

## Theories of the Capitalist State in the Indian Context

Pradip Kumar Bose

### Autonomy and Anarchy

Theories of the state in India cover a wide range of paradigm and divergent perspectives<sup>1</sup>. They are as much a dispute about the very idea of a state and what it means to theorise about, as they are about the conception of Indian political reality. The range of theories vary from the liberal-pluralist conception of the state, considering it to be an institution that stands outside and above society<sup>2</sup>, to viewing the Indian state as the 'soft state'<sup>3</sup>, an impediment to egalitarianism, to the conception of 'weak-strong' state premised on the contradictory pressures emanating from 'command group' and 'demand group'<sup>4</sup> to viewing it as a set of objective structures tied to capitalist economic process whose requirements it must satisfy, or the view that the state is an instrument of the capitalist class<sup>5</sup>. Perhaps the first thing to note in this brief outline is how very large is the sphere of action which the state in capitalist societies does have in all areas of life. It is deeply and pervasively involved in every aspect of economic life. It is a permanent and active presence in class conflict and in every other kind of conflict. It plays a great and growing role in the manipulation of opinion and in the 'engineering of consent'. It

---

<sup>1</sup> See for instance, A.R.Desai, *State and Society in India*, Bombay 1974; Arun Bose, "Analytical Models of Economics and Societies: Some Implications for Inter-Disciplinary Studies of Social Classes, the State and Civil Society", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 21 (31), 1986; Anupam Sen, *The State Industrialization and Class Formation in India*, London, 1983; A.Kohli, *The State and Poverty in India*, Bombay, 1987; R.Kothari, *State and Politics in Contemporary India*, New Delhi, 1988; M.Shakir, *State and Politics in Contemporary India*, New Delhi, 1986; for a review, see Anjan Ghosh, "The Problem", *Seminar*, March 1990; Yogendra Yadav, "Theories of the Indian State", *Seminar*, March 1990.

<sup>2</sup> R.Kothari, *State Against Democracy*, New Delhi, 1988; "Capitalism and the Role of the State", in Ghanshyam Shah (ed.) *Capitalist Development: Critical Essays*, Bombay, 1990.

<sup>3</sup> G. Myrdal, *The Challenge of World Poverty*, Harmondsworth, 1970.

<sup>4</sup> S.H.Rudolph and L.H.Rudolph, *In Pursuit of Lakshmi*, New Delhi, 1987.

<sup>5</sup> Desai, *op.cit.*, P.K.Bardhan, *Political Economy of Development in India*, New Delhi, 1985; Buddhdeva Bhattacharyya, "Dominant Mode of Production and the Character of the State in India", in Ghanshyam Shah (ed.), *op.cit.*, K.Mathew Kurien (ed.), *India - State and Society: A Marxist Approach*, Bombay, 1975.

has in Max Weber's famous phrase, a 'monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force'. It is alone responsible for international affairs and for deciding what the level and character of the country's armaments should be.

In the 'pluralist' version the state is viewed to be based on the consensus of the individuals that make up the society and is thus equipped with powers that it exercises for the conduct of their general affairs. The 'elitist' version, which appears to be an opposite version, in fact reproduces the same argument by assuming that the society is incapable of regulating its own affairs, and that the state is therefore endowed with powers handed over to it by the society. The state becomes then, an independent centre of power which acts on the whole society for the good of the latter. It is this theory which posited opposite tendencies vis-a-vis capitalism and the state<sup>6</sup>.

The opposite tendency formulated by the pluralist theorists was one in which, with the emergence of the post-colonial India, the state began to be seen as both a liberator from the colonial regime and foreign capital and the prime agent of capital accumulation and economic development. Consequently then, whereas capitalism was seen as a global force, the newly emergent state was conceived as providing a series of bulwarks of both socio-political and cultural kinds against imperialist thrust of capitalism. The emerging political process was seen as making the state to be accountable to diverse sections of society and this view reinforced the conceptualisation of the state as a liberator from various monopolies of power. In brief, capitalism by its very nature was viewed as universalistic which seeks to integrate various societies into one common framework and the emergence of the state and the political process within it represented forces in opposite direction. However, as Kothari writes: "It is only in recent years, starting sometime in the mid-seventies and catching on during the eighties, that this countervailing nature of the state, the political process against global capitalism has been weakened and there is growing evidence of the former colonies being reintegrated into one common framework". This

---

<sup>6</sup> R.Kothari, *State Against Democracy*; "Capitalism and the Role of the State".

