

as Same's Other and give them identity as communities who should be supported by the state.

(10) Discourse of development generates sense or experience of 'lack' or 'absence'. Striving to be 'what one is not' is ingrained in developmentalism. Once adhered to developmentalism this sense of lack and absence in oneself and in the society (say Kerala society) is quite probable. This is so as development is always discursively anchored to the developed or the advanced West through the idea of 'catching up'. That is, the moment one enters into developmentalism she/he is bound to accept the superiority of the developed and inferiority of the developing. That is how developmentalism encodes individual self-hood and subjectivities. And what is lacking in one is perceived in referential relation with what is present in the superior 'other'. The 'other' can be another nation, state, country, society, community, tribe, caste, individual and so on. By generating sense of lack, individuals are distributed in a skewed relation of power. For instance the relation between developing and developed or between haves and have not's. The interlocking ideological underpinning of development writing is intrinsically hierarchical by privileging certain societies, cultures and institutions while disapproving others.

(11) By inculcating sense of lack newer and newer subjectivities are constituted. That is some kind of 'seeking' subjectivity is created in individuals. Such individuals keep on seeking development, let it be material development or otherwise. In our case what is sought is charity of the state; of course Travancore have been known as "*Land of Charity*" (Samuel Mateer, 1870). The psychology of self-denigration, self-accusations and self-effacement were some of the results of seeking for charity of the state, or institutions resembling it, to overcome absences and fill the lack.

(12) Developmental modernity has prioritised insular identities which create several schisms in one's individual subjectivities and inter-subjective relations. One of the peculiarities is that while individuals have become insular there is seeking for social support systems. Once we consider this

insularisation, with splits within, then family disaggregation into set of individuated members, suicide, emotional instabilities and so on fall in frame. Perhaps the insularity itself persuades individual selves to be in self constituted collective identity. Being insular individual and at the same time seeking collective self-identity is perplexing. Collective action takes place far in between and seldom. Of course collective actions take place in our 'societies of control'<sup>1</sup> (over and above 'disciplinary society') through various electronic means and remote technologies.

(13) Developmentalism generates ambivalence by confusing between what is pointed at (let it be human development, sustainable development, equitable development or anything of this kind) and what points (say, index finger). Currently, any one conducting development telling gets immersed in the plethora of definitions of it and in general begins with development debate. Definition of what development is has been perpetually postponed. When, as is often the case, the question 'What is intended by development?' or indices is confused with the question 'What is development', an intention to develop is routinely confused with an immanent process of development. (Crown M.P. and R. W. Shenton, 1966, *Doctrine of Development*) Development seems to challenge definition, and there is little wonder why we are thoroughly confused by development studies texts as to what development means.(N. Shanmugaratnam, 2011). “[The] basic impulse of those who write development is a desire to define, categorise and bring order to a heterogeneous and constantly multiplying field of meaning. In a recent spate of development dictionaries we sense an urgent, even desperate, attempt to stabilize development and bring order out of ambiguity.” (Jonathan Crush, ed, 1995:2). Ambivalence is inherent in the inferences of indices of any kind as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unlike the eighteenth and nineteenth century, the concept of 'disciplinary society' formulated by Michel Foucault was sufficient to explicate certain features of these centuries. Whereas, Gilles Deleuze, argues that what is more important for the twenty first century is the concept 'Societies of Control' because capitalism is no more for production but for products/market. (Deleuze, 2011:139-144)



(14) Developmentalism generates added obligation to the extent that one is, at times, supposed to be an ascetic for the benefit of development of the nation; for those who are immersed in the fathomless depths of developmentalism it is non-problematic (which is not the case in reality). Individuals get obligated to institutions and organization of development or to any *dispositif*. *Dispositif* is a euphemism used by the Michel Foucault (1980), generally to refer to the various discursive, institutional, physical, regulatory decisions; scientific, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions; administrative mechanisms and knowledge structures which all together enhance and maintain the exercise of power within the social body. One will be put in such a predicament that, voluntarily or involuntarily, certain position has to be taken up either by favoring development (and thereby participating in it) or opposing it or at least opposing the effects of it or position oneself somewhere in between them. For example, the displaced people due to development project are told that this is the sacrifice that you are doing for the nation. If resist displacement then the *dispositif* becomes coercively operative.

