

Chapter 1

Governing the Present

Jack Z. Bratich, Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy

It is almost impossible to discuss contemporary Foucauldian scholarship or cultural studies research without recognizing the mutual effect the two fields have had on each other. The arrival of Foucauldian thought to cultural studies reshaped the way cultural studies defined its problematic around culture and power, challenging the very assumptions that informed a Gramscian framework for almost two decades now.¹ Conversely, cultural studies as an interdiscipline became a conduit for the deployment of Foucault into a variety of disciplines. Any work which attempts to situate itself within cultural studies and within a Foucauldian framework must take into account a sometimes messy array of texts on Foucault across various disciplines by scholars who consider themselves cultural studies practitioners and some who do not.

Furthermore, there have been very explicit attempts within cultural studies that have demanded a paradigm shift—one that overturns many of the historically significant terms of cultural studies' theoretical arsenal. *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality* is not a call to arms to radically overturn or redirect cultural studies. It does however take into account many of the debates over Foucault's position in cultural studies; for the most part, the work in this collection builds upon the premise that cultural studies has benefited tremendously from the influx of Foucauldian theory. Furthermore, the arrival of Foucault into cultural studies altered its problematic in such a way that proponents or critics of cultural studies have to address this Foucauldian influence.

But the intersection of Foucauldian work and cultural studies has never been a uniform or singular project. Partially this is the case because there are both many "Foucaults" and many versions of cultural studies. Cultural studies has been marked by a persistent questioning of its fundamental assumptions, political imaginaries, and interdisciplinary boundaries. This self-problematization was evident when cultural studies encountered Foucault's work (see the interview with Lawrence Grossberg and Toby Miller in this volume for a history and contemporary analysis of this contested terrain). As Meaghan Morris and John Frow (2000) have argued, Foucault's influences

have been multiple. His conceptualization of power/knowledge, for one, has assisted cultural studies in analyzing the links between meaning and social relations (p. 328). In addition, Foucault's work on the materiality of discourse (in *Archaeology of Knowledge*) allowed cultural studies to depart from more text-centered concepts of discourse (p. 331). Finally, Foucault's *History of Sexuality* not only challenged the ways identity and sexuality were historically fused, but also began to provide a new mapping of power (the microphysical analysis [p. 331]). This new analytics has provoked a full-scale problematization of neo-Marxist understandings of the nature and limits of the role of culture in political action itself.

We would also add that Foucault's work on disciplinarity primarily has been highly influential in cultural studies. Cultural analyses of the "disciplinary society" or "surveillance society" have cited this research extensively.² But while this cultural work has produced innumerable insightful accounts of recent trends, it has often remained squarely within the neo-Gramscian framework of cultural studies. In other words, this current brand of scholarship has instrumentalized Foucault within the traditional paradigm of cultural studies while leaving that fundamental framework intact, extending the shelf life of neo-Gramscian notions of hegemony, resistance, and the State.

The articles in this collection are situated in this heterogeneous tradition where Foucault and cultural studies have a restless relationship. Along with the threads discussed above, the pieces in this collection draw from a recently emerging strain of Foucauldian work that could be described as "governmentality studies." Arising from his germinal essay titled "Governmentality" and a series of lectures and course summaries (some of which have only recently been translated into English), this field of inquiry emerged in the 1990s as a powerful new approach to rethinking politics, the social, and power. It made explicit a different relationship between governance and the subject as a way of drawing together the micro and macro analyses of power (Gordon, 2000).

In simplest terms, governmentality refers to the arts and rationalities of governing, where the conduct of conduct is the key activity. It is an attempt to reformulate the governor-governed relationship, one that does not make the relation dependent upon administrative machines, juridical institutions, or other apparatuses that usually get grouped under the rubric of the State. Rather, as this collection demonstrates, the conduct of conduct takes place at innumerable sites, through an array of techniques and programs that are usually defined as cultural.

Governmentality addresses a formation of power that differs from disciplinarity and sovereignty (Foucault, 1991, p. 102). This formation is derived from the recognition that the strength of the state is dependent upon the proper disposition of humans and things.³ But, this recognition is not the state's alone. It is not so much that the state's reach is all-consuming; instead,

the techniques of governmentality emanate from numerous sources and without them the state would not be what it is (p. 103). Governmentality is an analytic perspective that defines the state's role as one of coordination, one that gathers together disparate technologies of governing inhabiting many sites. The *importance* of this coordinating function (its relative strength and effectivity and its centripetal force) is historically variable.

Perhaps the most prominent statement on this Foucauldian framework is *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (1991), which not only reprinted Foucault's essay, but published a series of projects informed by a study of the "arts of governing" (some of which emerged from his courses). Throughout the 1990s, this work was carried on in other collections (e.g., *Foucault and Political Reason* [1996], *Foucault: The Legacy* [1997], and *Governing Australia: Studies of Contemporary Rationalities of Government* [1998]), in the pages of the journal *Economy and Society*, and in book-length treatments by Nikolas Rose (1998, 1999), Mitchell Dean (1991, 1994, 1999), Tony Bennett (1995, 1998), Barbara Cruikshank (1999), and Ian Hunter (1988, 1994).