<sup>7</sup> R.Kothari, "Capitalism and the Role of the State", *ibid.*, p.117.

view is according to Kolhari, ideologically backed by the thesis of superiority of the market over the state as means of rapid modernization, leading to a philosophy of liberalization and privatization; and the superiority of the private firm and voluntary agency over the bureaucracy for a flexible, innovative and dynamic institutional framework for development.

The problem in this paradigm centres around the question of the autonomy of the state. It begins with a model of nation-building in which the state retained a large measure of autonomy, intervened in the socio-economic spheres with its own agenda of social change and was relatively free of class, caste and communal interests, at least at national and state levels. As a concomitant to this was posited the autonomy of the political process. However, as Kothari Writes: "A massive erosion of state autonomy has taken place in India. The undermining of the party system, the federal polity and the intermediate structures through which local problems and conflicts used to be sorted out has deprived the state of this capacity for social reform and has made it vulnerable to dominant interests. Ironically, greater centralization of power has made the state less autonomous. And independence from lower tiers of the federal system, from party and bureaucratic institutions, has made it dependent on dominant structures of national and international power and privilege"<sup>8</sup>. The decline of the state autonomy, in this view, goes along with growing delegitimization. State instruments like bureaucracy, government are no longer considered as efficient means for `progress`. The whole process of debureaucratizing the state apparatus, the growing importance of autonomous corporations, are all part of this massive shift from the state to the market as the agent of national development. The thesis puts the state at the centre of nation-building, as it were, and links the legitimacy of the state with its autonomy. The state here emerges as an independent form and superior to all classes, as being the dominant force in society.

Among the Marxists, the capitalist state is conceived of as a complex social relation of many different aspects, the main

---

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, p. 123.

ones being political processes and institutions, the ruling class, an objective structure of political/economic functions, and an arena for class struggle. Viewed from one aspect, or one side, the state appears as a one-sided relation and sometimes they contradict each other. For example, the view of the state as an instrument of the capitalist class (which suggests that the capitalist are in direct control of the state and consciously uses its institutions to promote their interests) appears to contradict the view of the state as set of objective structures tied to capitalist economic processes whose requirements it must satisfy (which suggests that the actions of whichever group controls the state are determined by forces outside its control, given that it does not want to overturn the entire capitalist system). Particular political developments may also have apparently contradictory meanings when viewed within different Marxist interpretations of the state. For example, a political reform that favors the working class, when viewed within the framework of the capitalist state as an arena of class struggle, appears as a victory for the workers, perhaps one which helps set limits to the exercise of capitalist power. On the other hand viewing the same reform within the framework of the state as the instruments of the capitalist class leads to the conclusion that the capitalists have adopted a more sophisticated way of controlling or cooling out the workers, that it is a higher order victory for the capitalists. These different conclusions do not balance out, and a compromise makes no sense.

Coming back to the question of autonomy, Marxists in India have shown greater willingness to recognize relative autonomy of the state thanks to Gramsci and Poulantzas. That the post-colonial state like India has a relative autonomy in mediating the dominant interests of the competing classes has been argued by some. Bardhan, for example, views the Indian state as an autonomous actor, as none of the classes constraining state action dominates the others and although social cleavages make compromise difficult and multiply the stresses and strains on the polity. Indian experience, to him, suggests that the very nature of class balance and heterogeneity make the proprietary classes somewhat more interested in the

maintainance of the autonomy<sup>9</sup>. The discussions on autonomy usually goes on at cross-purposes because the people involved do not sufficiently distinguish between these different Marxist interpretations of the state, and hence whether (under certain circumstances) the state is relatively autonomous from the ruling capitalist class, or from economic requirements of capitalism, or from other alienated social relations etc. As a matter of fact there is a case to be made for relative autonomy within each of these perspectives on the state. What is important is to remember that the confusion results from thinking that there is only one debate when there are really several.

