Freedom, Domination and the Liberal Art of Government: Advanced Liberal Technologies in Fraser Institute Discourse

By

Murray Shaw
B.A., University of British Columbia, 1996

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Sociology

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]

Dr. William Carroll, Supervisor (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Rennie Warburton, Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

D. Ken Hatt , Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Warren Magnusson, Outside Member (Department of Political Science)

[redacted]

Dr. Michael M'Gonigle, External Examiner (Faculty of Law, Environmental Studies )

© Murray Shaw, 2000

University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisor: Dr. William Carroll

## ABSTRACT

This thesis approaches the discourse of the Fraser Institute, a free-market think-tank based in Canada, from the perspective of governmentality, a body of literature that draws on the work of Michel Foucault. While the Fraser Institute is commonly regarded as disseminating the classical liberal tenets of the minimal state and market freedom, this thesis draws on Nikolas Rose's (1999) notion of 'advanced liberalism' to demonstrate that the Institute is articulating themes of contemporary governance that do not fit neatly under the heading of classical liberalism. The dismantling of the welfare state is explained from the governmentality perspective, and then this perspective is applied to an analysis of Fraser Institute discourse across several areas of public service provision, and in relation to the concept of 'community'. It is found that while a governmentality analysis offers productive insights into Fraser Institute discourse, this analysis misses important aspects of both contemporary political rationality and Fraser Institute discourse. Strengths and weaknesses of the approach are discussed, and suggestions offered as to how the governmentality perspective could be reoriented to offer a more satisfactory account of free market discourses such as that of the Fraser Institute.

[redacted]

Dr. William Carroll, Supervisor (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Rennie Warburton, Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

D. Ken Hatt , Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Warren Magnusson, Outside Member (Department of Political Science)

[redacted]

Dr. Michael M'Gonigle, External Examiner (Faculty of Law, Environmental Studies )

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# Introduction

Critical accounts of the Fraser Institute commonly portray the Institute's role as one of providing support for free market interests through the dissemination of the tenets of classical liberalism. The Fraser Institute is portrayed as the far-right vanguard of capitalist forces that are seeking to replace the social insurance and regulatory mechanisms of the Keynesian Welfare State with the mechanisms of the free market. From this perspective, the Fraser Institute's mandate is to weaken the institutions and values of the welfare state that impede capitalist activity. It carries this out by promoting principles associated with nineteenth century laissez-faire liberalism, principles such as the sovereign rights of the individual, the centrality of self-interest to 'human nature', and the moral and economic virtues of private property and the self-regulating market.

Dobbin (1998) notes that "the development and growth of corporate rule in Canada and elsewhere could not have taken place without an ideological assault on the values and expectations of ordinary citizens"(184). In this view, the Fraser Institute has elevated free market principles to the level of 'common sense', paving the way "for people to accept conditions they would otherwise protest against"(184). Havemann (1986) writes that the Institute promotes an ideology "based on neoclassical economics and libertarian rhetoric, Social Darwinism, disciplinary social policies and 'law and order' in order to coerce conformity to the interests of capital in an 'exceptional state'"(15).

In this thesis I will provide an alternative account of the 'productivity' of the Fraser Institute. This will be carried out through an analysis of Fraser Institute documents across several areas of public administration and social policy. The analysis is guided by the theoretical perspective of 'governmentality', a body of work inspired by Foucault's

genealogies of liberal political rationality. The purpose of analyzing Fraser Institute discourse from this perspective is to assess whether the insights gleaned from such an analysis can provide a unique and distinctive understanding of Fraser Institute discourse and its political effects, and to assess the contributions that such an understanding can provide to theoretical and political activity.

While the Fraser Institute's position on economic, social, and political issues is commonly referred to as 'neoliberal', the term 'neoliberalism' is itself subject to varying definitions. In the critical literature, the meaning of neoliberalism can incorporate varying elements of libertarianism, classical liberalism, and conservatism. In this thesis the definition of neoliberalism will not stress the elements of conservatism sometimes attributed to it. Neoliberalism will be treated as a political and economic doctrine that emphasizes

> the gospel of the free market, the laws of supply and demand, the private economy, value for money and the private sphere of the citizen against the 'creeping socialist' threats to liberty from an overweening state and an overextended state welfare system (Hall, 1986:67).

In this definition, the doctrine of neoliberalism derives directly "from the free market and libertarian traditions of classic liberalism and political economy"(67). This is not to deny that elements of social conservatism often accompany neoliberal discourse and practice, but rather to make it clear that conservatism is neither necessary nor central to neoliberalism, and that in fact a conservative ethos will often exist in tension with a neoliberal emphasis on the supremacy of the free market as a model for organizing society.

As a site of neoliberal discourse, the Fraser Institute is customarily seen as performing an ideological function in the service of capital. Its job is to reproduce and disseminate ideas that support the free market. Although the Fraser Institute has influenced public policy, most notably the British Columbia Social Credit Party in the 1980s, it has had its most noticeable effect in disseminating a neoliberal doctrine through media releases, various types of publications, conferences and public events, and educational programs.

The dominant critical approach to such discourse takes the general form of a 'critique of ideology'. This can involve revealing the contradictions and distortions contained in neoliberal discourse and uncovering the economic and political interests that it serves. For example, regarding the neoliberal claim that the free market unhindered by state regulation is the ideal model for organizing society, historical evidence can be brought forward demonstrating not only that periods of extreme economic liberalism have been accompanied by anarchic economic and social conditions, but that such periods have also been marked by a great deal of state intervention directed towards ensuring the growth of markets (Polanyi, 1957:140-2). Havemann (1986) provides the more recent example of the British Columbia Social Credit Party in the 1980s, which, in imposing its program of 'austerity capitalism' garnered "'exceptional' powers of control over the working class"(13), such as legislation "empowering government to interfere in internal union matters such as membership, disciplinary actions, and voting procedures"(24).

At a political level, the contradictions and destructive effects of neoliberal policies can be brought to public attention, and alternative programmes and policies offered for

achieving social order and productivity. However, the immense amounts of capital controlled by neoliberal forces, including the corporate ownership and control of the mainstream media – the growing economic and cultural 'hegemony' of neoliberalism – make it increasingly difficult for left progressive political movements to acquire widespread popularity or mount an effective and broad-based opposition to neoliberalism.

A critique of ideology approach often conflicts with, and to some extent passes judgement on the consumer lifestyles enjoyed, or at least aspired to by a majority of people in modern, industrialized societies. The sort of neoliberal doctrine being disseminated by the Fraser Institute is largely congruent with the lifestyles of the consumer classes in contemporary capitalist societies. While the Fraser Institute policy recommendations that find their way into the media are often regarded as being unreasonably harsh, there is a current of 'common sense' running through them that has become widely acceptable: for example, the necessity of drastically reducing public spending in the globalizing economy, the inability of the public purse to support social programs in their present form, and the need to run government more along the lines of a business. In the face of this, 'progressive' recommendations from the 'left' for more equitable modes of organizing society can come across as naïve or utopian. In the context of increasing neoliberal hegemony, such recommendations can appear not as 'progressive', but as expressing a desire to recreate a system that could only work in the past. The Fraser Institute, on the other hand, can be seen as articulating the harsh, but necessary attitudes and actions required for individuals, firms, and nations to be successful in the global free market.

The body of literature that has grown out of Foucault's work on 'governmentality' approaches neoliberalism not as a philosophy or ideology in the service of capitalism, but as a range of techniques for governing populations. In this view, neoliberalism is not about "less government but about shifting the techniques, focus and priorities of government"(Isin, 1998:173). Following Foucault, in the governmentality literature the analysis of governmental or political power is not focused on "the regulated and legitimate forms of power in their central locations, with the general mechanisms through which they operate, and the continual effects of these"(Foucault, 1980:96). Rather, this literature focuses on how techniques of intervention are adopted to address particular problems of governing populations, and how these techniques become invested in institutions – how they are "invested, colonised, utilized, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended etc., by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination"(99). Because the 'neoliberalism' referred to in the governmentality literature is of a different nature than the 'neoliberalism' commonly referred to in the critical literature, and to avoid confusion between these different uses of the term, in the analysis to follow I will use Nicholas Rose's term 'advanced liberalism' to refer to the contemporary political rationalities and technologies identified in the governmentality literature (See Rose, 1999:137-166).

Advanced liberalism introduces "a new way of thinking about the objects, targets, mechanisms and limits of government"(139). Where the term 'neoliberalism' refers to the revival of a laissez-faire privileging of the market over the state, the notion of 'advanced liberalism' refers to a mode of governing through technologies and strategies not

necessarily centred in the state or the market. Advanced liberal strategies of governing differ from nineteenth century laissez-faire insofar as the market is not considered to be a 'natural' realm operating according to its own laws, but rather, "the market exists, and can only exist, under certain political, legal, and institutional conditions that must be actively constructed by government"(Burchell, 1996:23). Advanced liberalism is viewed as a political rationality and set of techniques that seeks to replace the 'insurance form' of the welfare state with an 'enterprise form' as the basis for governing the social. Along with the introduction of forms of economic rationality into all areas of social relations, advanced liberalism seeks to alter the subject's relationship to him or herself, encouraging "the governed to adopt a certain entrepreneurial form of practical relationship to themselves"(Burchell, 1996:29). Advanced liberalism is described in terms of two broad areas of strategy: the extension of the 'enterprise form' to all modes of organizational, governmental, and individual conduct, and the promotion of 'techniques of the self' appropriate to contemporary capitalist societies.

Drawing on Foucault's genealogies of governmental reason and the related literature, in this thesis I will present advanced liberalism as a range of governmental techniques, and through an analysis of Fraser Institute documents, demonstrate that there is 'more' to Fraser Institute discourse than the promotion of free market ideology; that a good part of the Fraser Institute's 'productivity' involves the dissemination of the tenets of an advanced liberal 'art of government'. This analysis will be carried out along two general lines. The first of these concerns the discursive means through which the Fraser Institute promotes the replacement of the bureaucratic institutions of the welfare state with technologies of surveillance derived from principles of accounting and auditing. Rose

(1999) notes that these 'mundane' routines and principles, which existed years before the advent of advanced liberalism, have in recent years come to occupy a central place in practices of governing (154). These methods of order transform the domain to be governed, creating "patterns of accountability"(154) which adhere to norms of "transparency, observability, [and] standardization"(154).

The second line of analysis concerns the means through which subjects are constituted as "active purchasers and enterprises in pursuit of their own choices"(Isin, 1998:175). With the shift away from a 'paternal' welfare state wherein the subject possessed a certain entitlement to protection from the vicissitudes of everyday life in a market society, "risk becomes the responsibility of individuals as authors of their own destiny, [and] ill-fate and misfortune also become the responsibility of individuals"(175). While this sounds like a revival of the nineteenth century laissez-faire attitudes with which the Fraser Institute is usually associated, there is a shift here away from a nineteenth-century 'pre-social' conception of the "individual in a natural state"(Holton, 1992:55) to a conception of the 'active citizen' who is an "entrepreneur of him- or herself"(Rose, 1999:164). Similar to classical liberalism, advanced liberal techniques of the self are presented in the language of 'freedom' and 'choice'. However, unlike classical liberalism, under advanced liberalism there is recognition of the need for 'governmental' intervention in the construction of the self-responsible, autonomous subject in contemporary capitalist societies. In this part of the analysis, I will look through Fraser Institute documents for evidence that alongside of the more traditionally liberal conception of the individual exists a conception, and promotion of the advanced liberal individual as the product of subjectifying strategies of government.

Chapter One begins with a brief overview of the Fraser Institute's links to corporations and private foundations, its ties to policymakers and political parties, and the program of research and publishing through which the institute makes its work available to the public. This chapter outlines major themes in Fraser Institute discourse that have been identified in the critical literature. Chapter two introduces the governmentality literature and its relation to Foucault's genealogical analyses of power. I then outline the rationality behind the assault on the welfare state as it is presented in the governmentality literature, and give an account of the emergence of advanced liberalism as a project to extend "a model of rational-economic conduct beyond the economic itself, or generalizing it as a principle for both limiting and rationalizing government activity"(Burchell, 1996:27). In chapter three I apply the governmentality literature to an analysis of Fraser Institute discourse across several areas of public policy, and the increasingly prevalent political technologies of 'community'. In the conclusion I will assess the critical and political value of the governmentality literature's account of contemporary political rationality, and its account of the Fraser Institute as a site of advanced liberal discourse.

# Chapter One: The Fraser Institute

The Fraser Institute is "a federally chartered, non-profit research and educational organization, with tax-exempt status in both Canada and the United States"(Annual Report, 1998: paragraph 38).[1] It claims to be 'independent' and 'non-political', with a mandate to provide, through its research programs, "an alternative to well-intentioned but misguided and conventional views about the appropriate role of government in the economy"(paragraph 40), and to "ensure that all Canadians are constantly exposed to the ideas upon which our free society depends"(paragraph 144). In addition to its main headquarters in Vancouver, British Columbia, the Institute has an office in Toronto and a mailing address in Seattle, Washington (Scott, 1994:112).

Since its inception in 1974, the Fraser Institute has been actively struggling to secure a hegemonic position for 'free market' principles in the economic, political, and social domains of Canadian society. The corporate agenda that was gathering momentum in the 1970s involved a recognition that the collectivist values of mutual responsibility fostered by the welfare state and embedded in Canadian political culture were posing a barrier to corporate hegemony. The perspective of the corporate sector at the time was that "the private sector is increasingly subject to uninformed, but strident and highly publicized attacks which seem to have a pervasive impact on government policies"(Powis[2], in Dobbin, 1998:182). In a special issue of the Fraser Forum commemorating the Institute's twenty-fifth anniversary, it is stated that "the Fraser Institute was founded as a reaction to this growing intellectual consensus and its manifestation in the policies of government"(1999, August:5).

In 1973, while working for the federal finance department, Fraser Institute founder and director Michael Walker decided to act upon his concerns about the increasingly interventionist tendencies of the Canadian government. Walker's concerns regarding Ottawa's increasingly 'errant' economic policymaking were shared by T. Patrick Boyle, vice-president and comptroller of MacMillan Bloedel, who was alarmed by the political developments taking place since the New Democratic Party had taken power in British Columbia in 1972 (5). Walker managed to persuade Boyle and fifteen other resource industry executives to put up seed money to fund the Fraser Institute's start-up in 1974 (Scott, 1994:109). Since its first year, with an operating budget of $75,000 and a membership of 65, Institute revenues and membership have grown steadily, with annual income increasing to $825,736 by 1983, and to $3,425,771 by 1998, and total membership [corporations, foundations, individuals] increasing to 521 in 1983 to over 1200 in 1998 (Annual Reports, 1998:appendix[3]; 1983:17) (Fraser Forum, 1999, August:6,11).

The Institute's methods of fundraising have been compared to those of right-wing American think tanks such as the American Enterprise Institute (Havemann, 1986:15). Dobbin (1998) reports that in 1996, eleven percent of contributions to the Fraser Institute came from individual members, with the remainder coming from private foundations [57%] and corporations [31%] (186). The majority of the Institute's funding comes from organizations "such as the John Dobson Foundation, whose declared purpose is to 'educate the public with respect to the free-enterprise system'"(186). Wealthy American organizations that have contributed to the Fraser Institute include the Donner Foundation[4] and the Shelby Cullom Davis Foundation, both of New York, the Liberty Fund of

Indianapolis, the John M. Olin Foundation of Conneticut, and the Roe Foundation of South Carolina (Dobbin, 1998:186; Havemann, 1986:16-17).

