the braiding of force, discourse and environment in postcolonial development governmentalities in south Asia (Sanyal 2013; Gidwani 2008).

Gayatri Spivak (2000) has engaged revisionist works on biopower to force us to consider the contemporary governmentalities that claim subaltern bodies as (biological) property and subaltern knowledge as (intellectual) property (for a multi-scalar analysis of reproductive labour see Cheah 2010). As Srila Roy (this volume) shows us, in her exploration of the effects of neoliberalism on ‘governance feminism’ in contemporary India, an analysis of Foucault’s work on ethical self-formation can offer a means of critiquing neoliberal development governmentality while deliberating on the possibility of resistance and freedom within neoliberal regimes.

A rich seam of research has explored the city as a site of both development and of resistance. Asher Ghertner (2010) has explored the importance of aesthetic governmentality beyond statistical calculation and what happens to city-dwellers who do not fit the ‘look’ of the modern city. Arjun Appadurai’s (2001) influential study of democracy, development and the city showed how Mumbai was both penetrated by governmentalities of surveillance and calculation but also how alliances of organisations working with slum dwellers had also taken up similar tactics of self-surveillance, knowledge mobilisation across national boundaries and policy negotiation.

This brings us to the body of work that has perhaps done the most to make clear the post-colonial difference of contemporary South Asian governmentalities (which is also offered up as a model for thinking difference in the non-West more broadly). As suggested above, Partha Chatterjee (1998) encouraged us to think about how the demands of democracy had led to the Indian population being penetrated by policies which target the population. Rather than engaging civil society through organisations and debates about democracy, politics and rights, here the mass of the population (including its vast subaltern ranks) is engaged through policy and the techniques of governmentality, in political society. It is here that groups are engaged who mobilise around the enumerative categories of biopolitical or neoliberal governmentality itself (Chatterjee 2004, 2011 and this volume). This marks *not* an extension of welfare rights to the people as citizens, as happened in many western countries from the 1940s; rather claims are often met in para-legal ways beyond the norms of citizenship (Nigam 2014). This combines the insights of subaltern studies (non-elite forms of mobilisation are not necessary more violent, more traditional or less rational) and governmentality studies (examining politics at the point where power meets and makes conduct) to consider how the post-colonial experience of democracy and development, building on colonial legacies in terms of bureaucracy, enumeration and identity, creates forms of precarity, mobilisation, group affiliation and policy-making that are wholly different to experiences in the West (for one of the many applications and extensions of this thesis, see Ram 2015).

## 5. Differences within South Asia

While much work on contemporary South Asian governmentalities takes Chatterjee’s (2004) *Politics of the Governed* as its cornerstone, much of the historical work was inspired David Scott’s (1995) ‘colonial governmentality’ paper. Drawing upon Chatterjee himself, Scott made his argument through the case of Ceylon/Sri Lanka, embedding a non-Indian but South Asian study at the heart of the governmentality literature. The mass (in terms of territory, wealth, population and postcolonial scholarship) of colonial India has tended to overshadow regional differentiation within south Asian scholarship, despite the important governmentality work being done on many of these locations. James Duncan, for instance, has complemented his earlier discursive work on the Buddhist landscapes of Ceylon (Duncan 1990) with an analysis of the biopolitics of Ceylonese plantation landscapes and their complex and violent relationships with migrant Tamil labourers (Duncan 2007). The sense of an environment being systematically overhauled in search of profit also infuses Jonathan Saha’s (2013) study of Burma, which was governed as part of India from 1886 to 1937. The difference of Burma (in terms of tropical environment, Chinese migrants, scheduled tribes and natural resources) was rarely denied by governors or subjects alike; the environment, its people, its forms of sovereignty and religion felt foreign, even from the vast differences within India itself. Yet the practises (capitalist, governmental, migratory) that came to effect Burma shared many of the rationalities that had been deployed across the subcontinent, forging networks of sameness and differences to and within Burma for its relatively brief period within the Indian Empire.

If postcolonial governmentality debates in India have emphasised the question of the tactics used and responses to governmentalities within political society, elsewhere in South Asia more fundamental questions regarding the utility of governmentality studies have been raised. Three recent examples give a sense of the range of work being undertaken in these contexts. Marcus Daeschel (2015) has studied the early decades of (West) Pakistani independence in which a transnational model of development was grafted onto a nation and operated for, but also against, the post-colonial state. Daeschel uses the governmentalities of urban and regional development to examine the agonistic interplay of different sovereign figures and discourses, in which biopolitical plans for deep reaching development were resisted by a military keen to maintain security and social status quo. So wrought were these relations that the actual existence of governmentalities is thrown into doubt. For S M Shamsul Alam (2015), however, much of Bangladesh’s history after breaking away from West Pakistan in 1971, including its anti-authoritarian struggle in anticipation, can be understood as battles against certain types of (military) governmentality, as productive periods of nationalist governmentality, as engagements with Islamic governmentality, and as later, difficult, co-productions with global governmentalities. Finally, Fiona McConnell (2016) has produced an innovative analysis of the Tibetan government in exile, analysing the governmentality of a government that lacks a territory or a state, and thus lives through its performativities, its rituals and through conducting its diasporic population and their global supporters. Here, the study of a national governmentality takes place through its spaces of rehearsals, it self-surveillance and enumeration, its rethinking of welfare in exile and its nurturing of hospitality in its host state.