However, beyond the differences that are expressed in these discussions, there is also a fundamental measure of agreement that the state is decisively constrained by forces external to it, and that the constraints originate in the national and international capitalist context in which it operates. The state might be constrained by the imperative requirement of capital for its reproduction and accumulation; or by the pressure from lobbies and organizations and agencies at the service of capital or one or other of its `fractions`; or by the combined impact of these and international forces such as other capitalist states or the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund. It can be noted in this connection that this Marxist view of the state as impelled by forces external to it shares its `problematic` with the liberal or `liberal-pluralist` view of the state, notwithstanding the other profound differences between them: whereas the Marxist view attributes the main constraints upon the state to capital or capitalists or both, the `liberal-pluralist` one attributes them to various pressures exercised upon a basically democratic state by a plurality of competing groups, interests and parties in society. In both perspectives the state does not originate action but responds to external forces; it may appear to be the `historical subject`, but is in fact the object of processes and forces at work in society. Such a perspective fails, as some argue, to treat the state as an autonomous structure - a structure with a logic and interests of its own not necessarily equivalent to, or tuned with,

---

<sup>9</sup> P.K.Bardhan, *Political Economy of Development in India*.

the interests of the dominant class in society, or the full set of member groups in the polity.

From an entirely different perspective, some Marxists have argued that the concept of `relative autonomy` is hollow and theoretically unproductive. The failure originates in applying universalistic notions of Marxian theory without any accurate `reconnaissance of each individual country`, to use a Gramscian phrase. As Gupta writes: "I am of the opinion that theorist of the capitalist state (in India) have deflected probes into actual governments under capitalism, which is crucial for the left praxis and have instead justified left inertia by portraying the capitalist state as a rarefied phenomenon, as a cerebral essence, whose omniscience and omnipresence frustrates left activism at every turn and often before it has begun"<sup>10</sup>. Ideological hegemony ensures that the state acts in a relatively autonomous way and thus the capitalist state actively ensure hegemony and gets activated by the prevailing hegemony. These two aspects, in a manner "seal off" the state, leaving no space for forces diametrically opposed to work their way in. This theorisation undermines the weak schinks in the capitalist armoury and stress instead the maintainance of hegemony. The argument that autonomy and hegemony are derived from the anarchy of capitalist production and alienation respectively, is challenged on the ground that relative autonomy and hegemony are simply semantic parallels of capitalist anarchy and alienation and should be understood as analogical and not analytical constructs. "Alienation and anarchy refer to the economic realm and are derived via pointed existence statements which validate the necessity of fragmented (and divisible) capital and abstracted labour respectively, in the capitalist mode of production. Relative autonomy and hegemony on the other hand are constituted by a vertical transference of attributes from the economic to the superstructural level without adequate existence statements that can serve as analytical copula linking the two levels"<sup>11</sup>. While relative autonomy implies that the capitalist state by

---

<sup>10</sup> Dipankar Gupta, "Anarchy and Capitalism", *Seminar*, March 1990, p.42; also see his, "Theory Against Practice: A Critique of the Theories of the Capitalist State with Special Reference to India", in Ghanshyam Shah (ed.), *Capitalist Development: Critical Essays*.

<sup>11</sup> Dipankar Gupta, "Anarchy and Capitalism", p.44

placing itself, as it were, above the warring classes, is able to protect its long-term interests, the theoretical attraction of this model lies in `explaining` how capitalist society is able to reproduce itself inspite of internal fractions. This theorisation often borders on the illegitimate when it is assumed that actors and the state act to uphold the long-range trends for certain very analytical reasons.

In this context Gupta points out that as a theoretical tool relative autonomy is unable to explain a logic of the state-craft in India, the term is tautological and functionalist and reflect very imperfectly the state under capitalism in India. He suggests the term should be abandoned in favor of `relative anarchy` which has a number of distinct advantages. "If the anarchy of capitalist production forecloses any possibility of the capitalist class acting in union, then it is highly unlikely that other classes with differential locations in social structure will have identical outlooks. This anarchy is reflected in the functioning of the state, but it is only relative because the political imperative to stay in power force the government to bring about some form of order"<sup>12</sup>.