These studies in governmentality constitute a growing body of work, though one that should not be characterized as unitary. This field of inquiry does not seek to simply apply the concept to political and social phenomena, but questions the very limits of and characteristics of governmentality (especially its neoliberal form). We can see this debate at work in Colin Gordon's (1999) review of the *Governing Australia* collection, where he sharply distinguishes his approach to governmentality from others working in the area. We can also see it in this volume's interview with Grossberg and Miller, who often disagree with each other on the form and effects of liberalism, even while distinguishing themselves from Rose, Dean, and others. All of this is to say that, while an emergent body of work, governmentality studies has already matured to the point where clear differences in position are beginning to be drawn.

But governmentality studies has not been a field of inquiry isolated from cultural studies. At the groundbreaking cultural studies conference at the University of Illinois in 1990, Tony Bennett (1992) presented a paper titled "Putting Policy into Cultural Studies" which put the issues of culture and governing on the table. In his influential piece, cultural studies as a field was challenged for its reliance on defining culture as a set of signifying practices, and for its exclusive adherence to a political practice of forming counter-hegemonic subjects through those signifying practices. Bennett's primary critique of Gramscian cultural studies relied upon the incorporation of Foucault's notion of "police" into the underexplored dimension of Raymond Williams' conceptualization of culture as the "generalized process of intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic development" (p. 25). Here Bennett pointed out, quite insightfully, that cultural studies had depended, perhaps, too completely, on Williams' much more often cited definitions of culture as a "particular way

of life and the artistic deeds of men and women” (p. 25). According to Bennett, what William’s less popularized definition of culture (the “general process of intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic development”) makes historically evident is that “culture” has often been both the object and the instrument of governmental policy that regulates social life. Provocatively integrating Foucault and Williams, Bennett conceptualized culture as

a historically specific set of institutionally embedded relations of government in which the forms of thought and conduct of extended populations are targeted for transformation—in part via the extension through the social body of the forms, techniques, and regiments of aesthetic and intellectual culture. (1992, p. 26)

Bennett’s configuration also called upon Foucault’s notion of police as a distinctly modern form of power which intervenes in citizens day-to-day lives in a noncoercive fashion in order to simultaneously nourish the life of the individual and the State. Culture, as defined by Bennett, is thereby an integral part of the policing process. His work on the history of the modern museum articulated the specific “museological” techniques for managing the conduct of conduct (1995). Bennett continues this reformulation of culture in his contribution to this collection, where he challenges us to re-examine the relations between culture and the social via the mediation of governmentality.

At the same conference, Ian Hunter (1992) brought culture and governing together in his problematization of cultural studies’ critique of aesthetics. Hunter proposed a study of aesthetics as an ethic, one whose practical activity of the self on the self became technologized into a governmental sphere primarily through the rise of public education. Hunter called for a genealogy of this ethic, one that pays close attention to how forms of denunciation of the governmental sphere themselves have been governmentalized. Hunter then found in Foucault’s work on sexuality a different set of concerns than those mentioned by Frow and Morris cited above. In this conception, it is not just the ethical basis of sexuality as self-reflection that is problematized, but self-reflection itself and its cultural and social deployments that Hunter argues must be addressed. Hunter specifically examined how literature, as a pedagogical formation, not an ideological practice, operated as a means for altering ethical conduct.

Since that conference at the beginning of the 1990s, the relation between governmentality and cultural studies has primarily revolved around issues of cultural policy and policy studies. Housed mainly in Australia, the cultural policy studies field has included works by Bennett, Hunter, Tom O’Regan, and a whole host of others who occupy positions in the academy and/or policy sectors. As a field of study (examining the genealogical ties between culture and policy) and a public intellectual practice, policy studies has come

to fuse Foucauldian governmentality and cultural studies in a specifically Australian context. Yet one dislocated Australian, Toby Miller, has started thinking about how governmentality operates in America, or at least the level of the American-dominated global culture industry. Miller's unique take on governmentality, in this media context, foregrounds the issue of "truth" and more specifically "popular truth." He argues that genre, the demographic construct audience/nation, and specific cultural formations of modernity and postmodernity have all been utilized in forming a productive and consuming citizenry (1998, pp. 14–36).

NEW DIRECTIONS/NEW ENGAGEMENTS

In *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality*, we critically interrogate these new lines of thought while attempting to extend and deepen this trend of thinking at the limits of cultural studies. Through a variety of methods and empirical studies, this collection foregrounds new and unique approaches that attempt to: (a) bridge the gap between cultural analysis and governmentality studies in the United States, (b) open up new lines of inquiry into cultural practices, and (c) offer fresh perspectives on Foucault's writings and their implications for cultural studies.

Much of cultural studies, we contend, has focused on the discipline pole of Foucault's triangle "discipline-sovereignty-governmentality" (1991, p. 102). Here, we seek to supplement that work by accentuating the governmentality pole (though the other poles are represented here as well). We take on board this concept not merely to apply it to the same objects of study, but to problematize the relationship between culture and power altogether. Although not all our contributors agree with each other on the usefulness of the "governmentality" literature, all operate within the provocative and highly productive zone where culture and governing meet, and where the very possibility of a Foucauldian cultural studies is interrogated and put to empirical test. Ultimately, this collection seeks to extend the relation between culture and governing in three major ways.