Havemann (1986) notes that the Fraser Institute's claim to be an 'independent' research centre concerned with the 'well-being' of Canadians has its own special meaning (16). Since its inception the Institute has been "a creature of the corporate sector, and in particular, finance capital and the largely foreign-owned multinational resource development sector"(16). Counting among its membership over 300 corporations registered in Canada (16), the Institute's corporate linkages are impressive. By 1983, its board of trustees included

> 7 of the top 10 corporations {four of these, Imperial Oil, Shell, Texaco, and Gulf, are more than 75% foreign owned}; of the others, Alcan is 59% foreign owned, Canadian Pacific 25%, Bell Canada 5% and George Weston 1% foreign owned. Membership or affiliation to an institute trustee link the institute to all of the country's top eight financial institutions and top eight insurance companies....The Fraser Institute also counts among its members the two major newspaper chains in Canada, Thompson and Southam News, and numerous smaller comercial media outlets (Havemann, 1986:16).

Not much has changed since that time. Kim Goldberg (1997), writing in Canadian Dimension, reports that

> Conrad Black, who holds majority control of the Vancouver Sun and 58 other Canadian dailies, is represented on the Fraser Institute's board of trustees through his proxy, Hollinger[5] president David Radler. Joining Radler on the institute's board are senior executives from Royal Bank of Canada, Bank of Nova Scotia, MacMillan Bloedel, Imasco {owner of Shopper's Drug Mart, Imperial Tobacco and Canada Trustco and Mortgage Co.}, Rio Algom, Pocklington Financial Corp., Canadian Pacific, Bata, B.C. Packers, Canadian hunter Exploration {a Noranda Oil and Gas subsidiary},Kelly Douglas and Loblaw {food retailers and wholesalers}, and various other corporations (27).[6]

Along with the corporate representatives mentioned above, as of 1998 the Fraser Institute's board includes an executive from the American pharmaceutical giant Pfizer Inc. (Annual Report, 1998: appendix).

The Fraser Institute has also had links to political parties at the provincial and federal levels. According to director Michael Walker, the Institute does not lobby government, but rather, "Governments approach us to present ideas"(Walker, in Brunet, 1999:4). In the early 1980s, the Social credit government of B.C. not only 'approached' the Fraser Institute for ideas, but inserted some of these ideas directly into government policy. Havemann (1986) describes the Institute as the "architect of the B.C. budget in 1983"(19), pointing out that its "advocacy of self-reliance, church-based charity, voluntarism, and privatization was strikingly paralleled by government policy"(19). The B.C. government's *Residential Tenancy Act* of 1984 was drawn from a Fraser Institute publication on rent controls, and Institute information provided the ideological and strategic grounds for changes in such areas as welfare rights and labour force and human rights legislation (20-22). Throughout the Social Credit's reign from 1975 until 1991, Fraser Institute recommendations to the B.C. government were instrumental in opening up the province's resources to investment from transnational and American capital (20-22). While these measures came under immediate and sustained attack from left progressive forces, Havemann notes that they provided a focus and an intensity to a right market agenda in Canada which up until that point had "seemed unclear, divided, and less populist than its British or American counterparts and, therefore, unlikely to capture the overt platform of any major political party"(13).

The Reform Party, since its inception and during its stint as federal opposition party, has also drawn extensively on the Fraser Institute for its policy positions and critiques of government policy. Despite the striking parallels between Fraser Institute views and Reform Party platforms, and the winning of a Reform seat in Vancouver by an Institute staffer[7], Michael Walker and Herbert Grubel both vehemently deny any 'overlap' between the Institute and the Reform Party (Lorinc, 1994:12). While there may be no direct, formal link between the two organizations, the Reform Party has over the years proven to be a faithful consumer of Fraser Institute ideas. Fred Gorbet, Michael Wilson's deputy minister of finance is quoted as saying, "I do have the impression that a lot of what Preston Manning is talking about is coming out of work the Fraser Institute has produced"(12). Dobbin (1998) points out that "during the 1993-97 Parliament....Twenty-two of the fifty-one Reform MPs drew on Institute materials for their speeches"(194). A cursory review of Reform Party position papers reveals Fraser Institute influence. An article by Grubel and two Institute staffers (1975) arguing the theme of unemployment insurance-induced unemployment, is cited in a 1998 Reform paper on Canada's underperforming economy. Another Reform paper, this one from 1997, entitled "Beyond a Balanced Budget: A Discussion of the Options for Debt Retirement, Tax Relief and Responsible Future Spending", contains four references to Fraser Institute publications.

These instances of political influence notwithstanding, the Fraser Institute has had far less input into policy at the federal and provincial levels than the more 'mainstream' policy institutes such as the Conference Board of Canada and the C.D. Howe Institute. The reason for the Fraser Institute's lack of policy input may be related to the mode of

presentation used by the Institute. In the article "Policy Paradigms, Experts, and the State," Peter Hall (1990) suggests that the "deliberation of public policy takes place within a realm of discourse"(59). Defining as a "'policy paradigm'...the overarching framework of ideas that structures policy-making in a particular field"(59), he goes on to say that this framework defines "the broad goals behind policy...[and] the kinds of instruments that can be used to attain these goals"(59). In macroeconomic policymaking these instruments are highly developed: "Policy is made by reference to a complex set of economic theories....[which] specify the relationships between the conventional goals of policy and the likely effectiveness of the various instruments used to attain them (59). The policy analyses and recommendations of think-tanks such as the C.D. Howe Institute and the Conference board of Canada are customarily presented in the "objective language of mainstream economics"(Ernst, 1986:134), rather than the moral and philosophical language that the Fraser Institute uses to defend free market individualism and economic inequality. The 'objective language' of economics is amenable with the sort of policy paradigm described above, what Hall refers to as the "process of normal policy-making that takes place when an existing paradigm is already in place"(1990:60).

Evert Lindquist (1990) states that the policy-relevance of a policy institute's output can be assessed in terms of its 'amenability' or 'contestability' vis-à-vis the goals of its target audience (34). The Fraser Institute's role in relation to government policy has customarily had the quality of contestability rather than amenability, this customary role being one of subverting the policy premises of the government in power, as can be noted in the Fraser Institute's reactionary stance toward the policies of the N.D.P. government in British Columbia and the federal Liberal party. The Institute's positions and

arguments, even when couched in objective economic language, have their foundations in the philosophical and political writings of free market libertarians. This sort of approach diverges from 'normal' processes and techniques of policy analysis, and, in fact, can be seen as constituting an entirely different paradigm of policy research. Hall writes that:

> Policymakers accustomed to seeing the problems they confront in a particular set of terms will be resistant to new ideas that threaten their overall conception of the task at hand or that can only be implemented through a massive overhaul of the existing arrangements....the presence of particular policy paradigms helps account for the persistent 'incrementalism' and 'bounded rationality' that many associate with the policy process (1990:60).

In an article for Saturday Night magazine, Lorinc (1994) notes that the Fraser Institute's extreme position on policy issues has left it at "the fringes of Canadian policy debates for much of its existence. Its prescriptions...are generally seen as too outrageous, too vanguard, or too extreme for a nation of moderates"(12).

Ideologically, the Fraser Institute draws upon the works of writers such as Milton Friedman, Frederich Hayek, and Gary Becker. Its publications attack state intervention and promote deregulation of the economy under such headings as "*Tenth Anniversary of the FTA is an Occasion to Celebrate....How Popular is Medicare?....Flatten the Tax, Fatten the Revenues?*" [8] Fraser Institute discourse represents the market economy as a self-regulating organic entity, the natural processes of which are distorted by any form of government interference. The distorting effects of unemployment insurance on the mechanisms of the market economy has been a favored topic for the Institute since the mid-1970s. In the opinions of Herbert Grubel and Michael Walker, the 'disincentive to work' effects of UI [and other social programs] cause high rates of unemployment, and for this reason persistently high rates of unemployment are not an indication that markets

do not work efficiently (Grubel & Walker, 1978:13). The Fraser Institute supports such claims with empirical studies carried out by economists and other academics associated with the Institute.

From the point of view of the Fraser Institute, Unemployment Insurance is just one of many 'inefficient' government programs. The intellectual foundations of much of the Institute's rhetoric concerning the 'inevitable' nature of bureaucratic waste can be found in public choice theory, a theory which emerged in the late 1950s as the extension of rational choice theory to the political domain. James Buchanan, who sits on the Fraser Institute's editorial advisory board, and Gordon Tullock, whose work has been published by the Institute, are the 'leaders' of the public choice school of political thought (Green, 1987:92). A major branch of public choice theory deals with the desires and motivations of elected officials, bureaucrats, and other public-sector employees.

In The Economics of Politics, James Buchanan (1978) states that "all of public choice or the economic theory of politics may be summarised as the 'discovery' or 're-discovery' that people should be treated as rational utility-maximisers in all of their behavioural capacities"(cited in Green, 1987:92). The extension of economic theory to the social and political domains means that public choice theorists treat government bureaucracy as an apparatus, like the market, in which actors try to achieve their personal ends (99). From this perspective, unless placed under strict budgetary and organizational constraints, government departments will be set up in a way that maximizes the benefits to the bureaucrats who staff these departments. Following one of the main tenets of rational choice theory – that individuals are by nature driven to maximize their personal gains and minimize their losses – public choice theory states that public-sector personnel

will go to great lengths to maintain job security and power, even if this occasionally means acting against the best interests of the electorate. This generalization in regards to motivation is not restricted to any one group of bureaucrats wielding a particular amount or type of power, but is intended to apply to all who work in the public-sector, from politicians and bureau chiefs to lower-level bureaucrats. It is not difficult to imagine how this jaundiced view of government could lead to policy recommendations that are not amenable with what Hall (1990) refers to as the "process of normal policy-making"(60).

While the Fraser Institute has not had the direct policy input enjoyed by other, more mainstream policy institutes, it has played a pivotal role in informing and educating the public about the merits of the free market. The bulk of the Fraser Institute's operations consist of generating publications and holding conferences that are accessible to policy makers, the media, and the general public: "the work we do is global. Our books are distributed to 52 countries....in August we are holding a meeting of economic advisors and analysts from 40 countries"(Walker, in Brunet, 1999:5). Walker holds the view that the most effective way to combat government intervention into the market is not through political agitation, but through the dissemination of ideas (Brunet, 1999:4). The Fraser Institute takes the position that the greatest barrier to correcting the 'policy errors' of the welfare state is "the system of ideas used to inform the public about the expected consequence of the policies"(Fraser Forum, 1999, August:6). This system of 'errant' ideas is attributed to the works of John Maynard Keynes, whose ideas, according to the Institute, have been shared by liberal and conservative governments alike, and have also given shape to an intellectual consensus reflected in universities, the media, and in

popular literature (4). In summing up the Institute's approach to combating this intellectual consensus, Walker quotes Victor Hugo: "One can resist the invasion of armies, but one cannot resist the invasion of ideas"(Walker, in Brunet, 1999:5).

In its war against 'incorrect ideas', the Fraser Institute's mission is to educate "Canadians about the consequences of particular courses of policy action....[and] about the crucial role that markets do play in economic development"( Fraser Forum, 1999, August:6). The Institute has employed a flexible strategy for disseminating its ideas to the general public through press releases, public conferences, educational programs, and a wide variety of publications targeted towards a general readership. While the Institute has been quite prolific in publishing books promoting the message of smaller government and stronger markets, and puts on a wide range of well-attended student programs and other public events, it has made its greatest inroads into political discourse through the popular media, a forum in which

> the institute has moved from the fringe to the centre....shifted from [being] a comic example of ultra-right hyperbole to the representation of reason....No longer is its almost daily reference in the media prefaced with 'right-wing think-tank'....the Fraser Institute is now as respectable as the Conference Board and the C.D. Howe Institute (Hackett, 1998:157).

Hackett states that "the news uncritically transmits the Institute's dubious assumptions, categorizations, and polemical language"(157) and cites

> one study of economic stories over the Canadian Press wire service [that] found that during a one-year period the Fraser Institute was quoted in 140 stories, while the left-wing Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives was quoted in 16 (158).

Michael Walker's reply to Hackett is that the Institute's success with the mainstream media is due to the validity of its ideas:

> Hackett is correct in assuming we have changed people's opinions. But this is because good ideas stand the test of time and bad ones don't. Theories we

> published over the years have come true, and therefore more and more people listen to us. It's that simple (Walker, in Brunet, 1999:4).

As examples of its success in the media, the Institute's Annual Report for 1998 points out that its work was mentioned over 200 times in the Financial Post over a recent two-year period, and that "1998 saw a nine percent increase in the amount of coverage [in all news media] over the previous year"(paragraph 137). In addition to this,

> the Institute's weekly opinion pieces, sent via e-mail to over 72 outlets across Canada, continue to be picked up by newspapers across the country....in the United States, the NCPA's[9] Policy Digest, distributed to over 2,700 media, legislators, and public policy researchers, now includes summaries of Fraser Institute research on a regular basis (paragraph 142).

Despite Walker's assertions that the Institute's success in getting its message across to the public has been the result of 'good ideas', it does expend great effort in "developing a positive media profile and ensuring that all of...[its] research publications, student programs, and events are promoted to as wide an audience as possible"(paragraph 136). For example, it has been reported that much of the Institute's increase in media exposure can be attributed to its efforts at 'media penetration'. A Fraser Institute internal document from 1998[10] outlines a plan to create a database of journalists who cover Fraser Institute press releases, and through 'special treatment' of these journalists[11], eventually "become the central point of reference for economic information about social policy issues"(Fraser Institute, in Perelman, 1998). Also contained in the document are plans to provide Canadian newspapers with regular columns on health care issues, privatization, and popular culture.

Through its media presence, publications, and various programs, the Fraser Institute has been quite successful over the last twenty-six years in helping to push "the limits of

acceptable political discourse well to the right, and in creating more space and legitimacy for neoliberalism"(Cameron, 1997:13). An item from Saturday Night magazine, quoted in the Fraser Forum, notes that

> much of what today passes for conventional wisdom about the need for restraint in government spending, the rationalization of social programs, and the need to reduce taxes, is a reflection of the Institute's work during these past two decades (1999, August:55).

The Institute is quite explicit about its ideological mission to redirect "public attention to the role of competitive markets in providing for the well-being of Canadians"(Annual Report, 1998: paragraph 1). This mission is to be achieved largely through a relentless critique of governmental action in areas that could conceivably be managed in the market. While Institute literature is still widely regarded as being 'extreme' in its condemnation of government and promotion of market freedom, it has made an important contribution to the neoliberal agenda by helping to discredit social-democratic principles and policies, and by helping to create a growing consensus that government intervention and public expenditure are necessary evils to be avoided wherever possible.

Chapter One notes

1. APA format for in-text citations of on-line materials.
2. Chairman of the Noranda Corporation.
3. On-line document.
4. Dobbin (1998) also notes that the Donner Foundation gave the Institute $450,000 in 1994 "to make government debt a dominant public concern"(186).
5. Hollinger Inc. contributed $99,000 to the Fraser Institute in 1998 (Annual Report, 1998:paragraph 84).

6. For an analysis of Canadian policy institute – corporate linkages in 1976 and 1996, see Carroll & Shaw, "Consolidating a Neoliberal Policy Network in Canada: 1976 – 1996." (in press).

7. Grubel was forced by Walker to resign from the Fraser Institute in order to retain the Fraser Institute's tax-exempt status.