While it is possible to argue that the concept of relative autonomy can be used to identify structural characteristics of the capitalist state that originated from the relative separation of the "economic" and "political" instance, the term in recent literature has become a catch-all phrase that would counter the alleged "instrumentalist" conception of the state. The conceptual separation between economic and political that attributes an independence to the state can also be viewed as class-reductionist. The theoretical problem of class-reductionism has been sought to overcome by the concept of "potential autonomy", where the state is considered not to be relatively autonomous from the dominant classes, but potentially autonomous from the society as a whole, the working-out of the potentiality depends on the specificity of the situation. Paradoxically then, autonomy of the state is attributed to its repressive power, the use of "force" appears to be evidence for state`s autonomy. For its use of force, shows that the state is not necessarily based on consensus in the society.

---

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.*, p.47.

Hamza Alavi presents a slightly different version of the state autonomy in the context of "peripheral societies" in South Asia. In the post-colonial state metropolitan bourgeoisie constructs a state apparatus which is "overdeveloped" in relation to the internal structure of the colony, for it is designed to subordinate all indigenous classes. "The colonial state is therefore equipped with a powerful bureaucratic - military apparatus" which is inherited in the post-colonial period. But since at the moment of independence this apparatus is "freed from direct metropolitan control" and is not brought under the control of any one of the indigenous dominant classes, the apparatus itself gains relative autonomy<sup>13</sup>. This sense of relative autonomy derives from the power inherent in the state apparatus itself and is sustained by its role of mediation between the classes.

The "bureaucratic-military oligarchy" in these post-colonial states acts so as to sustain and reproduce its own autonomy. Economically, due to its position of power, the state has access to a large portion of the economic surplus. This surplus, in turn, is used in bureaucratically directed activities which enhances the state's autonomy. Politically, the state aims to defeat any threat to its position of power which may arise from the representative party system. This explains the inherent tendency to direct military-bureaucratic rule in post-colonial societies. Further Alavi argues, this specific autonomy of the post-colonial state provides the metropolitan bourgeoisie with the leverage to enter into the local class structure as an "absentee" dominant class. Thus: "The role of the bureaucratic-military oligarchy in post-colonial societies is only relatively autonomous, because it is determined within the matrix of a class society and not outside it, for the preservation of the social order based on the institution of private property unites all the three competing propertied social classes. Nevertheless the role of the bureaucratic-military oligarchy is relatively autonomous because, once the controlling hand of the metropolitan bourgeoisie is lifted at the moment of

---

<sup>13</sup> Hamza Alavi, "The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh", *New Left Review*, 74, 1972, p.61.



independence, no single class has exclusive command over it"<sup>14</sup>.

This view is obviously an "instrumentalist" view of the state and as Alavi states, it is precisely because no single class has gained domination that the state is not an instrument of a single class. Paradoxically, it is this instrumentalist view which leads Alavi to attribute a "relative autonomy" to the state. In his critique of Alavi's notion of over-developed state, Leys<sup>15</sup>, however, argues that this is a misleading concept. It is not certain that the state in the peripheral society is in any sense more extensive than what is called for by the role it performs, nor is it certain that the peripheral state is more extensive than the state in the advanced capitalist society.

Our discussion regarding the constraints on relative autonomy points to a real problem, which has not been satisfactorily resolved in the literature. Although the notion of relative autonomy suggests a healthy reaction to the "instrumentalist" interpretation of the theory of the state, it remains an abstract notion without substance unless it is operationalized. The problem arises precisely because of the conceptual separation between the "economic" and the "political" which in turn imposes the necessity to discover mechanism to link the two. More generally, the question remains, how great a degree of autonomy does the state have in capitalist society? What purpose is its autonomy intended to serve? And what purpose does it actually serve? These and many other such questions are clearly of the greatest theoretical and practical importance, given the scope and actual or potential impact of state action upon society over which the state presides, and often beyond.

### **Bureaucratization and Debureaucratization**

Besides characterizing the state as "instrumentalist" or "relatively autonomous", it is possible to view the state as a process or structuration and the model of the state is

---

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, p.72.

<sup>15</sup> C. Leys, "The 'Overdeveloped' Post-Colonial State: A Re-Evaluation", *Review of African Political Economy*, 5, 1976.

constructed taking into account the evolving and changing dimensions of the socio-political structures. Structuration relates the institutions and practices of the state into a pattern. The value of these concepts lies in viewing the relations over time between process and structure in continuity and discontinuity. Structuration focuses on structures and institutions and there is perhaps an implicit assumption that the state can be "structured" or "designed" rather than it emerging in the course of a historical process. The concept of structuration is, of course, far more subtle than the term "state-building", practically abandoned now, which arrogated the task of building the state to political planner in citadels of power.