First, this collection seeks to broaden the theater of intellectual debates over "culture and governing" studies from their current locales in Australia and Great Britain to the United States.⁴ At the risk of sounding parochial, these studies begin to ask how neo-liberal strategies of governing operate in their specificity in the United States. As has been noted elsewhere, the greater state sponsorship of culture in Australia and the United Kingdom continues to impact cultural policy debates and arguments about the role of cultural studies (Morris & Frow, 2000; Bennett, 1997).

We seek to assess cultural practices in the United States, where the State is not as central a player in organizing the relationship between "culture and

governing.” Instead, culture is more deeply inscribed in a privatized, corporate set of conditions. The issues of State cultural policy, then, are not the only, or even the primary, way of thinking about culture and governing in the U.S. context. As such, the authors examine numerous State, quasi-State, and private institutions, practices, and policies that work to elaborate core state interests, but, at other times, operate in conflict with the State.⁵ Insurance companies, volunteer organizations, pharmaceutical companies, architectural designers, private security companies, universities, education, talk shows, political science discourse, community museums, urban planners, and computer games are all examined as a part of this process.

This brings us to our second major extension of the culture and governing field. For whereas in cultural studies the primary way of thinking about governmentality has been through policy, we seek here to push the “culture and governing” debates into practices not typically understood as policy. Bennett, for instance, wants to consider the culture and governing relation through Foucault’s conception of the “police” (that is, a form of governance Foucault defines around total administration of the social field through knowledge of the tiniest detail). This allows for a stronger focus on the state policy sector (which again has a particular historical and geographical location). If we are to begin situating culture in the liberal and neoliberal art of governing “at a distance,” then policy (whether State-derived or not) becomes only one component of this governance—the codified, instrumentalized and institutionalized sort.

In accordance with this move of studying culture in its relation to governing at a distance, we take culture to be a set of reflections, techniques, and practices that seek to regulate conduct. In other words, instead of examining culture as primarily a policy issue, we look to culture as the intersection of policy and ethos (the practices of the self on the self and the technologies of subjectification). These ethical technologies are autonomous yet enrolled to perform tasks in a rationale of governing at a distance.⁶ That is, culture finds itself caught up in the processes of government without a necessary reliance on the codified, institutionalized forms of governing culture. And, when policy *is* a primary concern, it is often non-State institutions that are concerned with managing conduct. At the end of his “Governmentality” essay, Foucault makes this very point and, in fact, elsewhere warns against placing too much emphasis on the State (1991, p. 103).

With the expansion of neoliberal forms of governing, it is not only in institutional life that we recognize how we are both governed and govern ourselves. For one thing, culture is embroiled in modes of political subjectification. Liberal political rationality, according to Mitchell Dean (1994), is defined by the organizing of the relation between self-governing citizens and members of a governed flock, between the liberty of the governed and the need for properly loyal subjects (p. 185). This self-governance is secured

through a deployment of a series of ethical techniques of self-fashioning, ones that can have a strong cultural component.

The intersection of the production of truth and processes of subjectification *with* these institutions must also be taken into account. Throughout, we argue that in everyday life, knowledge is formed across multiple discourses organized by noninstitution-specific regimes of truth. These truths play an increasingly larger role in processes of subjectification pertaining to the ways we form our identities and subjectivities through an attachment to the games of truth about ourselves and the world. We use this understanding as a springboard to delve into areas of governance not typically addressed by cultural studies. In this book, the various analyses of museums, technologies of safety and security, new media practices, education practices, styles of thought, volunteerism, community and domesticity all have policy components, but in each case the institutional/codified components do not tell the primary story.

The third significant way that the work in this book breaks with previous work at the crossroads of policy and governmentality is that it does not clearly call for policy advocacy. The debate over the political efficacy of cultural studies policy practitioners has been fierce and still seems to rage a decade after the debate began.⁷ We would argue that as important as this debate is, it has clouded the importance of the critical genealogical work that has actually been done by those working in policy studies. Rather than simply dismissing the work or thinking in terms of its applicability, we choose to appreciate the work for what it has contributed to our understanding of how institutional rationalities are formulated, how it has expanded and articulated the relationships between culture, power, and subjectivity, and what new methods of analysis are now more clearly available.

The intellectual's role in policy decisions was also an issue that was hotly debated by members of our Foucault reading group collective. It was from these debates that the essays in this volume emanated. In fact, we would argue that there is no necessary correspondence between the study of policy or governmentality and a political prescription for the role of the intellectual. It would be unfair to characterize all contributors as sympathetic to the policy studies position, particularly in regards to the role of the policy practitioner. It would however, be accurate to state that the genealogical work done in the field has compelled many of the authors to rethink and reorient their own research regardless of policy applicability.