8. Article titles from the Fraser Forum, 1999, January&Feruary.

9. The 'National Center for Policy Analysis', based in Dallas, Texas. Its journal consists of pieces from think-tanks and other media. It is closely associated with American think-tanks such as the Cato Institute, the American Enterprise Institute, and the Hoover Institution.

10. Perelman states that this document, intended for Fraser Institute staffers only, was 'leaked' to sources outside of the Institute.

11. What exactly 'special treatment' consists of is not mentioned in the plan.

# Chapter Two

## Foucault, Genealogy and Governmentality

Genealogical method is fundamental to the governmentality literature's treatment of liberal and advanced liberal rationalities of government. Foucault's use of genealogy is derived from Nietzche's rejection of historical methods that search for the origins, eternal truths, essential elements, and unbroken continuities underlying historical processes and events. Traditional methods of historical analysis are criticized for bringing overarching categories to bear on historical events, thereby producing knowledge in which events marked by contingency, disparity, and dispersion appear to take on an internal logic and continuity (Smart, 1985:56). Traditional history represents certain events and concepts as historically important while others are neglected or marginalized (59). The genealogist, by refusing to engage in metaphysics, "finds that there is 'something altogether different' behind things: not a timeless and essential secret, but the secret that they have no essence or that their essence was fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms"(Foucault, 1984:78). This non-essentialism also applies to human 'being' or 'nature'. History becomes genealogical "to the extent that it places within a process of development everything considered immortal in man....Nothing in man – not even his body – is sufficiently stable to serve as the basis for self-recognition or for understanding other men"(87-88). For Foucault, genealogy is an attempt to 'emancipate' the subjugated knowledges which are present but have been "disguised within the body of functionalist and systematizing theory"(Foucault, 1980:82).

The theoretical and political role of the genealogist is not to provide people with knowledge of the 'true' conditions underlying their existence, but to discern the means

through which such knowledge and truth is produced, and to describe "how men govern (themselves and others) by the production of truth"(Foucault, in Smart, 1985:59). Knowledge is always related to power; "a site where power is exercised is also a place at which knowledge is produced"(Smart, 1985:64). For example, in Foucault's (1977) work Discipline and Punish, the development and implementation of modern forms of punishment and training is not treated in terms of the gradual emergence of a more humane ethos regarding the management and control of the individual. Rather, Foucault focuses on how knowledges from various sources were brought to bear on problems relating to the management of prisons and other institutions such as the factory and the school, and how the technologies derived from these knowledges were applied to the efficient management of individuals in a wide array of institutional settings. The particular institutions dealt with in this work provide illustrations of a more general shift in technologies of governing, from the 'spectacles' of punishment and violence which represented the power of a sovereign figure, to more covert and dispersed methods of training, normalization, and surveillance.

The novelty of Discipline and Punish is not in outlining the emergence of new forms of social control exercised through such mechanisms as the carceral, the panopticon, or the disciplinary society. Rather, as Miller (1987) notes, this "project is as much epistemological as it is sociological"(197). It examines the means through which "passions, instincts, anomalies, infirmities, maladjustments, effects of environment, drives and desires were to enter the process of judgement"(197). The role of the judge as sole arbiter of an offence and its punishment is mitigated by the introduction of 'expert' knowledge regarding the character of the accused, and the causal processes leading to the

deviant state of mind underlying a particular act. Knowledge of the individual becomes as important as the act itself in determining the form of punishment or 'correction' to be handed down. As with many of his other works, while Discipline and Punish offers an interesting historical re-appraisal of an institution and its related practices, the importance of this work is more general, resting on its articulation of the complex relations between "power, knowledge, and the body"(Smart, 1985:43).

With his work on governmentality, Foucault extends his "'micro-physical' analysis of practices of (disciplinary) power...[to] a 'macro-physical' consideration of governmental rationality"(Simon, 1995:37). These genealogies of political rationality do not take power in its central locations as their object of analysis. While recognizing the importance of the economic to questions of governing modern capitalist societies, economic interests are not held to be determining of social relations even in the final instance. Nor is the state viewed as a privileged site for the functioning of governmental power: "Rather than 'the state' giving rise to government, the state becomes a particular form that government has taken, and one that does not exhaust the field of calculations and interventions that constitute it"(Miller and Rose, 1990:3).

This perspective draws attention to the heterogeneity of authorities, rationalities, and strategies for governing conduct – the variety of discourses that intersect the space of government (Rose, 1999:21,22). Genealogical method treats discourse as being

> composed of signs...[which] do more than designate things, for they are 'practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak'....the rules of discursive practice 'define not the dumb existence of a reality, nor the canonical use of a vocabulary, but the ordering of objects'(Foucault, in Barrett, 1991:130).

This method of discourse analysis focuses not on causality, but on the complex 'play of dependencies' between the discursive and the non-discursive (Barrett, 1991:130).

Treating political rationalities as discourses that circulate throughout the social, the notion of governmentality marks out, "in the most general way, the field upon which one might locate all investigations of the modern operation of power/knowledge"(22).

Governmentality is treated as a mentality of rule that, since the mid-sixteenth century, has continually posed to itself the question, "what makes it necessary for there to be a government, and what ends should it pursue with regard to society in order to justify its existence?"(Foucault, 1997:75). In this body of work, liberalism is identified as "a form of critical reflection on governmental practice"(77), a form of political rationality that emerged in the early nineteenth century in response to problems of governing associated with 'reason of state'(75). During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a 'science of police' had developed, which in combination with the emerging science of statistics, provided the conditions of possibility for enumerating, monitoring, and controlling all aspects of a territory and its inhabitants (Rose, 1996:43). By recognizing that such efforts to govern and regulate a population down to the minutest details are likely to produce effects other than those intended, liberal rationality makes possible the emergence of the domain of 'society' as an object of knowledge (Barry et al., 1996:8). With the 'discovery' of society as "a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of disturbance"(Foucault, in Barry et al, 1996:9) emerges a form of rationality in which the proper exercise of government consists of "employing tactics rather than laws…[arranging] things in such a way that, through a certain number of means, such and such ends may be achieved"(Foucault, 1991:95).

> From the moment that one is to manipulate a society, one cannot consider it completely penetrable by police. One must take into account what it is. It becomes necessary to reflect upon it, upon its specific characteristics, its constants and variables (Foucault, cited in Barry et al., 1996:9).

Following Foucault's understanding of liberal political rationalities as "problematizations of their contemporary social, political, and economic situation"(Simon, 1995:38), the governmentality literature stresses the "critical and problematizing character of liberalism"(Burchell, 1996:21). Foucault (1980) recommended an 'ascending' method of analyzing power, beginning with technologies of power in particular, local manifestations, and analyzing how these local technologies are taken up and utilized in more generalized strategies of power (99). In keeping with this, genealogies of government do not seek to construct a theoretical framework within which strategies can be understood in terms of their relation to a global system, but "seek to establish the singularity of particular strategies within fields of relations of truth, power, and subjectivity"(Rose, 1999:57). The 'singularity' of particular strategies is established "by a means of a work on symptoms"(57), on the basis of which "genealogies of government seek to reconstruct the problematizations to which programmes, strategies, tactics posed themselves as a solution"(58). 'Technologies' of government consist of "the strategies, techniques and procedures through which different authorities seek to enact programmes of government in relation to the materials and forces to hand and the resistances and oppositions anticipated or encountered"(Rose, 1996:42). From this perspective, liberal political rationality employs methods of experimentation: "'The real' always insists in the form of resistance to programming; and the programmer's world is one of constant experiment, invention, failure, critique and adjustment"(Miller & Rose, 1990:14). The governmentality literature reconstructs the symptoms, and the problematization of the symptoms, that account for the development of the various forms

of liberal technologies and rationalities that have existed at different historical junctures since the nineteenth century.

Rose (1999) suggests that in its search for symptoms, problematizations, and strategies, analyses of governmentality practice "a kind of empiricism"(12). While empiricism is commonly associated with scientific methodology and an orientation towards objective 'fact' at the expense of conceptual reflection, in governmentality analyses, empiricism

> is not a matter of a reaction against concepts, far less an appeal to the primacy of lived experience. It is a method of inventivity, the invention of concepts as objects of an encounter, a here-and-now encounter which produces ever new, ever different 'heres' and 'nows' (12).

In this approach, the objective facts and lived experience that are the focus of traditional empiricism are replaced by the concepts that are regarded as 'true' at particular times and places. Moving away from the idealist notion of 'concept' to which empiricism is normally juxtaposed, concepts here "intervene to resolve local situations. They themselves change along with the problems"(12).

The sort of empirical analyses carried out in the governmentality literature are not 'hermeneutic'; it is not a matter of interpreting the motivations and interests underlying a particular strategy (56). Analyses of governmentality are of a more 'programmatic' nature; that is, strategies and tactics are regarded as 'explicit programmes' to address specific problems (Miller & Rose, 1990:4). The strategies and tactics taken up to address problems are often already in existence in other contexts, and may in turn be taken up and 'translated' for application in a broad range of other settings (Rose, 1999:277). Political strategies are also regarded as programmatic in the sense that they are "characterized by

an eternal optimism that a domain or a society could be administered better or more effectively, that reality is, in some way or other, programmable"(Miller & Rose, 1990:4).

## Technologies of the Welfare State

In order to identify and analyze advanced liberalism as a mode of governing, genealogical analysis must first address the problematizations that opened a space for the introduction of advanced liberal technologies and strategies of rule. The technologies of governing associated with the welfare state that appeared in the first half of the twentieth century are treated in the governmentality literature as solutions to problems associated with a juridical mode of mediating between conflicting interests in society. Within a juridical framework, conflicts arising from contradictions between "citizenship as the right to work, or the obligation of the state to ensure for its citizens the minimum conditions of their economic existence, and citizenship as the right of property"(Gordon, 1991:28) could only be resolved on the basis of contractual relationships between individuals. When constrained within the juridical language of contracts and rights, in mediating conflicts the state must directly intervene on behalf of one party or the other. At a general level, the problem for government becomes one of how to intervene without, on the one hand, coming into direct conflict with the working classes, or on the other, appearing to infringe upon the rights of property. This problem is 'insoluble' as long as conflicts are handled "within the classical terms of right"(Donzelot, 1991:171). Required are strategies of intervention that can link the economic and the social within a governable order.

In the nineteenth century, the various mutual aid organizations that addressed the economic and social conditions of the poor comprised a "haphazard array of devices, addressed to this or that specific problematic sector or issue; only a minority of these devices of government were linked into the formal political apparatus"(Rose, 1999:120-21). The gradual displacement of nineteenth century mutual aid societies by compulsory forms of state-guaranteed workplace insurance was an early manifestation of the social insurance principles of the welfare state. In Canada, one of the early applications of insurance principles to governing can be seen in Workers' Compensation legislation implemented in the provinces between 1914 and 1920. Prior to this point, compensation for injury had been handled within a juridical framework that took the notion of 'accident' as its principle of distinction (Ewald, 1991:203). Within a juridical framework of rationality, an "accident can only ever be an exception, something which disturbs an order conceived in itself as harmonious. The accident is due to some individual fault, imprudence, or negligence; it cannot be a rule"(203). By treating risk as a social regularity or fact that exists independently of the behaviour of individuals – a regularity that is rendered comprehensible through statistical and actuarial methods – political rationality based on technologies of insurance can ease tensions and conflicts between groups in a way that juridical rationality and methods cannot. In the case of Workers' Compensation, this diminished the adversarial relationship between workers and employers by bringing an end to a situation in which, on the one hand, an injured worker had to take an employer to court in order to secure damages, while on the other hand, in the case of a large settlement being awarded to an injured worker, an employer could face severe financial difficulty or bankruptcy (Chappell, 1997:31). The creation of

mechanisms to ensure conditions of collective security in the workplace made it no longer necessary for the state to take the precarious position of directly intervening on behalf of one side or the other in conflicts between labour and management.

The practical problems of governing associated with the juridical notions of right held by nineteenth century liberal thought set the conditions out of which developed a political rationality that relies not only on laws, but on the deployment of strategies and technologies. By approaching the realm to be governed "from the angle of interdependence between people, rather than in terms of...individuals' respective duties and faults, the insurance technique offers a considerably more effective and more moral kind of solution"(Donzelot, 1988:401). It can be seen as moral in the sense that it marks a move away from a system in which individuals in society are juxtaposed to one another, to a system of collective responsibility in which a sharing of common interests promotes solidarity (Ewald, 1991:207). It is effective in the sense that it provides a means to deploy throughout society technologies for reducing the high rates of poverty and social unrest associated with laissez-faire policies. Insurance technologies are also effective in a sense previously alluded to; that is, through the deployment of technologies and strategies rather than laws, the state can act to ameliorate conflicts in society without appearing to intervene on behalf of one group to the detriment of others.

Ewald (1991) notes that the introduction of a wide range of social insurance programs was "accompanied by a transformation of social morals, a transformation of an individual's relation to himself or herself, to his or her future, and to society"(209). The 'mutualities' fostered by the insurance form are different than those of "the family, the corporation, the union, the commune"(203). Where the latter mutualities "place one,

moralize one, educate one, form one's conscience....[insurance mutualities] leave the person free"(204); the insurance form seems to "reconcile those two antagonists, society-socialization and individual liberty....[which] is what makes for its political success"(204). In striving to remedy the destructive effects of the market, the technologies of the welfare state construct a new kind of political subject. In contrast to the nineteenth-century "individualized, autonomous and self-possessed political subject of right, will and agency"(Rose, 1999:1), the subject of the welfare state is a 'citizen-subject', possessing rights and obligations in regard to other members of society (46).

Social insurance programs were implemented within a broader economic domain which, through the "construction of a vast statistical apparatus...[could] be inscribed, tabulated, calculated, and acted upon"(Miller & Rose, 1990:12). 'Economic growth' became "a calculable entity rather than a vague attribution"(15), and as such, became a 'key indicator' of the economic health of nations (15). While labour and business differed over the proper means to achieve economic growth and the ends to which it should be applied, "these differences operated upon a common ground: politicians, businessmen and academics across a large swath operated under the a priori that 'growth' was a national goal and that new policies needed to be set into place to achieve it"(15). Although many of the policies to encourage economic growth were indicative of an interventionist mode of governing, the liberal principle that individual capitalists are in the best position to make informed investment decisions was generally retained (Miller & Rose, 1990:16) (Howlett, 1992:226-32). In the governmentality literature, the policies that made up industrial strategies in western welfare states, similar to those of social

insurance, involved the deployment of technologies that allow the economic and social domains to be governed through "indirect mechanisms of rule"(Miller & Rose, 1990:9).

In the areas of social insurance policy and national economic management, technologies of statistics, insurance, and accounting make the future to some extent knowable. On the one hand, with technologies of insurance

> one comes to experience a sort of dilation of timescales, stretched out to span not just one generation or lifetime but several…thus positing the survival of society for an indefinite future. One moves from a limited conception of time bound to the life of individuals, to a social time measured against the life of society (Ewald, 1991:209).

On the other hand, the technologies for understanding and managing national economies in their relations to other economies make the economic future of the nation calculable (Miller & Rose, 1990:18). Combined, these technologies make it possible to envision the interrelated courses of progress for the individual, the firm, and the nation.

Expert authority played an important role in the implementation of technologies to link the social and the economic:

> The devices of the 'welfare state' opened a multitude of new locales for the operation of expert judgements about investment in this or that ailing or up-and-coming branch of the economy, about interest rates and regional policy, about housing regimes and planning, about the best interests of the child and much more (Rose, 1999:149).