Structuration of bureaucracy can be very rewarding in the analysis and understanding of the state process. At a theoretical level the relationship between bureaucracy and the state has been understood principally in terms of two paradigms. In the Weberian paradigm, bureaucracy grows out of the need for rational administration in the increasingly complex capitalist society and it advances because of its technical superiority over any other form of organization. Precision, speed, unambiguity, continuity, discretion, unity, hierarchy, contribute towards the increasing power of bureaucracy. In Marxian paradigm bureaucratization is seen as a functional response by the capitalist state to conflicting pressures from classes which accompany the development of capitalism.

A post-colonial state, like India, already inherits a bureaucracy, with norms and values of the colonial regime. Such a bureaucracy is unable to fulfil even the basics of the Weberian paradigm. Bureaucracy in India as some studies would comment is in the state of decay<sup>16</sup>. The Indian state in the early period took on itself the responsibility for transforming the economy. More ambitiously, it sought to deliver new services - education, public health, sophisticated agricultural technology, cooperative marketing - to its people in villages. These new and additional burden overstressed the old colonial bureaucracy.

---

<sup>16</sup> Henry C.Hart, "Political Leadership in India: Dimensions and Limits", in Atul Kohli (ed.), *India's Democracy: An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations*, Bombay, 1991.

The principal structural change that was introduced was to counterpose to the lower reaches of the bureaucracy several tiers of elected councils, panchayat raj. The effect was both democratizing and divisive, and stress on field administration increased. A sympathetic biographer of the then Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru writes: "The failure to dismantle the civil services and to replace them with a new machinery of administration suited to the objectives of free India set up unnecessary hurdles"<sup>17</sup>. A crucial issue contributing to the general decline of bureaucracy was the peculiar relationship between the leaders and the bureaucracy. Like all institutions, since bureaucratic institutions constrain the scope of personal power, leaders have often undermined bureaucracy, for personal power considerations. Weakened institutions, in turn have had detrimental consequences for the state - powerfuls bypass the rules and efficient do not come to the fore.

Taub<sup>18</sup> in a study of Indian bureaucracy reports four different sources of strain vis-a-vis the state and the bureaucracy: 1) The changing nature of the job; 2) The democratization of the government; 3) The impact of democratization on income and 4) The impact of the British legacy. The changing nature of bureaucratic work in the post-colonial state subjected the bureaucracy to the kinds of pressure which turned out to be especially profound when the new role was contrasted with expectations based on a real, or perhaps, imagined past. In the post-colonial state, with the increasing emphasis on democratization, those who were formerly the agents of foreign rulers had to assume their new role as "public servants". Pressed by new groups for equal status, bureaucrats found themselves with their new role altered from that of "superior" to that of conciliator, bargainer, and agent. They had to be subordinate to people whose accomplishments they did not highly value, and this was both a source of tension and somewhat demeaning. The other contending political groups, who already thought that bureaucrats suffer from a "superiority complex", were arrogant, or even a "separate caste" were unlikely to support any move to grant them any more privilege either in terms of pay or power; and there are

---

<sup>17</sup> S.Gopal, *Jawaharlal Nehru: A Biography*, Cambridge, 1984, Vol. 3, p.282.

<sup>18</sup> R.P.Taub, *Bureaucrats Under Stress*, Berkeley, 1969.

commentators in India who believe that a civil service should not get "too far above" the rest of society in a "socialist democracy". The strains in the organization, stemming from the sources described above, lead to a particular pattern of behavior among bureaucrats. Taub writes: "This pattern is characterized by inflexible adherence to and dependence upon rules; a focusing of decision-making upward; and its reverse, a lack of delegation of authority; and a generalized rigidity that prevents the organization from adapting readily to changing demands upon it"<sup>19</sup>. Such a pattern is further complicated by particularistic ties, hierarchical norms and traditions of deference towards authority in Indian society.