CONSTRUCTING OBJECTS

Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality foregrounds 12 essays and an interview that engage directly with efforts to problematize cultural studies by drawing on Foucauldian frameworks of analysis. Writing from embattled

oppositional spaces within a cross section of disciplines—communications, educational policy studies, art history, kinesiology, philosophy, and literature—contributors examine Foucault’s work as an analytics of culture or a style of analysis. Our guiding objective here is to translate Foucault’s analytics of the arts of governing into the field of cultural studies, integrating these analytics into the very conceptualization of the objects of study pursued in this volume. Rather than just a series of case studies of Foucault-in-action, this collection contributes to studying contemporary “rationalities” of governing in a manner that alters the very conception of what an object of cultural studies is.

Even Foucauldian cultural studies scholarship has most often entailed piecemeal uses and applications of particular strands of Foucault’s thought (especially concepts such as discourse, discipline, and panopticism). Although these approaches have been crucial in providing new tools for understanding particular social and cultural phenomena, they have not concerned themselves with rethinking the type of research objects that have been brought on stream in cultural studies itself.

This reconceptualization opens up new objects of study for cultural analysis. For instance, at one level, one could read this collection as taking up the cultural phenomena of automotive driving, museums, urban design, computer games, conspiracy theories, education policy, architecture, even the subject. However, once these phenomena are considered governmentalized, we could view this collection as studies of the technologies of governing through subjectification (be it through volunteerism, safety, security, pedagogy, moderated thought, community, automobility, or gaming-logics). That is, it is not just a matter of simply altering the objects of analysis in an attempt to either validate a new object of study (low culture or the popular) or expand the scope of the discipline’s reach. Rather, this collection seeks to alter the very forms of analysis, the frameworks that would allow new objects to become intelligible. Lastly, there is always the demand to think in terms of the field itself, to think in terms of cultural studies as defined by a problematization of its own limits as a field, and the limits of culture (its object). As Tony Bennett argues in his contribution to this volume, the very definition of culture (once governmentality is put into the analytic mix) moves from a general mechanism (i.e., language-based) to a set of particular, technical practices rooted in particular historical moments. Cultural studies as a field and Foucault himself have both continually called for this type of theoretical and intellectual self-reflection and alteration.

We hope that this volume provides, instead, examples for locating and investigating new cultural formations, not for their novelty, but because of their role as a means of governing conduct. This is not to say that all cultural studies work should be focused upon this specific formulation, nor is it to say that all cultural formations are part of governmentality or neoliberalism. It is

to say that some cultural formations which were outside the purview of cultural studies were “made visible” due to this perspective.

We can turn to Foucault’s notion of “problematization” to elaborate⁸. For Foucault, analysis itself often produces its own object. This is because one does not study objects, so much as investigates how a given phenomenon came to be thought of in terms of a problem—how it was problematized. This approach often entails answering such questions as:

- How did a particular form of conduct come under scrutiny?
- Who was enabled to make such determinations?
- What programs of rehabilitation or alteration were set in motion?
- How did these programs affect other domains of governance?
- What forms of knowledge were created for, directed at, and affected by this conduct?
- Under what regime of self-reflection and self-identification were the offending parties and persons supposed to adhere?
- By what schema was the conduct to be measured?
- According to what rationalities was governance put into play?
- What conduct is made intelligible for reflection and guidance?

Any question that directs attention to the particular relationships between knowledge, power, and subjectification helps orient researchers toward an understanding of something akin to a Foucauldian method.

Besides providing new objects for analysis (by placing culture into the domain of governing), the investigations of our contributors open up new theoretical and methodological issues not previously brought to light in the work that has merged cultural studies and Foucault. To date, the unique methodological demands of bringing together truth, power, and subjectification through discursive analysis, with an emphasis on governmental practices, have not been adequately elaborated. We hope these essays will further thinking in this direction, just as the work cited throughout this introduction has influenced our own thinking about Foucault and cultural studies.

THE CHAPTERS

Following the introductory section, *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality* is divided into three parts that loosely adhere to investigations of knowledge, power, and subjectification. In the Preface to *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2*, Michel Foucault (1997b) outlines a programmatic explanation of his life’s works. Foucault claimed that each of his major studies could be thought of as having dealt with a particular form of experience, be it sexuality,

madness, or criminality. Each “locus of experiences” was the correlation of three axes, unequally apportioned in the various cases. Foucault provides multiple terms to describe the three axes, but in the simplest sense they deal with knowledge, power, and subjectivity. For instance, in the experience of madness there needed to be a type of understanding that described insanity through the disciplines of medicine and later psychiatry; a knowledge of mental illness was formed. Second, an apparatus was produced that managed the experience of madness through normative practices of internment and treatment; power relations manifested themselves. Third, a relationship between oneself and others as possible subjects of madness was specified; a “mad” subjectivity was produced. This “Preface” can be seen as an attempt on Foucault’s part to resituate the corpus of his work within a systematization that did not exist up until his latest work on sexuality, and he goes as far as saying so. However, this does not necessarily weaken his formulation, instead it provides a new articulation for his work and more importantly it provides something of a working schema, if not a methodology, for critical research. By using this same schematic, we recognize that as with the work of Foucault, these three axes only exist in relationship to each other.