Experts from a broad range of areas related to social well-being, and granted authority by professional status and knowledge, were pivotal in translating the various aspects of the social into objects of government (Barry et al. 1996:13).

While the introduction of the above-mentioned reforms produced links between the economic and the social, these two domains were still regarded as operating under different ethical and logical assumptions. In their recognition of the destructive effects of the economic on the social, the rationalities behind social insurance and Keynesian

demand management retained the notion that these two domains are essentially antagonistic to one another. While technologies of demand management and social insurance played a large part in facilitating industrial enterprise in the post-war period, technologies to reduce the destructive effects of the marketplace existed in tension with capitalist processes.

## Dismantling the Welfare state

Following World War II, at the same time that Keynesian economic and social policies were being implemented in western industrialized nations, currents of opposition to the welfare state were emerging. Alongside of the fiscal arguments against the welfare state, which highlighted the inefficiencies of planned economies, the welfare state was criticized for its repressive qualities. The mechanisms of demand management, social insurance, and expertise which were to ensure both the progress of society and the freedom of the individual from the depredations of the market were seen by many as in fact undermining these goals – as being "subversive of the very freedoms, democracies and liberties they sought to enhance"(Rose, 1996:50). Efforts to "'socialize' both individual citizenship and economic life in the name of collective security"(48) were criticized for having created a despotic state apparatus. In its position of exteriority, and through fiscal and bureaucratic expansion, the state was seen to be undergoing a shift from its role as "simple guarantor of the progress [and security] of society towards that of a manager directly responsible for society's destiny"(Donzelot, 1991:174).

In the governmentality literature it is noted that critiques of the welfare state have come from a variety of sources which cross-cut the traditional divides of left and right

wing, liberal and conservative. Rose (1999) notes that aside from whatever differences may have existed between 'left liberal civil libertarians' and right-wing fiscal conservatives, there was a common agreement "that the belief in a social state guaranteeing steady and incremental progress for all citizens must be rejected"(141). Despite the ascendance over the last several decades of free market solutions to the problems of the welfare state, this hegemony has not been uncontested, with much of this contestation coming from sources other than the marxist left. The liberal-democratic left, in rejecting centralized planning, has taken up a variety of approaches to reinvigorating civil society as a solution to, on the one hand, the repressive tendencies of the state, and on the other hand, the excesses of the free market (169). These solutions are responses to what is seen as the 'degrading, policing and controlling' effects of the mechanisms of the welfare state on the subjects of that system (175). Within this field of political thought, 'community' has emerged as a concept and range of technologies deployed against the "loneliness and isolation of the individual generated by mass society"(175). This is not simply a matter of 'community' replacing the 'social', but rather, with the questioning and weakening of the social as an organizing principle for governing, community is emerging as a more flexible mode of governance: "good governance must recognize the political importance of the patterns that arise out of complex interactions, negotiations and exchanges between 'intermediate' social actors, groups, forces, organizations, public and semi-public institutions"(168). The theme of community will be taken up in more detail in Chapter Three.

While the sources of opposition to the welfare state were heterogeneous, some of the earliest, most effective, and enduring criticisms came from the right. The discourse of the

Fraser Institute fits quite naturally with lines of critique that reactivated the tenets of classical liberalism. These criticisms pointed to the inefficiency of planned economies compared to market mechanisms; the inflationary expectations of individuals in terms of state-guaranteed material security, which leads to dependency and passivity; and the authoritarian tendencies of the state, if unchecked, to overreach the limits of legitimate authority, and thereby curtail economic and individual freedom (Rose & Miller, 1992:198).

Rose (1996) suggests that the writings of Friedrich Hayek are among the most notable of the early critiques of the welfare state (50). In "The Road to Serfdom"(1944), Hayek writes that the socialist policies that were at the time being implemented in western nation-states, "gained general acceptance under the flag of liberty"(24). He suggests that the essential differences between liberal ideals of freedom [freedom from coercion, from the arbitrary power of others, from traditional hierarchies] and the socialist notion of freedom as freedom from economic risk and uncertainty, were obscured by socialism in order to "harness to its cart the strongest of all political motives – the craving for freedom"(25). For Hayek, the amount of authoritarian intervention required to bring about conditions of economic equality renders the socialist conception of freedom irreconcilable with liberal tenets of freedom. The conditions of individual freedom and material security that were the promises of the welfare state are, for Hayek, no more than "socialist propaganda"(26). While belief on the part of socialists that these two notions of freedom, liberal and socialist, can coexist in a political system may be "genuine and sincere....socialism achieved and maintained by democratic means seems definitely to belong to the world of utopias"(26,28).

Hayek has served on the Fraser Institute's editorial advisory board, and is cited frequently as an authoritative source for Institute views. He is one of several noted writers to have exerted a considerable influence on the Fraser Institute, and his views on 'freedom' are often repeated in Institute literature. Echoing Hayek, Fraser Institute economist and research fellow Walter Block states that it is "important to make clear the connection between economic liberty and political liberty....Without economic freedom, political freedom is well-nigh impossible"(1989:203). Block illustrates the interconnectedness of economic and political freedom with an example:

> Imagine, if in Canada all employment was on government account. Would this stifle dissent? Would it limit the expression of religious, economic, or political opinions at variance with those maintained by government leaders? To ask these questions is to answer them (203).

The mechanisms of the welfare state are seen as not only stifling dissent, but as stifling the sort of individual initiative that is necessary for a nation and its people to progress and prosper.

These themes can be observed in an article by Milton Friedman entitled "Capitalism and Freedom," drawn from a 1988 Fraser Institute symposium. In this work, Friedman debunks the 'widely held' notion that "politics and economics are separate and largely unconnected....and that any kind of political arrangements can be combined with any kind of economic arrangements"(51). For Friedman, this sort of thinking is the basis of the 'social-democratic' belief that "it is possible for a country to adopt the essential features of Russian economic arrangements and yet...ensure individual freedom through political arrangements"(52). His main reason for rejecting this belief and its accompanying practices is the claim that any political system not accompanied by economic freedom will develop a concentration of political power in centralized

government. The overarching regulations and restrictions that inevitably issue from such centres of power place unacceptable limitations on individual freedom, "replace progress by stagnation...[and] substitute uniform mediocrity for the variety essential for that experimentation which can bring tomorrow's laggard above today's mean"(49). While the above passages emphasize individual freedom, and contain the 'experimental' aspect attributed to liberalism in the governmentality literature, they retain a state-centred approach in which political power is "analysed in terms of an apparently ineluctable tendency to centralize, control, regulate and manage"(Rose, 1999:15). This leads to the conclusion that competitive capitalism is the only economic system that "promotes political freedom because it separates economic power from political power and in this way enables the one to offset the other"(Friedman, 1988:53).

In this view, the oppressive aspects of the welfare state are attributed to fundamental errors in how the various forms of socialist thought conceive of the individual. The tendency of socialist thought to conceive of individuals in terms of their embeddedness in social relations leads to a collectivism that is antithetical to a classical liberal view of human nature. This misreading of human nature, and its realization in government policies and programs, leads to unanticipated effects. For writers associated with the Fraser Institute, these unanticipated effects, such as welfare dependency and state authoritarianism, far outweigh any benefits of centralized, collectivist forms of government.

The classical liberal philosophy disseminated by writers such as Hayek, Milton Friedman, and others associated with the Fraser Institute centers on the priority of the individual's rights to life, liberty, and property. These 'negative' rights are the only

legitimate rights, and include, for example, the right not to have one's person or property invaded (Block, 1989:290). 'Positive' rights, which are illegitimate, all have in common "a request or demand for wealth – always for the property or rights of other people....[such as] the right to food, the right to housing, the right to clothing, the right to challenging and interesting employment"(290). These requests and demands interfere with the rights of others to pursue their own self-interest; these latter rights of course being contingent on their not impinging on the negative rights of others.

The a priori nature of individual rights suggests that the market is the ideal model for organizing society. Hayek points out that the 'utopian' character of the welfare state stems from its neglect of one of the fundamental tenets of the liberal philosophy described above, that is, the centrality of 'self-interest' to human nature. For classical liberalism, the 'instinctive' pull of self-interest is the motor that drives individuals in society. As Adam Smith states in a famous passage:

> Every individual is continually exerting himself to find out the most advantageous employment for whatever capital he can command. It is his own advantage, indeed, and not that of the society which he has in view. But the study of his own advantage naturally, or rather necessarily, leads him to prefer that employment which is most advantageous to society (1976:477)

In this view, each individual pursuing his own selfish interests is "led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention"(477). The 'end' achieved is that society as a whole is better off as a result of everyone pursuing their own interests.

However, this fundamental human drive is also present in societies not organized entirely around market principles. For the Fraser Institute, when policies hindering the free pursuit of interests are operative, the results will be anything but beneficial for society. Herbert Grubel and Michael Walker (1979) illustrate this point in a collection of studies published by the Fraser Institute that explores the 'disincentive to work' effects of

Unemployment Insurance. The authors explain that when individuals who are by nature self-interested and rational are offered a choice between working or receiving money for enjoying leisure, they will most often opt for leisure. As Walker puts it,

> the existence of insurance greatly reduces the amount of income lost as a result of enjoying increased leisure (whether voluntary or not) and hence should, to the extent that people try to maximize their welfare, increase the amount of leisure that people opt to enjoy (13).

This leads to the conclusion that "if the unemployment insurance program did not exist, the incidence of the event 'unemployment' as conventionally measured, would be less pronounced"(13). The authors concede a subjective dimension to the issue, that is, that an actor will often make a value-distinction between unemployment insurance and gainful employment as sources of income, a distinction that they admit could very well lower the level of 'disincentive' related to unemployment insurance. They go on, however, to attribute the ability to be able to make such a value-distinction to the generational cohort one belongs to:

> On the basis of casual observation, one would have to remark that the younger generation in 1977 is much less concerned about the source of their income than their fathers and mothers would be. In part, this is undoubtedly due to the radical change in the perception of the rights and responsibilities of the individual that have occurred in the last thirty years – largely as the result of the evolution of paternalistic governments. This factor may, to some extent, explain why, in Canada, about 40 per cent of all UI beneficiaries are less than 24 years of age (13).

While Fraser Institute and advanced liberal criticisms of paternalistic governments are similar in many ways, the Fraser Institute, unlike advanced liberalism, retains the classical liberal notion of the market as a "quasi-natural realm"(Burchell, 1996:23). One of the central attributes of classical liberal reason is a

> skepticism about the possibility of it [the state], or of anyone, being able to know perfectly and in all its details the reality to be governed, and about its capacity to shape that reality at will on the basis of such a knowledge (22).

This inability of governments to possess enough knowledge of the 'natural realm' of the market to be able to predict policy outcomes is, according to the Fraser Institute, only compounded by more government intervention:

> The already enormous impact of government policies and regulations reinforces the drive to still more intervention, as prices in private markets swing ever more wildly because normal market adjustments are postponed and frustrated, and because government so frequently, haphazardly, and abruptly, changes policy directions (Walker, 1984:xi).

In the governmentality literature advanced liberalism is treated as being fundamentally different from classical liberalism in its approach to antagonisms between the state and the market. Liberalism as a political philosophy is usually counterposed to collectivism and state interventionism. The question of the role of the state comes down to material and ideological struggles between conflicting forces. According to the governmentality literature, however, advanced liberalism "is not rendered intelligible by counterposing a non-interventionist to an interventionist state"(Rose & Miller, 1992:199). Rather, advanced liberalism is an attempt to reduce the 'autonomy' of the 'social' technologies and authorities that make the social difficult to govern. Where technologies of insurance came under attack for creating conditions of dependency, passivity, and fiscal crisis, the legitimacy of expert authorities came under attack because of their ability to "make decisions not on the basis of an externally imposed plan, or criteria reaching them from elsewhere, but according to professional codes....[their] enormous capacities to 'enclose' themselves and their judgements, to render themselves almost ungovernable"(Rose, 1999:149). From a governmentality perspective, criticisms of the various 'symptoms' of the crisis of the welfare state can be subsumed under the general problematic of 'ungovernability'. It is in response to this problematic that advanced liberal technologies and strategies emerge.

According to Foucault's concept of discourse and genealogical method, any analysis of liberalism that focuses on the balance of forces between market and state, intervention and non-intervention, and the various combinations of these found in different settings, expresses a network of themes that possesses an internal coherence, "and has its own history and conditions of existence"(Barrett, 1991:126). One of these conditions is the existence of the 'national economy' as coextensive with the 'nation-state', a condition which is quickly receding with the new spatialization of the 'global' economy (Rose, 1999:143). With the "dispersal of the apparent unity of 'the national economy' on the one hand to supra-national, international networks of finance, investment, employment and trade, and, on the other, to infra-national, local and regional economic relations"(143), a genealogical focus on concrete technologies offers useful critical insights into the nature of contemporary power relations.

The treatment of advanced liberalism in the governmentality literature follows the lines of Foucault's 'decentring' of power relations, in which the analysis of political power is not concerned with the 'central' location of power, nor with who 'possesses' power or his or her 'conscious intention'. Rather, the analysis of political power involves "studying power at the point where its intention, if it has one, is completely invested in its real and effective practices"(Foucault, 1980:97). While rhetoric such as Hayek's and Friedman's corresponds with advanced liberalism's privileging of market rationality, from a governmentality perspective advanced liberalism's central thrust is not the separation of political power from the economic, but the infusion of technologies of economic rationality and calculation into the very practices of political power. Unlike

classical liberalism, this privileging of the economic does not stem from a rationality that regards the economic as a 'natural' domain, but rather, the market is regarded as needing the conditions of its existence to be constructed. With this focus on technologies and practices of power, there is a shift away from viewing power as solely negative – in this case as suppressing the 'natural' processes of the market – to viewing power as 'productive' of new types of institutional arrangements and political subjects. In the next chapter, Fraser Institute discourse on several areas of social policy will be analyzed from the perspective of governmentality.

# Chapter Three: Advanced Liberalism and the Fraser Institute

In the governmentality literature, advanced liberal rationality is identified with the deployment of technologies of accountability, responsibility, and freedom throughout society. Rose (1999) notes that "thought becomes governmental to the extent that it becomes technical, it attaches itself to a technology for its realization"(51). 'Government', in this sense, refers not only to a range of strategies for the state to extend its reach into the social, but also extends well beyond the state, involving practical methods for directing the activities of widely dispersed individuals and groups towards particular objectives. The technologies employed to carry this out not only shape the contexts in which activities take place, forcing conformity to set procedures and objectives, but also effect changes in actors' attitudes and ways of reasoning about situations, problems, and solutions.

In Chapter Two, it was noted that the Fraser Institute's critique of the welfare state follows the lines of classical liberal thought. It was also noted that the classical liberal outlook on market freedom and the state exists in some tension to advanced liberalism as presented in the governmentality literature. In this chapter, I will consider whether or not there is 'more' to Fraser Institute discourse than the dissemination of the free-market, anti-statist tenets of classical liberalism. To carry out this analysis, I explore Fraser Institute documents across several areas; public-sector administration, health care and education [K-12] provision, income assistance programs, and the notion of 'community'. In each of these areas, I search through Fraser Institute documents for the themes of advanced liberalism identified in the governmentality literature, looking for instances in

which Fraser Institute discourse promotes the use of disciplinary technologies to produce 'free' self-governing subjects.