## 6. What is Not a Governmentality

In his *Birth of Biopolitics* lecture of 31st January 1979 Foucault, infamously, suggested that socialism lacked a governmentality, ‘ . . . that is to say, a reasonable and calculable measure of the extent, modes, and objectives of governmental action’ (Foucault 2008, 92). While socialism proposed an historical and material rationality, and had techniques of intervention (health, social insurance etc.), this did not constitute an autonomous socialist governmentality. Rather, Foucault suggested, socialism had to link up with other governmentalities (forming a corrective to liberal governmentalities, or the internal logic to administrative governmentalities in police states) because it had been too obsessed with texts and not enough with ways of governing. This is pretty damning stuff, especially when each socialist-governmentality hybrid was described as producing ‘. . . the same deadly fruit’ (Foucault, 93). Yet, Foucault insisted that a socialist governmentality could be invented, but not through texts (Foucault, 94; also see Ferguson 2011; Hannah 2011).

This was one of the relatively few places in which Foucault suggested what was *not* a governmentality. One of the great benefits of governmentality as an analytic is that it allows heterogeneous actors and objects to be brought into unitary frames of analysis; but how can we think of its borders, whether to overcome or retain them? Governmentalities triangulate biopolitical, governmental and sovereign power relations and thus cannot be reduced solely to an analysis of the ‘conduct of conduct’, rather: ‘Transformations of governmentality need to be placed against contingent transformations of the exercise of sovereign and biopolitical powers of life and death’ (Dean 2002, 123). As Chatterjee (this volume) argues in his elucidation of the emergence of the modern state in South Asia, what needs to be understood is the different political rationalities at play in colonial and post-colonial India fashioned by the shifting relationship between sovereign and governmental power. Such tensions are at the heart of Heath’s analysis, too. Heath contends that sovereign power was more restrained than biopolitical power because of the ways in which the latter is infused with a form of racism that can be used to justify the eradication of particular peoples or groups, which for her explains why the colonial regime in India sustained and systematised the use of torture as a technology of rule.

Another way of thinking about the boundaries of governmentalities, and how we study them, is through the troubled category of ‘resistance’. Resistance is something which the later Foucault insisted was inseparable from power, and his post-1977 lectures constantly sought out ways of thinking about resistance in and against governmentalities (for instance counter-conducts, critique and parrhesia). While the majority of his material addressed forms of control (which were and remain vital to study) the chapters collected here attempt to draw our gaze to resistance, to creation through refusal, and to the traces of those who evaded surveillance: Indrani Chatterjee highlights the ongoing systems of care that resisted colonial encroachments and continued to service their flock; Prathama Banerjee explores the way in which subjects have resisted through ‘politicisation’ (claiming to have transitioned from being a social to being a political subject) or socialisation (claiming to be a purely social subject and by refusing to be called political in the first place); Ritu Birla highlights the refusal by ‘vernacular practitioners of capitalism’ of contracts as the universal instrument for market exchange; Jonathan Saha raises the prospect of the more-than-human resistance of captive elephants, who were noted for their delinquency, bell-tampering, and aggression to humans; Stephen Legg considers nationalist truth-discourses as ones which mobilised a powerfully affective anti-colonial governmentality, but one with a subalternist logic that presumed the masses to be in need of elite conduct; Partha Chatterjee considers the use of violence and of para-legal infrastructural getting-by as evidence of everyday resistances within political society; Sarah Hodges sensitively examines the work of waste pickers and questions assumptions about their resistance and uplift as they work at the borderline between human and non-human; while Srila Roy raises the vital question of the ethical subject of Indian feminism, suggesting that the Indian Women’s Movement is more usefully considered as a technology of self than as a governmentality. She focuses on the ethical work of self-formation, where subjectification is threaded through with the rationalities of neoliberalism and development and *yet* the gendered self presents opportunities for resisting forms of abject subjection.

Resistance tests the boundaries of governmentality, being internalised by it through problematisations, forcing its evolution, or remaining stubbornly outside. If one boundary marker is resistance, then another is the subject of governmentalities themselves. For Sarah Hodges, while governmentality scholarship has devoted considerable attention to the material, ‘the question of *matter itself* has remained relatively under-examined’ (emphasis in original). In her exploration of urban Indians’ relation to, and disenchantment with, plastic, she reveals how an attention to matter offers insights into the ways in which quotidian struggles over the government of things shape understandings and practises of caste and untouchability. Attention to matter can reveal more than the ways in which the conduct of human bodies has been shaped and resisted. In his examination of the ways in which colonial elephant camps in early-twentieth-century Burma sought to transform elephants both body and soul, Jonathan Saha argues that understanding the ways in which animal subjectivities have been constructed necessitates elucidating the ways in which their bodies have been managed. Drawing on Foucault’s analysis of Christian thought Saha poses the problem of animal subjectivity through asking the provocative question: ‘do animals have souls’? In addition, using Judith Butler’s testing of Foucault, Saha pushes us to ask how, in our research, we find *Bodies that Matter*?

This introduction (long, but still too short for its subject matter) has hinted at the richness of the existing south Asian governmentalities literature and has suggested that there is much more work to be done. This work might address the ongoing publication of Foucault’s governmentality lectures, the application of a governmentality analytic to new subjects and places, the absolutely vital work of pointing out what Foucault and his South Asianist interlocutors haven’t said and correcting what they have said where it doesn’t work, and further provincialising a postcolonial Foucault.
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