Chapter one, “Governing the Present,” elaborates the intersections of Foucault and cultural studies, with particular attention to the Foucaultian strand known as “governmentality studies.” Following the introduction, Lawrence Grossberg and Toby Miller (in an interview with Jeremy Packer) provide historical depth and critical perspective on the often uneasy relationship between Foucault and cultural studies. This history elaborates the contextual contingency of Foucault’s application to cultural studies. It also provides a much-needed explanation of what forces, political, theoretical, and academic, moved cultural studies practitioners to Foucault at various moments and in various places. They also discuss in some detail their own philosophical negotiations of Foucauldian thought and its wider relevance and application to contemporary cultural politics. Although they agree that Foucault’s work should continue to inform cultural studies, the specific nature of that role is debated. Most significantly, they disagree on the very character of governmentality and on its current applicability to contemporary formations of power and governance.

Tony Bennett’s chapter, “Culture and Governmentality,” speaks from the long view of developments in cultural studies over the last decade since the publication of his influential Foucaultian essay, “Putting Policy Into Cultural Studies” (1992). Bennett compares Stuart Hall’s reading of Foucault’s notion of discourse with Nikolas Rose’s interpretation, and finds in their divergence a new way of theorizing culture. Governmentality, according to Bennett, is not simply added to the mix of theories about culture and society—it fundamentally changes the definition of culture from a general mechanism (akin to language) to “a distinctive set of knowledges, expertise, techniques and appa-

ratures.” Culture becomes technical, and this notion of a “culture complex” alters the history of relations between culture and the social.

Knowledge, Rationality, and Expertise

The first section is comprised of essays that deal most explicitly with issues of knowledge, rationality, and expertise. Jack Z. Bratich (“Making Politics Reasonable: Conspiracism, Subjectification, and Governing Through Styles of Thought”) and Jonathan Sterne (“Bureaumentality”) begin this section with chapters that directly engage key oppositions that have informed cultural studies and other forms of radical neo-Marxist scholarship for some time but are now thoroughly unsettled by the philosophical interventions of Michel Foucault. Bratich explores the pivotal opposition in cultural studies between thought and materialism, in which the former is often conceived as an epiphenomenon of the latter. Drawing on Foucault’s writings on thought as an ethos, Bratich insists that thought has had a dynamic role in modern politics since its concrete incorporation into nineteenth century liberalism as a form of active political rationality. He argues, with illustration, that political experts have problematized “conspiracy theories” to form a style of thought that mobilizes technologies of truth in an ethos of self-reflection. Thought, then, instead of being inert or inactive, is now at the seismic center of contemporary political calculation and political action.

Following Bratich, Sterne casts critical attention to another type of opposition that has been a longstanding organizing principle separating structuralism and poststructuralism from Marxist forms of culturalism: the opposition between humanism and antihumanism (see e.g., Stuart Hall’s [1980] pivotal essay, “Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms”). Unlike some forms of cultural studies formulations, this opposition between humanism and antihumanism is not, Sterne argues, as clear-cut in the writings of Foucault bearing upon topics such as governmentality. Quite provocatively, Sterne insists that Foucauldian thought betrays an ambivalence in its very silence on the political agency of the masses. In his very silence on human agency, Sterne argues Foucault’s work reveals a hidden investment in mass insurgency or a “black populism” to use the language of Carlo Ginzburg (1980). Sterne further maintains that this issue is not particularly well resolved by Tony Bennett and other exponents of the Australian policy studies approach to cultural studies. He takes on the latter’s attempts to counterpose a putative outmoded humanism of Antonio Gramsci and its foregrounding of a heroic status for “the people/the popular” to the presumably more pragmatic and efficacious contemporary site of institutional policy and politics. Unlike Bratich, Sterne comes out on the other side of poststructuralist thinking as illustrated in the antihumanist reading of Foucault to be found in the cultural policy studies

movement. Sterne ultimately raises a very difficult question for this genre of Foucauldian merger with cultural studies: What happens to representational politics, social justice and a mass-based sense of the good life when you banish humanism?

Jeremy Packer (“Disciplining Mobility: Governing and Safety”) looks at techniques of governing at a distance through mobility and freedom and the related production of safety regulations and safety discourses in post-War United States. Deploying a Deleuzean strategy of analysis, he unpacks the discourse of safety and its naturalization as a global set of rules and goals of state trusteeship of modern populations. Packer ultimately demonstrates the ways in which safety exceeds a concern for the well being of the “public” and contributes instead to techniques in which modern individuals and populations organize, rationalize, and inhabit their world.

These chapters primarily concern themselves with the technologies of truth, the expansion of expertise, and rationalities of governing. Recognizing that culture is often the domain of knowledge-production, these pieces begin to shift the definition of culture away from signifying practices and towards one that encompasses truth-telling practices and the discursive mechanisms of governance.

Policy, Power, and Governing Practices

In this section, the authors analyze a number of cultural practices, institutions, and discourses from a Foucauldian cultural perspective. They approach these research objects as a set of cases of the application of government and discipline. Here, the technologies of governing themselves are foregrounded in order to explain the concrete workings of power.