## Discipline

In Canada, the restructuring of the state bureaucracy is one area in which the introduction of new institutional arrangements can be observed. Concerns about government bureaucracies 'running out of control' led to the development and implementation of systems of accounting and audit intended to restore efficiency and rationality to the business of government. The Auditor General of Canada claimed in 1976 that he was "deeply concerned that parliament – and indeed the government – has lost, or is close to losing, effective control of the public purse"(Auditor General, in Saint-Martin, 1998:533). The response to these concerns has been the introduction of private-sector methods of management into the public sector. These methods fall under the general heading of the 'New Public Management', which is "shorthand for the group of management ideas imported from the business sector that dominated the bureaucratic reform policy agenda of many Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries since the 1980s"(533). To facilitate the incorporation of these ideas into public-sector management, Canadian public officials have been encouraged by the Treasury Board to make use of private management consulting firms in devising strategies to create a "more flexible and innovative management environment"(Comptroller General, in Saint-Martin, 1998:534).

From the perspective of advanced liberalism, the aim of encouraging the development of such strategies has not been to create experts and specialists who can

oversee the rational and efficient management of government business, as this would only "reinvent the very systems of professional power that had produced the problems in the first place"(Rose, 1999:150). Miller (1994) discusses how techniques of accounting – managerial or cost accounting in particular – make it "possible to link calculations at one place with action at another"(244). These techniques provide a mechanism for governing behaviour that relies upon objective principles and standards, rather than the judgements of expert individuals. Through the application of methods of management accounting, government agencies, departments, and offices all become "calculable spaces"(253) whose efficiency and performance can be assessed and manipulated from a central point. Rose (1999) notes that in the 'new public management',

> the focus is upon accountability, explicit standards and measures of performance, emphasis on outputs, not inputs, with rewards linked to performance, desegregation of functions into corporatized units operating with their own budgets and trading with one another, contracts and competition, and insistence on parsimony maintained by budget discipline....a shift from an ethic of public service to one of private management (150).

These themes, corresponding to those of 'Public Choice Theory', which the Fraser Institute strongly endorses, are present in Institute recommendations regarding public sector management in Canada. In the 1995 book Thirty Million Musketeers: One Canada, For All Canadians, Gordon Gibson, senior fellow in Canadian Studies at the Fraser Institute, discusses the reorganization of the public sector. Regarding 'accountability', the author asks,

> would it be too much to ask every government to use a consistent accounting basis, or, failing that, to have the Federal Council prepare consolidated budgetary statements on a consistent basis?....With accounting tricks stripped away in an official compilation, the comparisons would be interesting and useful to the taxpayer (180).

The establishment of measures of 'economic performance' is encouraged:

> We need a system of measurement. Measurement is as fundamental to the political marketplace as it is to its economic counterpart. However, it is much more complex on the political side....Dollars can serve as a measure in the political marketplace....There is a huge difficulty here though. The dollars spent are only measures of input. What we are much more interested in knowing about is output....suppose a government spends dollars on a soldier, or a nurse, or a teacher. We know how to value what went into the equation, because we can spend money elsewhere. But how do we know how to value what comes out? How do we know the worth, or even the quantity, of the protection, or health care, or teaching service that has been purchased?(144-5).

In terms of measuring 'outputs' rather than 'inputs':

> Only by assessing the value of outputs can we really measure how well the system is working for us. A redesigned system of government should produce much more of this kind of information, as a natural result of its functioning (145).
>
> The spenders of the money, the wielders of authority, must be directly and clearly identified with responsibility and accountability for what they do. Sometimes there will be more than one decision maker. Despite these complications every effort must be made to ascribe each specific responsibility to an actual human being, or a small group of them (164).

'Competition' and 'trading' among units is also encouraged:

> The essence of a marketplace is competition and exchange....bureaucracies have the ability to compete with one another in an expert and public manner in order to serve the interests of the public. The trick is to devise the machinery that will allow this kind of competition of public-policy expertise to take place openly (143).

And finally, there is mention of a 'central' point of calculation and control:

> So there is a first 'new power' for Ottawa. It would not run the machinery of economic coordination, but without question the central government would find its economic influence extended through such machinery (181).

Another means through which institutional arrangements are being restructured can be seen in the 'decentralization' of administrative authority over the various aspects of social insurance. The theme of decentralization is embodied in the replacement in 1995 of the Canada Assistance Plan [CAP] with the Canada Health and Social Transfer [CHST].

Under the CAP, provincial authority over the use of transfer funds was superseded by federally imposed conditions on how the funds could be applied to social programs. Provinces that complied with these conditions were eligible to have fifty percent of any cost overruns covered by the federal government. Under these arrangements, 'universal' entitlement to the social welfare programs covered by the CAP was more or less guaranteed. The important point is that ultimate authority over the administration of funds was held by the federal government. The CHST, on the other hand, combines the various components of the CAP into one block payment to each province, at a reduced overall level of funding, and does not attach conditions to how funds are allocated (Pulkingham & Ternowetsky, 1999:93). In this way, administrative authority is devolved to the provincial level, with different sectors of the social 'safety-net' forced to compete for funds within an environment of reduced funding. For Gordon Gibson of the Fraser Institute, the introduction of competition into intra-governmental relations reduces the inefficiencies and overlap associated with federal-regional relations in a highly centralized system. For Gibson, bringing business concepts and practices into the public sector will provide

> the maximum incentive for efficiency, the maximum freedom to adapt local practices to local needs, and the maximum accountability to the electorate, because there is no one else to take the blame or the credit (Gibson, 1995:66).

With this decentralization of the welfare state, the language of cost-efficiency, value-for-money, and performance is gradually encroaching on a terrain that had for several decades been characterized to some degree by notions of economic redistribution and universal entitlement. Armitage (1996) notes that the influence on the policy process of such technologies as "cost-benefit analysis, cost-outcome analysis, and planned program budget systems"(166) has been of a 'programmatic' nature, that is, the "questions for this

type of research are usually narrow and administratively oriented....questions are posed and answered without reference to any general policy direction"(166). In spite of their administrative nature, the cumulative effects of these technologies on the conduct of policymaking is substantial (166). The governmentality perspective pursues a similar line of inquiry, drawing attention not so much to the vested interests underlying the introduction of business practices into the social welfare field, nor to the effects of this ethic on recipients of social programs. Rather, this perspective draws attention to the discourses and technologies that have made it possible to take diverse and geographically dispersed groups of people and align their activities with specific economic and political objectives.

The decentralization of public administration is accompanied by the increasing use of accounting technologies to govern areas such as health care and education. In Canada, recent battles between provincial premiers and the federal government over the funding and administration of health care are indicative of a shifting political agenda. While privatization measures such as Alberta's *Bill 11* have encountered federal opposition, fiscal pressures, an increase in private-sector health-management firms, and other forces contribute to making the policy environment receptive to alternatives to centrally administered, universal health care (Harden, 1999:170-71). 'Unfortunate necessity' as a rationale for decentralization, privatization, and reduced funding is gradually being replaced by a more 'positive' emphasis on national competitiveness and prosperity (170-71). The theme of enhancing the accountability and competitiveness of hospitals and hospital services is increasingly viewed as a 'common-sense' solution, one which is taken up by the Fraser Institute.

In a 1996 Fraser Institute-published book, Healthy Incentives: Canadian Health Reform in an International Context, visiting Institute fellow William McArthur M.D., Michael Walker, and an Institute staffer argue that

> many of the changes which have taken place in the health care sector in Canada, including the introduction of universal health insurance, have taken place for political rather than medical reasons. Inefficiencies have been built into the system (section 1, paragraph 93).

The authors note that when medicare was established

> there were no organizational framework impositions [placed] on hospitals-there was no accountability for the funds required....This created disincentives to run a hospital efficiently (section 1, paragraph 9).

Operating under such conditions,

> the Canadian health care system...is virtually devoid of the normal competitive forces that guide and shape most other economic activities in Canada (section 2, paragraph 1).

Competition between health care facilities based on measures of output and performance is encouraged:

> Hospital services are measured in various ways. These include such factors as appropriateness, effectiveness, and efficiency. An appropriate service is one that, on the best scientific evidence, will improve the health status of the recipient the most and where the benefits exceed the risks by a wide enough margin to make the service worth providing. An effective service is one that improves the health status of the recipient. An efficient service is one that is delivered in the most cost-efficient place at a time when the effectiveness of the intervention will be optimal (section 1, paragraph 75).

In this example, the output measure of health status can be combined with input measures of cost to produce ratios by which the benefits and savings in one location can be compared with those of another. This accords with Miller's (1994) observation that through accounting technologies, 'complex and diverse processes' are transformed so that they are comparable in an objective format that appears "set apart from the world of politics and intrigue"(246). Of note here is not the capacity to quantify and compare

qualitatively different phenomena, as such procedures are standard in the statistical sciences, but rather, the ascendant status of such calculations in political debates relative to other forms of argument and rationality.

Turning to education, Canadian government officials are exploring ways to develop performance indicators that will guide 'priorities and directions' in educational policy ("Major Education Report Released," 2000). Kachur (1999) attributes such initiatives to a policy environment in which a business rationale is "guiding education and other programs at the provincial and federal level no matter the political party in power"(133). Strategies for educational reforms at both levels of government follow the imperatives of cost-efficiency and output measurement, with efforts underway at the provincial level to cut education budgets and make teachers submit to written competency exams (Galt, 2000), and at the national level to implement standardized tests for students (Kachur, 1999:133).

In the September 1997 issue of the Fraser Forum, Helen Raham notes that

> Many elements in the [educational] system resist measurement and management for results. Governments now have a vision of what is needed, but struggle to find policy options to achieve this goal ....[there is] a troubling lack of useful hard data on performance....Without annual standardized data across grades and programs, there is a lack of opportunity to compare results between schools and jurisdictions to guide decision-making.... We must assemble data and sites that provide evidence of approaches that work (paragraph 1).

The use of standardized output indicators can provide a guide for funding decisions:

> The education budget process must become results-based....With rigorous program evaluation and monitoring in place, deliberate reallocation of funds from weak programs to those producing the best results can occur....In a results-based system, we must clarify who is accountable for what (paragraph 6).

Schools and districts should compete for funding:

> Link funding to performance. Provide incentives for improved performance. Districts and schools exceeding their performance targets should be rewarded with increased discretionary funding to invest in school improvement (paragraph 7).

Another Fraser Institute publication, the Third Annual Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools, 2000 ties student attendance rates to school performance and budget considerations:

> Taxpayers pay for the operation of the public school whether its students attend class or not: poor attendance represents a waste of public funds. Regrettably, not one of the province's school districts has yet provided basic attendance data.... We had planned to use this data in the Report Card as an indicator of the extent to which schools were successful in engaging the interest and attention of their students (section 1, paragraph 22).

Teacher performance will be a central node in assessing and improving outputs and granting incentives. Raham (1997) notes that in Dallas,

> teacher and principal performance rewards are tied to learning results. Each year $2.4 million is awarded to school staffs where the "value added" in student learning outcomes is highest....Test scores have increased across the district since the incentive system was implemented five years ago (paragraph 9).

She advises that

> hiring by competency, not seniority, will ensure the school has the best personnel to carry out its mission....Processes to remove incompetent teachers should be strengthened (paragraph 7).

On the face of it, recommending stricter guidelines for the hiring and dismissal of teachers presents nothing new. However, within the 'calculable spaces' described in the above passages, decisions around hiring and promotions would be based not only on 'traditional' criteria such as training and experience, or in the case of dismissal, complaints from students, parents, and other staff. Teachers would be drawn into a network of surveillance and evaluation in which, for example, attendance records and

students' grades would take on new meaning as indicators of a teacher's 'value' or a school's 'value'. Such measures would also take on a dramatically new meaning as possible determinants of job security and school funding. The introduction of accounting technologies into educational and other public sector organizations creates norms for evaluation and judgement, which can, in theory, be operationalized to govern the actions of individuals near or distant in relation to a site of calculation.

Themes of accountability and output measurement are changing the way that income assistance programs are delivered. The increasing prevalence of mandatory training and job-readiness programs as components of income security provision is indicative of new techniques for governing the unemployed. In spite of the widely acknowledged existence of fixed rates of unemployment brought about by economic policy and structural factors – the inevitability of mass unemployment in market economies – funding for training programs is being obtained largely through the reduction of funding in areas of basic income support (Hess, 1996:45). Programs to integrate or re-integrate people into the workforce have been introduced or strengthened in such program areas Employment Insurance [formerly *Unemployment Insurance*](Stanford, 1996:130-31), provincial income assistance (Armitage, 1996:45-6), income assistance for single parents (Low, 1996:188), and disability benefits (Hess, 1996:45).

Such "active unemployment policies"(Rose, 1999:162) mark a move away from a model of assistance in which the primary goal is the provision of security against economic risk, to a model in which the primary goals are performance and cost-efficiency, measured in terms of statistical evidence of success in moving people off of

assistance roles and into the workforce. The status of welfare recipients makes them particularly vulnerable to the sort of liberal 'experimentation' mentioned in Chapter Two. Fraser Institute economist Patrick Basham (1999) writes glowingly of research conducted in the United States, in which it has been found that, of all recipients cut off of the welfare roles, a fairly high percentage find work within a year. Basham suggests that the public assistance system in Canada could benefit from such research:

> Canadian attempts to reform a clearly dysfunctional system of public assistance have been limited and have only occurred in Alberta and Ontario. It is time that a coast-to-coast series of experiments were conducted north of the border so that we may reap the benefits of this promising social experiment (paragraph 17).

One outcome of such experimentation is an increased emphasis on the 'policing' functions of welfare workers. Administrative measures such as the elimination of the category 'unemployable' and the withholding of benefits from recipients unwilling to participate in training and work-readiness programs (Pulkingham & Ternowetsky, 1999:95-96) render the activities of welfare workers open to measures of performance and output.

In discussing the proliferation of initiatives to move unemployed people into the workforce, Rose (1999) notes that 'workfare' programs exist in 'uneasy combination' with state-sponsored training programs (264). Workfare is associated with a free-market emphasis on getting people off welfare roles and instilling productive habits, carried out with a minimum of state involvement. State-funded training programs, on the other hand, are associated with the sort of communitarian spirit contained in the politics of the 'third way', which emphasizes the importance of 'inclusion', that is, drawing the unemployed into the market system and the benefits to be obtained therein (264). Following the

governmentality literature's characterization of advanced liberalism as a political rationality that takes an experimental approach to symptoms, problematizations, and solutions, the range of programs from workfare to publicly-funded training can be seen as comprising a range of tactics that can be applied to the problem of joblessness in societies with relatively fixed rates of unemployment. While workfare programs do move people off the official welfare roles, because of their lack of effectiveness in creating real jobs and the extreme reactions they can provoke from welfare rights and other groups, such programs are applied sporadically compared to state-funded training programs.

The position of the Fraser Institute on these issues draws out a point of tension between the Institute's classical liberal tendencies and advanced liberalism. Fraser Institute opposition to state-sponsored training programs is based on research demonstrating that such programs in the United States and other countries have failed to

> reduce unemployment, increase earnings, and reduce welfare dependency among poor single parents, disadvantaged adults, and out-of-school youth (Fraser Institute media release, 1997, December 12).