(15) The project of development at first constitutes individuals as objects of development discourse and projects. Once this is accomplished then the development project proceeds to make individuals as subjects of it or bearers of developmentalism. These subjects propagate developmentalism, make individuals propagandists (knowingly or unknowingly) of development. Individuals are subjectified (to others as well as to oneself) through objectifying them in discourses. Developmentalism touches every aspect of sociality and individuals within it. It is hardly possible to find an individual either objectified or subjectified or molded as both within developmentalism.

There cannot be any balance sheet of development as there is nothing like success and failure. Success of some can be failure of someone else. The success-failure paradigm does not work. That is, failures are perpetuated only because they are success of some; this is especially so when failures becomes phenomenal. Any number of examples can be found in the case of Kerala. So the pertinent question is not why development projects fail, but who benefit

from such perpetual failures. That is, when one rethink about Kerala development model, the question who benefit from the failures of development projects attains more importance than thinking about why such and such projects failed. While rethinking about the Kerala model one has to inverse or at least reframe the habituated questions. In any case thinking and rethinking are coterminous; rethinking is an iterative practice.

(16) The term development is elusive and incorrigible: there is plethora of 'developments', they appear in different garbs such as, economic development, ecodevelopment, alternative development, human development, women's development, social development, sustainable development and what not. One interesting point can be put forwarded here. Hopes for sustainable development of the economy and sustainability of ecosystems are indeed luring at first sight, but they are incompatible, if not incommensurable (sustainable development of the economy and sustainability of ecosystems are two mutually contesting concepts). The plethora is such that they in sum are elusive; that is, it is hard to isolate one from the other and also identify any exclusive one; it is hard to comprehend; it tends to evade our grasp with dexterity. That is development discourse is a set wherein oxymora can be sighted with ease. Think of eco-development which has intrinsic ambivalence. Statements of conservation of ecology can only be in opposition to that of development as it is in Kerala and elsewhere. Think of the ambivalences and mutual incompatibilities involved in the concept of ecodevelopment projects in National Parks and Wild life Sanctuaries in Kerala; one is bound to confront oxymora of many varieties.

(17) Any material process including development involves 'loss' of energy. Because consumption is implicit in development. Consumption means devouring, destroying, squandering, expending wastefully, using up, burning up etc. (Webster Comprehensive Dictionary, Vol.II, P.281) Consumption engenders disappearance. Development and destruction are positively related.



It is worthwhile to think of the difference between a dam and a bridge as Martin Heidegger has shown in his well known essay "Question Concerning Technology". Dams entail disappearance of rivers but a bridge does not do so. Dam ceases river to exist, at the same time it enables new appearances and presences. But it involves higher or unfathomable entropy.

(18) The notion of development cannot refrain from rational expenditure and a telos. The rational choice is primary in the development discourse constituting a 'restricted economy'. To elaborate the point, reflect on the distinction between prudence (rational accumulation or consumption) and extravaganza (as in squandering, processions, carnivals, festivities, *Potlash*, giving without receiving anything etc) Ordinary economic thoughts such as political economy, the neoclassical equilibrium analysis economy etc. are reductions both empirically and theoretically. This is well depicted by Georges Bataille's conceptualization of 'restricted economy'. To overcome this he puts forth the concept of 'general economy'. In this value is thought not merely in relation to the societal or private economy, but includes the economy of giving without returns, excess, wasteful expenditure (George Bataille, 1991:19-41). In Kerala there are gift exchanges and apparent extravaganza in conducting rituals, festivals and ceremonies. No more we can consider them as irrational for they come within the general economy. Development discourse has to pay attention to the notion of general economy and move beyond the apparent 'irrationality' of restricted economy.

(19) Development discourse does not go well along with the schisms the developmentalism ignites. The schisms constitute individual subjectivities as well as inter-subjectivity. Rather than multiple-subjectivity, it is split or dual-subjectivity that gets constituted in and through the development discourse and developmentalism. Marginalised and mainstream; rich and poor; rural and urban; educated and not-educated; upper and lower; social and anti-Social; pro-development and anti/non-development; environmentalist and anti-environmentalist; possession and dis-possession ... and the list goes on. These dualisms are almost overwhelming. All these dualisms are frequently

and repeatedly invoked into development discourse in Kerala and it gained considerable repeatable materiality (materially based and repeatable, despite the context of the statement's enunciation). One's subjectivity and inter-subjectivity get constituted through such binary opposites or dualisms and then schism is a probable event. Such a split-subjectivity in distinction to multiple-subjectivity is emblematic of developmental modernity in Kerala.