James Hay (“Unaided Virtues: The (Neo)Liberalization of the Domestic Sphere and the New Architecture of Community”) takes up the central question of the meaningful limits of neoliberalism and its broader imbrication in the elaboration of mass communications technologies and the normalization of cultural practices since the latter part of the twentieth century. A fascinating feature of this chapter is Hay’s deft treatment of the theoretical connections between Foucault’s concept of governmentality and Raymond Williams’ deployment of the term “mobile privatization.” Hay merges Foucault’s and Williams’ theories concerning the pivotal role of culture in the emergence of modern practices and environments of governing in order to better understand the impact of communication technologies, specifically television, within contemporary social formations. He ends by examining the relations between New Urbanism, cultural technologies, and community as a way of understanding recent strategies of “governing at a distance.”

The deployment of community within the terms of neoliberal political rationality is also analyzed in the chapter authored by Mary K. Coffey ("From Nation to Community: Museums and the Reconfiguration of Mexican Society Under Neoliberalism"). This contribution explores the relevance of governmentality to the workings of culture and the renarration of the state/civil society couplet in the Mexican national context. Coffey is concerned with the discursive and practical entailments of the policy initiatives of the benevolent modern state and its impositions on modern populations. Unlike Sterne, though, Coffey draws empathetically on Bennett's deployment of a theory of governmentality to understand the policy work of the contemporary museum as a cultural institution in late twentieth century Mexico. Her focus here is on the critical role of community-based museology in the elaboration of the neoliberal cultural policy initiatives of the postrevolutionary Mexican state as it strove to mold a new democratic order.

The chapters by Carrie A. Rentschler ("Designing Fear: How Environmental Security Protects Property at the Expense of People") and Greg Dimitriadis and Cameron McCarthy ("Creating a New Panopticon: Columbine, Cultural Studies, and the Uses of Foucault") address the rather alarming contemporary pattern of intensification of surveillance and regulation of social space within the education setting. In Rentschler's chapter, she calls attention to the changing dynamics within the university that foreground the use of a totally planned environment to regulate the movement of bodies on the University of Illinois' campus. The university's environmental planning goal here is to anticipate and to eliminate all crimes based on the principle of excluding the unwanted stranger from the campus environs. Rentschler argues, persuasively, since sexual assault against women is predominantly an acquaintance phenomenon, that this fact of familiarity complicates the private/public split so central to the university's crime prevention philosophy. The university's attempt to regulate public spaces privileges the idea of the protection of private property and consequently marginalizes the security needs of women on campus in an effort to deploy power spatially.

Greg Dimitriadis and Cameron McCarthy call attention to the intensification of surveillance technologies in American schools in the aftermath of the Columbine School massacre at Littleton, Colorado in April of 1999. They argue that current cultural studies in education approaches to these developments are inadequate in that they continue to rely on neo-Marxist, Frankfurt School, psychoanalytic and neo-Gramscian models of analysis that reduce youth violence to models of "resistance." Drawing on Foucauldian concepts of discipline, surveillance, and panopticism they argue that the modern school has become a site in which the contemporary school curriculum has been displaced by models of cultural style and the regulation of conduct produced in popular culture. They maintain that in a striking manner, too, the

school is being transformed by the world of commodified popular culture in which violence and its antithesis of technological fantasies of security are all-pervasive themes. These latter two essays focus on the environmental changes in education and the deepening patterns of commodification and surveillance associated with the greater infusion of commercialized cultural initiatives into the university and school settings.

Technologies of the Self

The chapters in Part III address technologies of the self more explicitly. The first chapter in this section, by Samantha J. King (“Doing Good By Running Well: Breast Cancer, the Race for the Cure, and New Technologies of Ethical Citizenship”) examines the powerful nexus of sport, volunteerism, and the elaboration of neoliberal forms of self-management and privatization of social problems. As a powerful example of these dynamics, King explores in some detail the way in which the Komen Foundation’s annual fundraiser for breast cancer, “Race for the Cure,” a 5K run held in Washington D.C., links a “fit and healthy body” to the task of neoliberal governance and the privatization of social causes concerning the national welfare. King foregrounds these economic and cultural practices as ethical practices, where consumption, health, and citizenship converge in a relation of self to self, and by extension to others.

Shawn Miklaucic (“God Games and Governmentality: *Civilization II* and Hypermediated Knowledge”) looks at the productive epistemologies of popular simulation in computer games, linking this new technology with technologies of subjectification. For Miklaucic, computer games are not simply articulated to questions of surveillance in a practical sense; they, in fact, function more powerfully as conceptual and interpretive tools of self-problematization and system organization. Computer games such as *Civilization II* simulate reflexive models that valorize hierarchical, state-centered forms of political rationality. Drawing on Tony Bennett’s work on museums, J. David Bolter and Richard Grusin’s work on hypermediation, and Frederic Jameson’s concept of metacommentary, Miklaucic makes the case for greater attention within cultural studies to computer games as sites of the production of contemporary political rationalities. In turn, he offers the outlines of a new methodological approach to these sites of political simulation that involves modes of reflexive textual analysis that read narrative content against the formal qualities of interface and game play.