Filip Palda of the Fraser Institute states that these programs "impose a cost of several hundred million dollars a year on taxpayers"(1993, paragraph 1), but escape public scrutiny and outcry because they are a form of education: "we should question to what extent these programs are simply a transfer of money from taxpayers to firms and workers"(paragraph 1). Palda goes on to say that these transfers only benefit the special-interest groups of labour and business. In a system of market incentives,

> new workers will offer their services for a wage lower than the value of what they produce. In return, the business will devote time and resources to making the employee productive. The workplace is a school in which both the employee and employer bear part of the training cost. They are willing to bear this cost because there is an immediate return which both share (paragraph 2).

> There is no reason for a government to subsidize training unless it believes that something is keeping employees and firms from exchanging training for lower wages (paragraph 3).

Even if government had reason to believe that this was the case, government intervention is bound to be misguided because the state cannot possess adequate information of the labour force to pinpoint exactly where problems lie. Government must rely upon

> advice from business and labour to draft its training policies. The problem is that government is at the mercy of advice it cannot properly weigh. Business and labour are only too glad to receive public money for investments in worker quality that they would have made without official help (paragraph 3)

The Fraser Institute favours a market-driven, workfare approach to dealing with unemployment. In a 1996 Critical Issues Bulletin, Fazil Mihlar and Danielle Smith state that

> private-sector welfare-to-work programs (e.g., America Works; see Nye 1996) are more successful at finding work for long-time welfare recipients at substantially lower costs than government-sponsored training programs (section 8, paragraph 4).

The pro-workfare approach recommends

> programs that set clear expectations for welfare recipients, provide low-cost job search only, and require mandatory participation in job search or employment (section 8, paragraph 4).

In this view, workfare is not intended to be

> a program providing skills for an eventual transition into the workforce (although this may occur inadvertently) but as a means by which grant recipients can return something to the community in exchange for the support they receive (section 8, paragraph 4).

The Fraser Institute's focus on 'results' in this case distances Institute discourse from an advanced liberal emphasis on producing governable subjects. The Fraser Institute's emphasis on detaching people from the welfare roles so that they can 'sink or swim' in

the marketplace lacks the advanced liberal insight that the market is not a 'natural realm', and that surrendering administrative decision-making to the logic of the market can have disastrous social and economic effects, if taken too far. While training programs may be ineffective in terms of creating employment and increasing earnings, the fact that they offer a politically acceptable means of [limited] economic redistribution makes them an effective technology for managing unemployment.

Rose (1999) notes that "technologies of government are those technologies imbued with aspirations for the shaping of conduct in the hope of producing certain desired effects and averting certain undesired events"(52). Workfare initiatives, as recommended by the Fraser Institute, have the politically undesirable potential to stir up resistances and disturbances. State-funded training and educational programs, on the other hand, make possible a limited redistribution of income in an indirect manner, through various decentralized governmental agencies and service providers. While both methods render the activities of service providers 'measurable' in terms of rates of success in moving people off of direct income assistance, publicly-funded training programs provide a more effective and politically acceptable means for transforming the unemployed into 'governable subjects'.

## Self-Governing Subjects and Freedom

Thus far, methods for governing bureaucrats, public agencies, and the recipients of income assistance have been discussed as disciplinary mechanisms, that is, as technologies of surveillance, control, and assessment. With advanced liberalism, the contexts in which various initiatives are planned and carried out are transformed in such a

way that the activities of individuals are opened up to measures of performance and accountability. Methods for governing the recipients of income assistance will be returned to later in this chapter, in the section on 'consumers'. In this section, I will discuss how strategies for controlling and directing the activities of public employees and organizations move beyond that of simple 'domination'.

For the individuals working in agencies that deliver social services, accounting as a disciplinary technology bears a similarity to the methods of 'scientific management' popular in industry in the early decades of the twentieth century. One of the main objectives of scientific management was to increase efficiency in the workplace by applying various types of calculations and performance measurements to the work process. Similar to accounting, these methods were to replace the subjectivity of human judgement with objective procedures, thereby reducing the levels of error, wasted time and cost related to any particular output. However, because of its crude instrumentalism, neglect of social processes, and strict control of personal work-life, scientific management methods provoked strong resistances from "workers, trade unionists, and even managers"(Marshall, 1994:465). Similarly, due to the unpredictability of human behaviour, principles of accounting, when applied solely as control mechanisms, may elicit resistances that undermine the sought-after goals of efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

One of the unique contributions of Foucault's work was to treat the 'conditions of possibility' of such resistance [actors possessing agency and will] as not being antithetical to the exercise of power (Rose, 1999:54). The writings of Foucault and governmentality theorists differ from critical approaches in which disturbances and

resistance to technological domination are seen as being the result of an incompatibility between instrumental rationality and human subjectivity (54). In such forms of criticism, analyses of the workings of power tend to privilege structure over agency, with structure exercising an oppressive power over an essential subjectivity. In the governmentality literature, subjectivity is treated as a medium through which power circulates, and as such, is granted a central role in the functioning of power. Rather than viewing attempts at technological control as necessarily resulting in distortions of human subjectivity, governmentality theorists treat different forms of human subjectivity as being "the resultants of specific configurations of power, certain technological inventions, certain more or less rationalized techniques of relating to ourselves"(54).

The governmentality literature treats the application of accounting technologies to governing as being a product of advanced liberal political rationality. As such, incorporated into their functioning is the notion of individual liberty, not in the sense of "the natural liberty of the individual, but rather as a governmental product – that is, as the effect of a multiplicity of interventions concerned with the promotion of a specific 'form of life'"(Hindess, 1996:65). As a technique of intervention, accounting creates a subject who obeys not through being coerced or constrained, but through being provided with the freedom to consider options and make choices. These techniques are a means to "bring the actions of 'free' individuals into accord with specific objectives by enclosing them within a calculative regime"(Miller, 1994:244). Miller (1994) applies this rationality to governing the conduct of managers:

> Rather than telling individual managers which investments to choose, why not specify a percentage rate of return to be earned on all investments and leave them to make the decisions 'freely' themselves? Why not, in other words, seek to produce an individual who comes to act as a self-regulating calculating person,

> albeit one located within asymmetrical networks of influence and control? The same holds for budgets. Rather than risk constant face-to-face confrontations over the allocation of resources, why not provide funds to an individual, or individuals, who will have both the responsibility and the freedom to spend the money as they see fit (245).

The granting of decision-making autonomy within parameters of output measurement and cost-effectiveness embeds individuals in "networks of calculation, as objects and as active participants"(Miller, 1994:253). With such 'embeddedness', the merit and legitimacy of action based on principles of accounting and calculation become self-evident (245). Regimes of calculation also "have a role in subjectification – they turn the individual into a calculating self endowed with a range of ways of thinking about, calculating about, predicting and judging their own activities and those of others"(Rose, 1999:214). Regarding the production of responsible, accountable, and most importantly, 'governable' subjects, Miller (1994) asks,

> why not generalize this technology of government to as many spheres of social life as possible? For, from the perspective of an analytics of power, as much may be gained by transforming the doctor, the social worker, or the school teacher into a calculating self as by transforming the manager of a division of a multinational corporation (245).

In this way, managers and experts across various industries and disciplines can be 'responsibilized' along the lines of new criteria, with responsibility based on knowledge, training, and professional ethics replaced by a form of responsibility answerable to external criteria based on measures of performance.

## Organizations and Management

With the devolution of decision-making authority to decentralized units, professionals and managers in the various social service fields are constructed as 'active' participants

in defining the work process and their occupational role in terms of budget constraints, the production of measurable outcomes, and competition with other providers. With the extension of the market model across areas formerly set off from the economic, competition for scarce resources becomes a defining feature of work life and professional identification. Along with the economic necessity of restructuring, the Fraser Institute represents such organizational changes in the language of freedom and choice.

In a Fraser Institute-published book on health care, Ake Blomqvist (1979) suggests that opening the hospital system to free-market forces will

> grant more autonomy to individual hospitals while at the same time increasing their responsibility for generating their own revenue (174).

The authors of the previously-cited Fraser Institute report Healthy Incentives: Canadian Health Reform in an International Context (1996), note that, under the present system in British Columbia and most other provinces, the freedom for hospitals to innovate is severely restricted. Under this system, hospital boards

> can operate only within fiscal and administrative regulations set by government. They can neither build, renovate, nor operate without government approval. They cannot even sell their property unless the government agrees. If a board is seen to step out of line, it can be replaced by the Minister of Health (section 1, paragraph 74).

It is said that replacing the Canada Health Care Act with legislation allowing private companies to provide hospital services would open the field to a more diverse range of interests and initiatives:

> For-Profit Private Enterprise Hospitals would provide an important competitive incentive to the Canadian health care scene. These facilities, owned and operated by privately or publicly owned companies, would have the opportunity to compete on an equal basis with the other hospitals (section 2, paragraph 97).

Opening the field to a broad range of private and public interests would increase local input and freedom of choice over issues of hospital management:

> Community Hospitals owned and operated by the communities which they serve should be encouraged. This would provide a degree of local input into a hospital which is not possible within the government-owned crown corporation structure (section 2, paragraph 96).

In this setting the shareholders would

> be the community, which would have the power and choice to create profits or accept losses as its members chose (section 2, paragraph 96).

The relationship between local control and increased freedom of choice is also applied to schools, school boards, and local councils. Writing for the Fraser Institute, Helen Raham (1997) states that

> our tangled, top-heavy governance structure must be streamlined so that both the authority for making decisions and the responsibility for them are moved down to the school level within a framework of clear expectations (paragraph 7).

In the September 1997 issue of the Fraser Forum, Graham Baldwin, Headmaster of Collingwood Independent School in West Vancouver, asserts that devolving control over spending and curriculum to the local level will allow schools

> to make maximum use of current technology, but also to make maximum use of our increasing knowledge of how we learn; to rid ourselves of some of the archaic industrial models which have been imposed on our schools from the beginning and which may have been appropriate once, but are certainly no longer appropriate (paragraph 32).

Raham (1997) notes that local control would offer the opportunity to

> broaden school choice plans. Schools should be encouraged to differ in their missions and delivery to meet varying learning styles and needs (paragraph 8).

Rather than being protected and at the same time dominated by top-heavy bureaucratic regimes, managers and workers in sectors such as health care and education would,

through performance evaluation and competition, be provided with 'incentives' to produce measurable results. Decentralization of administrative responsibility coupled with the introduction of technologies of accounting allows employees to "retain the formal independence of the professional while utilizing new techniques of accountability to render their decisions visible, calculable and amenable to evaluation"(Rose, 1996:351).

## Consumers

Changes in techniques of delivering health care and educational services are particularly relevant to the consumers of these services. No longer is security defined in terms of freedom from risk guaranteed through the state. The responsible citizen is one who exercises his or her freedom of choice to insure self and family against risk, and to invest in services that carry the maximum benefits. It is not a simple matter of these restructured services being 'thrust upon' recipients. While changes in the ways that services are provided are commonly justified along the lines of fiscal necessity, these changes are also framed in the language of freedom, choice, and responsibility.

Commenting on the Canadian heath-care system, Fraser Institute fellow William McArthur (1999) states that

> Canada joins countries such as Albania, Cuba, and North Korea in having legislation which prevents its citizens from purchasing comprehensive health care insurance…the 'publicly administered' section of the Canada Health Act must be repealed, thereby permitting Canadians the freedom to purchase their own comprehensive health insurance (paragraph 8).
>
> We must join the community of free nations by letting our citizens exercise their freedom and judgement to make choices about their own lives (paragraph 9).

A Fraser Institute Press release claims that opening the health care system to market forces would

> emphasize the importance of individual patient choice and decision making....[and] introduce incentives for both patients and providers to act in a fiscally responsible manner (Fraser Institute press release, 1996, August 15).

In this case, the restructuring of health care is justified on the grounds of individual freedom, as well as fiscal responsibility [accountability] on the part of both consumers and providers.

Turning to education, in a 1998 report for the Fraser Institute, Satinder Chera and Fazil Mihlar state that

> historically, provincial governments throughout Canada have had a monopoly over the funding and delivery of public education (paragraph 3).
>
> In most provinces, including British Columbia, parents are deprived of choice over what type of education they wish their children to receive. Since all children have varying degrees of talents and skills, it is difficult for a standardized system of education to meet the different demands and provide the level of education suited to each child (paragraph 5).

They point to evidence of the benefits of decentralizing educational services:

> In jurisdictions around the world where parents have greater choice over schooling and participate in how local schools operate, there is a greater degree of satisfaction with the system of education....In spite of the evidence that points to the merits of providing school choice, many provinces, including British Columbia, continue to deprive parents of choice in the educational system (paragraph 5).

Although lagging behind other countries, Canada is beginning to learn from others' experiences:

> With escalating costs, poor levels of student performance, less choice, and greater dissatisfaction with the publicly operated system, most provincial governments are striving to meet parental demand for more accountability in the system (paragraph 3).

They recommend the introduction of a system of school vouchers and the establishment of charter schools as ways of increasing consumer choice and freedom:

> The provincial government should provide school vouchers for educational services at institutions of their choice to the parents or guardians of every student in British Columbia. If the government opens up the educational system to private suppliers, parents will have the choice of sending their children to the school that best meets the individual needs of each child (paragraph 10).
>
> Charter schools are another means of offering parents more choice and control over the education their children receive. A group of interested parents could apply for a government charter to establish a school based on the type of education they wish their child to receive. Parents would have control over curriculum, transportation, the hiring of teachers, and the general management of the school (paragraph 11).

With its promotion of workfare-type programs to force people off welfare roles, the Fraser Institute's recommendations for welfare reform are somewhat draconian compared to its recommendations for the recipients of health care and education programs. While the Fraser Institute treats welfare recipients in a much harsher manner than it treats health care and education recipients, and is strongly supportive of strict disciplinary measures to combat welfare fraud and dependency, it also stresses that a restructured income assistance system will provide recipients with a new-found sense of responsibility and increased freedom of choice and self-esteem. Although the Fraser Institute's promotion of workfare programs goes against some of the themes of advanced liberalism presented in the governmentality literature, Institute discourse converges with the advanced liberal emphasis on the "ethical reconstruction of the welfare recipient"(Rose, 1999:263). In the governmentality literature, the shift from need-based income assistance programs to 'work-readiness' programs "is linked to a cluster of ideas with a nineteenth-century puritan heritage, but given a new ethical gloss: paid work engenders pride and self-respect, or self-esteem, and ties the individual into respectability, identity and community"(266).

With the transformation of the concept of 'citizen' from the passive citizen of the welfare state to the active citizen who is an "entrepreneur of him- or herself"(164), the category of 'unemployed' no longer denotes the status of 'passive recipient'. Rather, 'unemployed' comes to refer to a diverse category of individuals who, for whatever reasons, are excluded not only from paid work, but from the "benefits and resources necessary to participate as a full citizen in the life of the community"(258). The programmes and incentives which are increasingly supplementing, or displacing the simple provision of income assistance are linked to strategies of 'inclusion': "unemployment must become as much like work as possible if it too is to connect the excluded individual with the modalities of control which have come to be termed 'freedom' and 'choice'"(164).

In a Fraser Institute-published book entitled Welfare, No Fair, Rico Sabatini (1996) reports that while some of the literature on the relationship between work and well-being

> suggests that full employment is not only a dream but also unnecessary and undesirable for economic reasons....the vast majority of the literature supports the Puritans, Martin Luther, and John Calvin in holding that work is not only good for the economy but equally beneficial to the individual. The importance of work has been emphasized by Freud, Adler, Herzberg, Kubler-Ross, and Maslow, among many others (218-19).