It is on such grounds the traditional agencies of the state and bureaucracy are held responsible for depriving people of resources, and are sought to be replaced by autonomous agencies, corporations, with involvement of voluntary bodies and `people`s organizations`. This debureaucratization process is projected as a new thinking, a new structure of governance run not by discredited politicians and corrupt bureaucrats but by a committed band of professionals. The critics of this move, however, point out that a corporate, rather than a bureaucratic, structure makes it possible to create entities that are not accountable to the usual machinery of constitutional government and the parliament. The move to incorporate into this process voluntary agencies and people`s organizations makes it possible for the state to co-opt and appropriate sources of dissent. In the name of professionalism real experts are replaced, as Kothari writes, "by managers, ad men, foreign foundation hands and well-connected journalists who are adept at hijacking the work of genuine professionals. Together, these forays into the governing structures have undermined accountability to elected representatives and enables industrial houses and transnationals, hitherto suspect in India, to find entry into the system"<sup>20</sup>.

The process of debureaucratization is attempted through a wide diffusion of liberalised, privatised efforts with promises to open up vast hinterlands with the help of new technologies,

---

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, p.161.

<sup>20</sup> R.Kothari, "Capitalism and the Role of the State", p.126.

cost-effective methods and competitive ethos. Here also we view the same contradictory tendencies of bureaucratization and debureaucratization, used by the state to wield greater powers accompanied by less accountability. But the contradictory pulls and pressures also remain a continuous source of tension within the state.

### **Power without the state and the state with power**

The state in India, as in many third world countries, is beset with formidable problems in achieving its goal of creating a `national` society. Unlike the European state, the state in India, because of its different historical antecedents, achieved to do this by shorter and seemingly easier course of continuous state intervention. There is a dissonance between the state whose self-image is of a major agent of change seeking to bring about a homogeneous `national` society and the prevailing cultural diversities in the society which tend not to concede such a role too easily to the state. The state projects a supra-cultural entity called the `nation` often by activating majoritarian culture based on ethnicity or religion and cultural pluralities are sought to be contained through the symbolism of majoritarian culture which the state articulates through its social and cultural policies. In the process `nation-building`, rather than the creation of a civil society that can restrain the absolute power of the state, becomes a primary task of the state. In a pluralist set-up the forces generated by democratic politics prevent the state from choosing a single cultural identity, even majoritarian as the basis of nationhood. Thus the project of nation-building becomes inseparable from the building of a civil society.

However, there is a deeper source of dissonance between the state and the cultural pluralities. This is based on an alternative notion of power in traditional communities which is concerned with the establishment and maintenance of internal cooperation and external independence. The power in such communities had often been diffused, distributed not in a casual manner but following a very close-knit grill of norms which envisaged a partial and temporary exercise of power for

all members. It can be argued that the traditional communities are societies against the state, not only because they operated according to different model of power but because they were organized against its appearance. The state becomes the image of bad power against which the communities defend themselves by preventing its birth. In the modern state the power is equated with the state can be contrasted with the idea of a diffuse power, distributed within the body of society, of a plurality of local powers exercised from innumerable points.

Thus the state's attempt to homogenise the cultural pluralities and contain them within the ambit of the `nation` is resisted from a different model of power without the state. The state in its ongoing process of modernization devises policies which allow the state to penetrate deeply into the social life of community and subordinates the social codes followed by different communities to the penal and economic codes which it expressly devises for its members and make them universally applicable to them all. With the aim of creating `national economy` and `national market`, the state makes the pluralities incapable of controlling or regulating the growing and much differentiated arena of economical relations among its members. Such encroachments on the economic and socio-cultural spaces occupied by diverse communities are resisted on the grounds of unilateral usurpation of power by the state, a kind of power that is criticized by Foucault as "centered on the sole functioning of the law and on the sole functioning of prohibition" for its highly limiting character. "A power that is poor in its resources, economical in its proceedings, monotonous in the tactics that it uses ... a power that supposedly has nothing other than the ability of saying no"<sup>21</sup>.

At a theoretical level as long as power remained identified with the state and its apparatuses, all discussions of power turned into analyses of the state. From an anthropological perspective, yet to be attempted in case of the state in India, it is possible to discuss power in communities not located in the state or its apparatuses and those form of diffuse power within communities that do have a state, and which grew outside or

---

<sup>21</sup> Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, New York, 1978, p.76.

against it. This can enlighten us not simply about the intricacies and complexities of the state process but provide us with alternate notions of viewing the state.