While authors of the previous chapters tend to foreground macrological concerns with the subjectivization of populations, Lisa King (“Subjectivity as Identity: Gender Through the Lens of Foucault”) concludes this section with an intensive micrological exploration of the implications of Foucault’s problematization of the self for a reconsideration of the nature and experience

of gender identity in modern life. Drawing on the first volume of Foucault's *The History of Sexuality*, King calls attention to "the modern compulsion to tell the truth about ourselves." She uses a single case—the case of David Reimer, the boy who lost his penis to a botched circumcision, was raised as a girl and then through sex reassignment as a teenager, became a boy—to draw normative lessons about the politics of identity. King argues that political action based on essentialized identities that presume an a priori coherence unmodulated by social forms of problematization reside on very shallow and unstable ground indeed. Instead, King calls for a practice and technology of the self enacted through an aesthetico-political lens.

GOVERNMENTALITY AND WAR

In the post-9/11/2001 world, we can see how these analytic frameworks have even stronger purchase on contemporary events. From one perspective, these governmental rationalities under scrutiny are "peacetime" rationalities, counterposed to a "wartime" scenario (that we were under as this book went to print). However, if we take Foucault's claim seriously that "politics is war pursued by other means" (1980, p. 93), then the peace/war distinction no longer holds regarding governmentality. Thus we take a different perspective, one that argues that recent events are an *intensification*, *acceleration*, and *integration* of governing strategies under a state of emergency, or permanent war.

We can just take some of the more obvious examples from this volume to make our point. Samantha King's analysis of the enrollment of volunteerism and consumption as a governing strategy has a newfound resonance with the recruitment of nationalist citizen-subjects through donations, patriotic shopping, and community service. The production of subjects through discourses of safety (see Packer's chapter) and apparatuses of security (see Rentschler) has taken on heightened visibility with life-and-death stakes. Bratich's discussion of the governance of thought as a self-reflective ethos has acquired new valences, as George W. Bush declares a National Day of Reflection and the White House calls for a "re-examination of culture" while citizens are warned to watch what they say and think. The imaging of wars through popular culture has become problematized, and Miklaucic's analysis of *which* kinds of violence count in computer games becomes even more relevant, as the gaming industry regulates itself regarding the kinds of terrorism allowable in future games. McCarthy and Dimitriadis' assessment of critical pedagogy's possibilities takes on a more urgent tenor, as schools become the sites for nationally coordinated pledges of allegiance as well as sites for contestation over the meaning of national symbols like the flag.

What these examples demonstrate is that the strategies of governmentality, rather than being displaced by older forms of war-sovereignty, are indeed

crucial to composing this “new war.” Governmentalizing culture through processes of power, knowledge-production, and subjectification does not take a back seat to a reemergence of State-power. Instead, following Hardt and Negri (2000), the techniques of governmentality analyzed in this volume are remarkable for being “immanent” strategies of governing, deployed in a biopolitical context (pp. 24–28, 329–332).

Seeing as the formation of power relations which governmentality describes takes populations and citizens as not only the object toward which power is directed, but its means as well, then given the current “domestic readiness,” the current form of war is necessarily undertaken via the American citizen. We are all then (and not just to the degree that we are loyal and supportive of state military action, but in our daily lives) at war; either “against terrorism,” as citizen/surveillors and self-monitors, or “for terrorism” if we speak out or fail to remain vigilant and afraid. We have the freedom to respond, but the popular truth-value of that action has been severely circumscribed. Wartime rule is not simply legitimated by sovereign and consenting subjects, but exercised through their mundane habits and communal interactions in the name of their “own” defense.

Just as culture has been made amenable to technical concerns for over a century (see Bennett’s chapter), now that same governmentalized culture can be enlisted and redirected under the state of war (e.g., the centralizing and coordinating function of the Office of Homeland Security). The techniques of governing, already immanent to the productive process of life itself, have been articulated together in a wartime-mobilization that has *made war itself immanent to everyday life*. While the relation between the specificities of the current state of war and governmentality need further conceptual elaboration, suffice it to say that “new war” depends upon a domain of everyday life already saturated with governmental techniques.

CONCLUSION

In our uses and application of Foucault, we aim to provide direction for future cultural studies work which still carries on the traditional commitments while addressing the unique circumstances facing cultural studies scholars in the historical moment in which we live. These unique circumstances include the following: an increasing globalization of culture, the emergence and extension of neoliberal governance, in addition to the growing importance of electronic mediation, migration and diaspora formation in the production of notions of popular memory, history, subjectivity (specifically citizenship and community), and truth. The book does not claim to address all of the characteristics of this historical moment. Rather, the emphasis here is on recent rationalities of governing (especially the link between practices of governing and practices

of the self). These circumstances demand a reconceptualization of the relationships between truth and ideology, the State and power, as well as identity and subjectification. In sum, they require a redefinition of culture itself, one that does not simply reduce it to the site of ideological reproduction or to the location of resistance.