Walter Williams, in a 1991 article for the Fraser Forum entitled "War Against the Poor," states that

> THE MOST UNCONSIONABLE [caps in original] thing we do to the poor is destroy their options through high-sounding, often self-serving, public policy (paragraph 1).
>
> Starting out poor is tough. The last thing you need is do-gooders cutting off options so that they can feel good, or politicians doing the same to get the votes of powerful, vested interest groups. What poor people need most is the freedom to

> find their own solutions to their problems, not political hustlers promoting dependency (paragraph 6).

Institute staffer Chris Sarlo notes that

> the legacy of the social safety net has been dependency; erosion of self-esteem; work avoidance; subsidization of irresponsible behavior and an entitlement mentality. Recipients may gain something in the short run, but are clearly worse off in the long run (1995, paragraph 5).

In Fraser Institute discourse, welfare is destructive not only of self-esteem and freedom, but health as well. In rejecting explanations that attribute higher rates of poor health among low-income people to a lack of funds to buy nutritional food, Sabatini (1996) states that a more plausible explanation is related to the

> well-documented relationship between work and well-being. Work profoundly influences people, gives them purpose, pride, self-esteem, self-reliance (221).

Training and incentives are necessary to push welfare recipients towards a life of independence and responsibility. For Sabatini, it is

> better to teach a person to fish than to give him a fish. It is always better to give people the tools to help themselves. Concepts of self-reliance, personal responsibility, and independence, so central to world aid, seem to be missing from our domestic aid policies. Has our current safety net become, as some have suggested, a hammock, or even a trap?(217).

Aside from the moral tone of the incentives and training programs intended to make welfare recipients self-responsible and therefore able to exercise freedom of choice, Fraser Institute discourse treats health care, education, and income assistance recipients in a similar manner insofar as administrative reforms are seen as necessary for freeing people from institutional constraints on individual autonomy. These reforms are not simply the realization in practice of a liberal skepticism regarding the ability of a centralized state to govern efficiently (Rose, 1999:84). Across the areas thus far

discussed, public administration, health care, education, and welfare, can be observed the "emergence of a new way of understanding and acting upon human beings as subjects of freedom"(84). Unlike the 'citizens' of the welfare state, advanced liberal citizenship is defined in terms of

> active individuals seeking to 'enterprise themselves', to maximize their quality of life through acts of choice, according their life a meaning and value to the extent that it can be rationalized as the outcome of choices made or choices to be made (Rose, 1996:57).

## Community

This analysis has revealed points of similarity between Fraser Institute discourse and advanced liberal rationality, similarities that centre around the technologies being deployed to render individuals and 'public' institutions governable. In line with Foucault's description of liberalism as "a principle and method of rationalizing the exercise of government that obeys…the internal rule of maximum economy"(1997:74), advanced liberal technologies of accounting create subjects who are made self-governing through the internalization of principles of economic rationality. The technologies that have been discussed in the areas of public administration, health care, education, and income assistance, in relation to both providers and recipients, seem to be directed towards creating a subject who exercises freedom as a self-responsible, autonomous individual, similar to the subject of classical liberalism. The organizational frameworks and political subjects being created within these frameworks also seem to be well suited to the changing nature of capitalism over the last several decades. Though Foucault stressed the historically contingent nature of the subject, the governmentality analysis of

advanced liberal technologies undertaken thus far does not rule out the existence of an essential subjectivity, a subjectivity that is being manipulated or distorted by these technologies. The methods of governing that have been discussed could be regarded as sophisticated methods of political and organizational control that distort an essential subjectivity in the interests of capitalism.

However, in the governmentality literature, advanced liberalism is not presented simply as an abandonment of the 'social' and a reactivation of the autonomous individual governed only through economic relations. With the notion of 'community', the governmentality literature outlines a fundamental shift in the contexts in which contemporary political subjects are located, a shift which is difficult to wholly account for in terms of capitalist interests. As discussed in chapter two, the 'social' technologies of the welfare state associated with collective obligations and responsibilities marked a fundamental shift in the relationship of the individual to oneself and to society. With the introduction and spread of the universal technologies of security associated with the welfare state, the social came to be

> imagined as a single space, territorialized across a nation....government 'from the social point of view' posited a single matrix of solidarity, a relation between an organically interconnected society and all the individuals contained therein, given a politico-ethical form in the notion of social citizenship (Rose, 1996a:333).

Rose (1996a) notes that by the early 1960s, the language of community was becoming a prominent feature of political discourse, reflected in discussions of various risk communities, debates about multi-culturalism and religious and ethical pluralisms, as well as various initiatives based on notions of community, for example, "community care, community homes, community workers, community safety"(331). The increasing salience of community indicates that "'the social' may be giving way to 'the community'

as a new territory for the administration of individual and collective existence, a new plane or surface upon which micro-moral relations among persons are conceptualized and administered"(331).

As noted earlier, opposition to the social forms of government embodied in the welfare state has not been restricted to the fiscal and ethical concerns of the right. Discourses on community date back several hundred years, and have figured prominently in 20th century political debates from both progressives and those promoting traditional values. Many of the earlier discourses on community were critical of the severing of the 'natural' bonds within local communities by the forces of capitalism and the division of labour – the 'unsettling' of settlements of individuals bound to one another by ties of kinship and common history. Others have criticized the state bureaucracy's lack of flexibility and responsiveness concerning the diverse needs of particular communities. In such discourses, calls for more community involvement were not necessarily recommendations for reduced state involvement. In many cases, particularly those involving activism on behalf of the social welfare needs of local citizens, "community was actually a diagram for the reorganization of publicly provided, bureaucratically organized and professionally staffed services"(Rose, 1999:171). Recent calls for a return to 'community' can be seen as responses to the problems of dependency and lack of civic responsibility brought on by the sense of 'entitlement' fostered by the welfare state. They provide a way of restoring the durable relations among individuals in a community, relations that were "eroded by the bureaucratic incompetence of well-intentioned but patronizing planners, the bonds of mutuality [that were] destroyed by the very welfare regime that sought to support them"(172).

The introduction of advanced liberal technologies that render institutions and individuals self-governing is not taking place in a context in which the social is simply being replaced by principles and methods of economic rationality. The construction of political subjects whose allegiances are towards a community or communities rather than society involves a relationship of self to community "that appears less 'remote', more 'direct', one which occurs not in the 'artificial' political space of society, but in matrices of affinity that appear more natural"(177). Technologies of accountability are implemented not just on the basis of efficiency and economic rationality, but are implemented within communities of shared interests for whom these technologies are seen to advance particular goals, whether these interests are those of taxpayer coalitions looking to reduce public costs, parents looking to maximize their children's educations, or community groups looking to provide services for the marginalized or disadvantaged. 'Partnerships' between an 'enabling' state and 'responsibilized' individuals, established through the devolution of many aspects of decision-making to local authorities and groups, activate 'natural' bonds of community. While ultimate decision-making authority over funding is held onto by central government [i.e., CHST 'block-grants' to the provinces], the mobilization of community responsibility regarding the implementation and outcomes of initiatives puts distance between the state and the effects of its funding decisions.

The inculcation of values within this space is of a different nature than projects that draw upon symbols of moral authority such as the church, the school, or public figures in efforts to reinstall traditional codes of moral behaviour (185). The values expressed by such traditional authorities are problematic from the perspective of advanced liberalism

because they are frequently at odds with the commercialization and commodification of lifestyle that is an integral part of contemporary capitalist society (185). The 'neoconservative' approach to restoring moral virtue through the powers of the state, exemplified in Newt Gingrich's 'Contract with America', is also problematic because it involves an intensification of state power that contradicts the free-market, liberal tenets of individual autonomy and choice. Initiatives based on moral authority that attempt to impose moral standards from above violate the liberal principle of 'governing at a distance', that is, the principle that "'one always governs too much' – or, at any rate, one always must suspect that one governs too much"(Foucault, 1997:74).

Along with the previously-mentioned communities of interest, communities of 'identity' are also mobilized. These communities may be mobilized along such lines as ethnicity, lifestyle, sexuality, or political and moral allegiance, and "are not unified across a nation but localized, fragmented, hybrid, multiple, overlapping, activated differently in different arenas and practices"(Rose, 1999:178). The forms of political subjectivity that are put in play through the mobilization of 'non-conventional' communities are closely linked to techniques of market research and attempts to target specific consumer groups through advertising and various other forms of media imagery (178). This "commercialization of lifestyle formation....[through] technologies of images and identities, of lifestyles and choices, of consumption, marketing and the mass media....allows the possibility of 'other subjectivities' – novel modes of individuality and allegiance and their public legitimation"(179). However identity is defined, "the individual is no isolate – he or she has 'natural' emotional bonds of affinity to a circumscribed 'network' of other individuals"(135-6).

The Fraser Institute literature makes frequent reference to the 'natural' bonds of community as providing the most effective means for governing society. Michel Boucher and Filip Palda in the July, 1996 Fraser Forum state that

> it is wrong to pretend that there is no such a thing as community feeling. But it is also wrong to suggest that such feelings can be pressed on a community from above. This feeling is something that has to evolve on its own, as does friendship. As with friendship, our ability to refer to ourselves as 'We' is a precious commodity. It allows us to cooperate and makes us tolerant....A sense of community helps to ease frictions between people who come from different backgrounds but share the same principles (paragraph 7).
>
> Under decentralized government it starts to make sense to speak of the will of the people, and social justice....Hippie communes, kibbutzes, and the Amish are examples of people who have sorted themselves into communities that stick to very strict common standards. Decentralization is an admission that no one has a monopoly on wisdom, and that when it comes to government, humility is in order. No one can tell us who 'We' are. That is something that people have to sort out for themselves (paragraph 8).

The above passages convey a 'communitarian' vision that is discussed in the governmentality literature, that is, an emphasis on community as "a space of emotional relationships through which individual identities are constructed through their bonds to micro-cultures of values and meanings"(Rose, 1999:172). For the Fraser Institute, however, the forces that create and sustain such communal bonds can be reduced to the incentives that regulate the tendency for individuals to provide and receive assistance. Chris Sarlo, in the January 1995 Fraser Forum, states that

> throughout history, most welfare programs have been informal in character. That is, in times of need, people have been assisted by their family, their friends, their community (paragraph 2).
>
> With informal welfare mechanisms, there is a strong incentive to participate in the giving of support. Not only do you genuinely care about the people in your circle, you also ensure reciprocity in your own time of need. The advantage of informal welfare is that it strongly promotes the work ethic and minimizes the chance of cheating. This is because the givers are intimately aware of the recipient's situation and because of the awkwardness for the recipient of requesting help on a

> repeated basis. The disadvantage is that requesting help from within one's own social circle may be somewhat demeaning, especially if the problem is perceived to be self-induced (paragraph 3).

In Fraser Institute discourse, the means through which communities and individual identities are constructed is not an open question; the fundamental and universal principle of self-interest is the mechanism underlying such phenomena as emotional relationships and shared values. The incentives that encourage people to behave communally can be reduced to the principle of economic self-interest. Chris Sarlo, in the November 1997 Fraser Forum writes,

> in a real sense, rational self-interest must be the driving force behind human decision making. And this is true of non-economic as well as economic behaviour....But what about the decisions we make that appear to serve the interests of others, sometimes at a cost to ourselves?....we can maintain that these and all other similar good and virtuous behaviors are driven by self interest. Helping others in our society makes us feel good. Kind acts improve the well-being of the giver as well as the receiver. It is an intrinsic part of our humanity to take pleasure from the happiness of others. And a good thing, too! For such acts are the glue of social order (paragraph 3,4,5).
>
> In the language of economics, we can say that the well being of other people (some more than others) is a factor in my 'utility function'. My utility is improved whenever the well-being of certain others is improved....The point, then, is that any choice made by human beings is necessarily driven by self interest. Other supposed motivations such as altruism or 'ethics-related' influences are a fiction, or at best, are a subcategory of self interest. We – all of us – are self-interest maximizers. We cannot do otherwise (paragraph 7,8).

In this discourse, the full benefits of the 'natural' incentives to contribute to the well-being of a community can only be realized when state intervention is minimal. When people depend on the state to provide for their needs, the incentives for productive participation in the community are removed. In other words, the reciprocal relations of exchange which are the 'glue of social order' are lost when government takes over functions that could be performed otherwise by private individuals.

The Fraser Institute offers a very particular conception of community, one which stresses the importance of economic incentives and rejects the constitutive potential of other types of social relations. This conception seems to be partially at odds with the vision of community contained in the politics of the 'third way'. In third way politics, there is a recognition that individuals and communities need to be protected from the forces of the free market, though not through the auspices of a strong central bureaucracy. The need for a revitalized sense of community arises out of the increasing inability of governments to protect individuals from the market, not out of an ethical or logical predisposition against the state. Because

> the commercial and public sectors are no longer capable of securing some of the fundamental needs of the people, the public has little choice but to begin looking out for itself, once again, by re-establishing viable communities as a buffer against both the impersonal forces of the global market and increasingly weak and incompetent central governing authorities (Rifkin, in Rose, 1999:171).

In the contemporary politics of the 'third way', the idea of a 'social' state gives way to the idea of "the facilitating state, the enabling state or the state as animator"(Rose, 1999:174). Moving beyond both a 'traditional left' emphasis on state control and a 'new right' emphasis on the dismantling of public investment, "the Third Way stands for a modernised social democracy, passionate in its commitment to social justice and the goals of the centre-left, but flexible, innovative and forward-looking in the means to achieve them"(Tony Blair, in Rose, 1999a:467). In The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy, Anthony Giddens (1998) states that "having abandoned collectivism, third way politics looks for a new relation between the individual and community, a redefinition of rights and obligations...*no rights without obligations*...no *authority without democracy*"(68). By supplementing the traditionally 'left' values of equality and

opportunity for all with the values of responsibility and community, the third way promotes a new "kind of contract between those who have the power to exercise power and those who have the obligation to be its subjects"(Rose, 1999a:470). With political government relieved of the obligation to directly oversee and provide for the social welfare needs of society in areas such as health care and education, "individuals, firms, organizations, localities, schools, parents, hospitals...must take on themselves – as 'partners' – a portion of the responsibility for resolving these issues"(174).

In Canada, the need to reorient social policy to the realities of a rapidly globalizing economy is reflected in the policy platforms and initiatives undertaken in recent years by the New Democratic Party at the federal and provincial levels. Left criticisms of the NDP point to the federal party's 'rightward shift' in recent recommendations for tax cuts and debt reduction ("Is the Party Over?", 1999, March/April:12). The NDP's shift onto the ideological and political territory occupied by the other major parties is seen to raise "questions about the very worth of the NDP as an oppositional force"(12). The British Columbia NDP, in its efforts to make the welfare system more responsive to changing economic realities – for example, replacing the GAIN act with the B.C. Benefits program – is criticized for imposing reductions on the poor in order to fund training programs and tax cuts (Goldberg, 1997:20).

The shift to the right outlined in such criticisms can be accounted for by the NDP's adoption of a 'third way' emphasis on community and the reciprocal rights and obligations held by society and the individual. In an article entitled "A Modern Socialist Approach: R and R for Socialist Policy," NDP member of parliament Chris Axworthy

(1999) criticizes the traditional left's approach to social policy as being "based on a notion of entitlement alone....Not much has flowed from this approach other than entitlement to receive a cheque....there has been no empowerment...dependencies have been created"(279). Axworthy stresses the importance of community as the locus for re-conceiving the nature of the rights and obligations held by society and the needy individual. In this view, along with the rights of individuals to receive, and the responsibility of government to provide adequate assistance and ample opportunities for employment and self-improvement,

> it also becomes incumbent on the individual to meet his or her responsibility to the community. To each according to need; from each according to ability. This model would put an end to the near passivity of social programs (283).