(20) Developmental modernity goes on reinscribing and adjusting itself to undermine skepticism about the project of development in order to guarantee circulation and repeatable materiality of developmentalism. Developmental modernity embraces science but strategically alters its reasons continuously by convincing ever more novices of developmentalism that the reasons of it are objectively derived unaffected by social stratification, politics and power. That is why development was unquestionably accepted as the objective condition of freedom, equality, redemption and liberty from tutelage. In other words, this condition was universalized and normalized among Keralaits, although it had the genealogy of multiversality, as development was reductively constituted. It was made into a truth before it was circulated as ideology. Developmental modernity neither expelled tradition out of modernity nor modernized all the aspects of everyday affairs completely; it created a kind of, in the absence of a better word, hybridity and liminal social spaces. There were also several locales in which hybrids were never thought to be hybrids for the boundary between 'inside'/here and 'outside'/there were aloof from the prevalent thought. Modernity and modernization are different from developmental modernity.<sup>2</sup> Developmental modernity requires alterations in the continued art of governing the 'nature and 'Man'.

---

<sup>2</sup> Within developmental modernity Nature is separated from Man— not only differentiated; modernity-tradition divide is solidified; Nature is split into useful (resource) and waste or useless; universe is divided into human and non-human; societies are separated into developed and undeveloped, cultured and natural, civilized and primitive etc; besides a society or a nation is judged by its wealth and control of others and oneself.



That is why we conceive development modernity as part of the governmentality or art of government. A rationality of government means a modality of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed), capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and on whom it was practiced. (Foucault, *The Foucault Effect*, eds G. Burchell, Colin Gordon and Miller, University of Chicago Press, 1991).

Governmentality (the neologism Foucault employs for governmental rationality) is equally applicable to Kerala as well. Given this sense, governmental rationality is inextricable in the discourse of development. Several processes involved in development are discernible. Not the governance by the state but the multiple practices, diversified and stratified societies and disparate objects including human artifacts of all variety. That is there takes place a coupling: governmentality and development. As a form of governmentality development gives its presence everywhere, both at the top as well as the bottom of the social.

Instead of an End

Redemptive powers of development coexist with development of loss. The question here is what makes so difficult to think beyond development? How can we decode oxymoron replete in the development discourse, especially when it is indeterminate, evasive and definitions of development increase at exponential proportion? In the midst of oxymoron, it is better to find recourse in Utopia than Dystopia.

References

Alain Badiou, 2001, *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*, Verso, London.

Arturo Escobar, 1995, *Encountering Development: the making and unmaking of development*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

- Crown M. P. and R. W. Shenton, 1966, *Doctrine of Development*
- Crown M. P. and R. W. Shenton, 1995, 'The Invention of Development' in Jonathan Crush (ed) 1995.
- Deleuze Gilles, (2011) 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', in *Cultural Theory: An Anthology*, eds. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy, Wiley-Blackwell, Sussex.
- Foucault M. 1991, *The Foucault Effect*, eds G Burchell, Colin Gordon and Miller, University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault M, 1980, "The Confession of the Flesh" in *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings* (ed Colin Gordon).
- George Bataille, (1967, 1991) *The Accursed Share*, Vol.1, Zone Books, New York
- Jonathan Crush, Ed. 1995, *Power of Development*, Routledge, London
- N. Shanmugaratnam, 2011, *Development Theory in Historical Perspective and Overview of Development Studies*, Vols I&II
- Raju S., 2003, 'Developmental Modernity: Man and Nature in the Discourse of Wealth and Labour', *Contemporary India*, vol.2, No. 1, New Delhi
- Rama Varma, 1874, *Our Industrial Status*, Trevandrum Debating Society, C.M.S. Press, Trivandrum
- Sachs 1992, *The Development Dictionary*, Orient Longman, New Delhi.
- Samuel Mateer, 1870
- Waltraud Ernst and Biswamoy Pati (eds) *India's Princely States: people, princes and colonialism*, Primus Books, 2010