Rather than diagnose a current “conjuncture” (called neoliberalism), we wish to perform what Foucault calls an “ontology of the present.” Our primary concern in this volume is to provide critical frameworks to analyze cultural practices and strategies of governing as ways of better answering the contemporary conjunctural questions—What are we? How do we navigate the expressions of meaning and power in everyday life and the institutional logics that bear down upon us as modern subjects living in a new millennium? In performing an ontology of the present, we seek a better understanding of the contingent yet sedimented strategies of neoliberal governing that compose everyday life. By making these techniques and tactics intelligible, we can begin to make them amenable to strategies of contestation.

NOTES

1. Lawrence Grossberg for instance, in his 1984 essay “Formations of Cultural Studies” attempts to steer cultural studies in a Foucauldian direction, primarily through the concept of the apparatus which creates “an interested mapping of the lines of concrete effects” (1997, p. 228). Barry Smart argues that Foucauldian conceptions of power should replace Gramscian theorizations in his book, *Foucault, Marxism and Critique* (1983).

2. Perhaps the most widely recognized and cited instance of this kind of work is Mike Davis’ *City of Quartz* (1990).

3. Foucault summarizes the art of dispositions in this way. “The things with which in this sense government is to be concerned are in fact men, but men in their relations, their links, their imbrication with those other things which are wealth, resources, means of subsistence, the territory with its specific qualities, climate, irrigation, fertility, etc.; men in their relation to that other kind of things, customs, habits, ways of acting and thinking, etc.; lastly, men in their relation to that other kind of things, accidents and misfortunes such as famine, epidemic, death, etc.” (1991, p. 93).

4. The exception, Mary K. Coffey’s piece on Mexican community museums, remains in North America.

5. But even “resisting the State” does not guarantee that governmentality, the conduct of conduct, is not present. Indeed, liberal forms of governance, as Foucault (1997a) argues, have as their regulative principle that “one always governs too much, or, at any rate, one always must suspect that one governs too much. Governmentality should not be exercised without a ‘critique’” (p. 74). Liberalism is “a tool for criticizing reality,” and “a form of critical reflection on governmental practice” (pp. 75, 77).

6. Similarly, as Foucault examines in *Discipline and Punish* (1977), disciplinarity is a technology of power, though it had specific conditions of emergence in the panopticon, used in various social situations to achieve the same ends.

7. Tony Bennett provides an excellent account of both the debate and its historical precedents in *Culture: A Reformer's Science* (1997). Jim McGuigan (2001), on the other hand, critiques the policy studies approached based on its misapplication of political engagement. To avoid this quagmire he suggests returning to a definition of culture comprised only of signifying practices.

8. See especially Foucault (1988, 1997b).

REFERENCES

- Barry, A., Osborne, T., & Rose, N. (Eds.), (1996). *Foucault and political reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennett, T. (1992). Putting policy into cultural studies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 23–37). New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, T. (1995). *The birth of the museum: History, theory, politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, T. (1997). *Culture: A reformer's science*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds.). (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The will to empower: Democratic citizens and other subjects*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Davis, M. (1990). *City of quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles*. New York: Verso.
- Dean, M. (1991). *The constitution of poverty: Toward a genealogy of liberal governance*. New York: Routledge.
- Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology*. New York: Routledge.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality*. London: Sage.
- Dean, M. & Hindess, B. (Eds.) (1998). *Governing Australia: Studies of contemporary rationalities of government*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish* (Alan Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1988). The Concern for truth. In L. D. Kritzman (Ed.), *Foucault, Politics, Philosophy, Culture* (pp. 255–267). New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller. *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 119–150). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Foucault, M. (1997a). The birth of biopolitics. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Foucault, ethics: Subjectivity and truth* (pp. 73–79). New York: New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997b). Preface to the *History of sexuality*, Vol. 2. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Foucault, ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. (pp. 199–206). New York: New Press.
- Ginzburg, C. (1980). *The cheese and the worms: The cosmos of a sixteenth-century miller* (J. & A. Tedeschi, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gordon, C. (1999). Under the beach (review article). *The UTS Review: Cultural Studies and New Writing*, 5(1): 157–177.
- Gordon, C. (2000). Introduction. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Foucault: Power* (pp. xi–xli). New York: New Press.
- Grossberg, L. (1997). The formation(s) of cultural studies: An American in Birmingham. In *Bringing it all back home: Essays on cultural studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hall, S. (1980). Cultural studies: Two paradigms. *Media Culture and Society* Vol. 2 Newbury CA: Sage.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hunter, I. (1988). *Culture and government: The emergence of literary education*. Hampshire, United Kingdom: Macmillan Press.
- Hunter, I. (1992). Aesthetics and cultural studies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Hunter, I. (1994). *Rethinking the school: Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Miller, T. (1998). *Technologies of truth: Cultural citizenship and the popular media*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- McGuigan, J. (2001). Problems of cultural analysis and policy in the information age. *Cultural Studies <—> Critical Methodologies*, 1(2).
- Morris, M., & Frow, J. (2000). Cultural studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.)* (pp. 315–346). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Farrell, C. (Ed.). (1997). *Foucault: The legacy*. Brisbane, Australia: Queensland University of Technology.
- Rose, N. (1998). *Inventing ourselves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smart, B. (1983). *Foucault, Marxism and critique*. London: Routledge.