In several respects, Axworthy's 'third way' recommendations regarding the revitalization of community as a focal point for defining rights and responsibilities mirror the discourse of the Fraser Institute. For example, Axworthy, like the Fraser Institute, suggests that the welfare system should provide "a hand up, rather than a handout"(283), and that "the only way to save and build our social programs is to devolve their design and application to those who are their users – the social assistance recipients themselves and the communities within which they live"(284). While the existence of such similarities between groups that are commonly regarded as opposed to one another reveals interesting features of advanced liberalism, such similarities provide only a partial picture.

Patrick Basham (2000) of the Fraser Institute, in an article entitled "'The Third Way': Marketing Mirage or Trojan Horse?", states that the NDP's adoption of third way politics represents "a formula for winning elections. The question is whether it is anything more

than that"(paragraph 26). For Basham, the efforts of third way parties to stake out a middle ground in contemporary politics between free market pragmatism and collectivist idealism leaves this form of politics "empty of content"(paragraph 30). In this view, the policies of the NDP and other third way parties reflect the "application of the median-voter theorem of public choice theory"(paragraph 14), in which a party seeks out the ideological point on the political spectrum that will draw the maximum number of votes.

For Basham, however, while the policy shifts of the NDP represent a change of tactics, they do not necessarily represent a change of heart. And while he may consider the politics of the third way to be empty of content, this does not mean that such political tactics are without effect. Although approving of an emphasis on personal responsibility, the Fraser Institute is wary of the 'communitarian' elements of the third way's

> commitment to civic responsibility, that is...[its] delineation of the precise range of behaviours for which individuals are seen as responsible to the community and which the state may therefore legitimately seek to regulate (paragraph 10).
>
> The danger of Communitarianism is that of attributing superior value to collective entities over and above the individuals who compose them. This disastrous error was made respectable by the teachings of Hegel, and reached its apotheosis in the State worship of the Nazi and Communist regimes (paragraph 11).

The reliance of third way politics on the directing capacity of the state conflicts with the Fraser Institute's insistence on protecting the market freedoms of the self-interested individual:

> It would be naïve not to appreciate that the ideological instincts of these modernized social democrats are aligned with a general philosophy which places the value of the state above that of the individual and, as such, is prepared (enthusiastically so, at times) to limit the latter's freedom in order to conduct experiments in social engineering....The Third Way retains a paternalistic view of government as an instrument that shapes and controls society. To this day, those who support the Third Way believe in the capacity of government and of planning (paragraph 33).

The notion of community contained in the rhetoric of third way advocates goes beyond the conception of community shared by Fraser Institute writers, that is, community as grounded in the economically rational decisions of self-interested individuals. For Basham, the implication that society has an obligation to protect the economic security of the individual makes third way politics a threat to the freedom of the individual. For the Fraser Institute, such societal obligations always involve an increase in state intervention, and therefore an increase in inefficient and authoritarian rule.

The analysis thus far has found that Fraser Institute discourse contains the themes of 'advanced liberalism' identified in the governmentality literature; themes of accountability, responsibilization, and community. The rationalization of public administration and social services provision provided by technologies of accounting are consistent with the Fraser Institute's emphasis on value-for-money and efficiency. The strategies of 'responsibilization' made possible by accounting technologies can also be found in Fraser Institute discourse. By removing administrative responsibility from central bodies of authority, decision-making responsibility is devolved onto individuals in local settings, thereby increasing individual freedom and autonomy within parameters of accountability. However, there were tensions observed between the Fraser Institute's somewhat coercive strategies for the responsibilization of income assistance recipients and the advanced liberal emphasis on 'inclusion' and 'empowerment'. With the concept of community, tensions between advanced liberalism and Fraser Institute discourse become more evident. The advanced liberal conception of community outlined in the governmentality literature, a conception closely identified with the political programmes

of the 'third way', incorporates a communitarianism antithetical to the principles of economic self-interest that provide the foundation of the Fraser Institute's conception of community.

In the next section, I will discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of a governmentality approach to contemporary political rationality. Following this, I will assess the governmentality account of Fraser Institute discourse undertaken in this thesis, and offer suggestions as to how this analysis could be steered in a more 'critical' direction.

# Conclusion

O'Malley et al. (1997) note that the governmentality literature's "principal strengths and contributions stem from a characteristic concern with the nexus between political rationalities and technologies of rule"(503), and from an 'empirical' concern with how advanced liberal rationalities of rule envision and implement programmes through "techniques and lines of action at a distance"(503). In focusing on the means through which government deploys technologies indirectly through various types of state agencies, QUANGOs[1] and private organizations, the literature avoids becoming entangled in "metatheoretical debates over such binary oppositions as state and civil society"(503). By decentring the state as the locus of political power, this approach is able to focus on the empirical details of programme implementation in particular settings and the rationalities embodied in the particular technologies employed.

As pointed out in Chapter Two, the governmentality literature's attention to 'rationalities of rule' differentiates this approach from traditional empiricism, which stresses objective fact at the expense of conceptual reflection. Attention to the types of rationality embodied in the technologies applied in particular situations is accompanied by the identification of similarities across the rationalities and technologies applied in widely divergent settings, cutting across divisions such as state and civil society, public and private sectors. The way in which technologies "are developed with specific purposes in mind...[and] generalized to other purposes and fields"(O'Malley, 1996:193) is evident in Chapter Three's analysis of the logics of accountability that are being imported from the business sector and applied in various areas of public service provision.

This focus on mundane, everyday practices of rule distances the governmentality literature from forms of Marxist theory that function at a "high level of abstraction – notably theorizing around the nature of the 'capitalist state', of modes of production and the nature and extent of the 'relative autonomy' of the state"(O'Malley et al., 1997:503). Genealogy unearths the languages, such as that of accounting, that systematizing theories have treated as peripheral in importance. This focus on technologies allows the governmentality literature to avoid difficulties in articulating the relationship between thought and practice, a characteristic difficulty of Marxist approaches (503). The rationalities of rule behind technologies of accounting and responsibility map directly onto empirical settings where these technologies are in play. Genealogies of government offer empirical illustrations of the technologies of liberal rationality operating in a broad range of political and social institutions, demonstrating how these technologies provide the means to closely gauge individual and organizational performance and produce self-governing subjects.

In Chapter Three it was found that Fraser Institute discourse exhibits themes of accountability that the governmentality literature defines as 'advanced liberal'; that is, the Institute promotes the development and use of performance and output measures in the areas of public administration and social services. The spread and refinement of 'disciplinary' technologies of accounting bears a resemblance to Weber's discussion of the increasing rationalization of Western culture. For Weber, the rationalization of bureaucratic administration, which is closely tied to the processes of industrialization, "makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results for the heads of the organization and for those acting in relation to it"(1968:223). Similar to the advanced

liberal technologies of accounting discussed in Chapter Three, the "intensive efficiency"(223) made possible by techniques of administrative rationality can be applied "to all kinds of administrative tasks"(223). However, the process of rationalization which Weber illustrated with the metaphor of the 'iron cage' is different from the advanced liberal political rationality described in the governmentality literature. For Weber, the process of rationalization is virtually irreversible, and the tools of instrumental rationality that are put into play are part of a global historical process:

> The needs of mass administration make it [rationalization] today completely indispensable. The choice is only between bureaucracy and dilettantism in the field of administration....When those subject to bureaucratic control seek to escape the influence of existing bureaucratic apparatus, this is normally possible only by creating an organization of their own which is equally subject to the process of bureaucratization (224).

Weber's prognosis for the future of bureaucratic, industrialized societies is dystopic: "Not summer's bloom lies ahead of us, but rather a polar night of icy darkness and hardness, no matter which group may triumph externally now"(1958:158).

In the governmentality literature, the spread of 'rational' technologies of accounting is not represented in terms of *progressive* degrees of domination exercised over society. Rather than being an inexorable, global process, Foucault suggests that we must "analyze specific rationalities rather than always invoking the progress of rationalization itself"(1983:210). For Foucault, the technologies of domination manifested in centralized bureaucratic administrations have as their "necessary counterpart the perpetual presence of resistance and thus the possibility, if not the promise, of a displacement of particular manifestations"(Smart, 1985:139). The technologies of bureaucratic administration [i.e., accounting] that are taken up and applied in diverse settings can often elicit resistance. A

practical task for advanced liberal government is the creation of spaces where subjects can exercise the capacity of autonomous decision-making.

In the governmentality literature, advanced liberalism is a political rationality that considers the 'overall' interests of the state and the population; that is, there is a recognition that the limits placed on the exercise of freedom by administrative rationality and other forms of domination may prompt covert and unpredictable resistances that are difficult for government to control or eradicate. Discussed in Chapter Three were some of the means through which 'free subjects' are constructed as a product of governmental rationality. It was found that Fraser Institute discourse expresses advanced liberal themes of freedom of choice and responsibility – within parameters of accountability – for both the providers and consumers of public services. The selections of Fraser Institute discourse analyzed in Chapter Three contain the two main themes of advanced liberal rationality mentioned in the introduction: the application of technologies of accountability to organizational and individual conduct, and the creation of governable subjects through the subjectifying strategies of government.

The governmentality literature's treatment of advanced liberalism gives the impression that the strategic deployment of technologies to construct governable political subjects has become perfected to such a degree that the possibility of resistance poses much less of a threat to maintaining order than it may have in the past. The ubiquitous nature of advanced liberal rule seems to suggest that any resistances will represent problematics to be resolved within advanced liberal rationality, rather than representing possibilities for radical political and social change. O'Malley et al. (1997) suggest that from the

perspective of the governmentality literature "the role accorded to contestation can only be the negative one of an obstacle to rule"(510), as sites of programmatic failure that are met with the strategic redesign of programmes. While the conception of power put forward in governmentality studies moves beyond Weber's conception of bureaucratic domination, from the point of view of actors desiring radical social and political change, it can appear equally 'dystopic'. Simons (1995) points out that genealogical method has been criticised for representing history as "perpetual spirals of power and pleasure....'a single drama' of the endlessly repeated play of dominations"(49). He asks whether Foucault's lesson is that "we are trapped for eternity as 'humanity...proceeds from domination to domination'"(Foucault, in Simons, 1995:49). Advanced liberal rationality is presented as being so comprehensive in scope and so flexible in its capacity to adopt and apply technologies that it becomes difficult to conceive of what effective resistance would consist of, or what kind of political activity might pose an effective obstacle to rule.

While the ability of advanced liberalism to take up and apply technologies derived from various sources is central to the governmentality literature's discussions, little mention is made of the struggles among different groups and interests, and the role of such struggles in determining the sorts of techniques that are taken up and applied in governmental programmes. Because the governmentality literature is an analytics of power that takes the perspective of ruling mentalities, all instances of struggle and contestation, whether those of parties, pressure groups, or social movements, are regarded as "sources of programmatic failure....and, in turn, failure is understood primarily as a source of reform and innovation *by the programmers*"(O'Malley et al., 1997:510,511).

The discussion of 'community' in Chapter Three revealed tensions between some elements of the advanced liberal conception of community and the Fraser Institute's emphasis on economic self-interest as the force that creates and sustains communal bonds. It was also noted that capitalism has long been regarded as having a 'fragmenting' effect on the bonds of community. In terms of governing through community, the tenets of economic rationality promoted by the Fraser Institute can be seen as presenting possible problems for advanced liberal strategies of government. In other words, from the governmentality literature's theoretical point of view, the possible effects of Fraser Institute discourse appear as a problem of government, rather than as a possible focal point for contestation or resistance.

The difficulty of understanding power and resistance through an analytics – such as that of governmentality – that takes the 'internal rationality' of power as its theoretical object, is indicated by Foucault's observation that "there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy…[that] circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy"(Foucault, 1990:102). This difficulty has been observed in the analysis of Fraser Institute discourse. When advanced liberalism is approached from the point of view of its internal rationality, analysis reveals the logics and techniques that can be and are deployed to neutralize potential disturbances arising from the agendas of partisan organizations. From this point of view, conflicting discourses and strategies, such as those of the Fraser Institute and the NDP, or between the Fraser Institute and any number of groups, are viewed solely in terms of how they can be 'managed' in the ongoing process of rendering the social 'governable'. Differences in the 'underlying' interests or partisan agendas of such groups are not addressed in the

governmentality literature. Nor does it address the struggles and resistances that may be provoked by differing interests and agendas.

One reason for the lack of a theory of resistance in Foucaultian work is a rejection of systematizing theories and broad-based political programmes that prescribe solutions. Foucaultian studies have "discerned that power is local and decentered in form...[therefore] forms of political struggle must be of similar character in order to combat the various facets of power"(Best, 1995:118). In this view, political programmes that prescribe solutions have a tendency to subordinate local struggles to broader political aims, and in so doing "contribute to the functioning of a determinate situation of power that...must be criticized"(Foucault, in Best, 1995:120). Such programmes can be seen to place limits on the capacities of marginalized subjects to address their specific concerns, concerns which may be peripheral to the central concerns of the programme or movement in question. This critical orientation towards relations of power and knowledge has led to an oppositional stance not only towards institutionalized forms of power, but also towards the power relations at play in conventional forms of political contestation and resistance.

Foucault suggested in his later works that rather than studying power from the vantage point of ruling strategies, the study of forms of resistance could be a productive direction for further genealogical research:

> Rather than analyzing power from the point of view of its internal rationality....I would like to suggest another way to go further towards a new economy of power relations....[which] consists of taking the forms of resistance against different forms of power as a starting point....[and] using this resistance as a chemical catalyst so as to bring to light power relations, locate their position, find out their points of application and the methods used (Foucault, 1983:210, 211).

The study of resistance, as set out by Foucault, can contribute to an understanding of the points at which particular manifestations of power provoke resistance and become sites of struggle. He suggests that the types of struggles that have emerged over the last several decades – "opposition to the power of men over women, of parents over children, of psychiatry over the mentally ill, of medicine over the population, of administration over the ways people live"(Foucault, 1983:211) – are not struggles against a 'general' functioning of power. He gives the example of the medical profession, which "is not criticized primarily because it is a profit-making concern, but because it exercises an uncontrolled power over people's bodies, their health and their life and death"(211). These struggles address 'immediate' concerns: "In such struggles people criticize instances of power which are the closest to them, those which exercise their action on individuals. They do not look for the 'chief enemy', but for the immediate enemy"(211). They are struggles against "the submission of subjectivity"(213), against everything that ties the individual "to his own identity in a constraining way"(212).

Following Foucault, Rose (1999) alludes to the potential usefulness of studying diverse and local forms of resistance in order to get a better understanding of advanced liberal power relations. He notes, however, that such studies would have to ask different questions from those that have been addressed in the governmentality literature (281). This acknowledgement relates to a criticism that has been raised against governmentality work:

> Studies of government have constructed their theoretical object as one of political rationalities and technologies, a restriction that precludes problematizing effects, and thus presumably eliminates the possibility of assigning costs to any mentality of rule (O'Malley et al., 1997:509).

The governmentality literature's perspective of 'ruling mentalities' draws out aspects of Fraser Institute discourse that correspond with advanced liberal strategies of governing, but offers little insight into the effects of these strategies on the governed. From this perspective, discourses of economic rationality, such as that of the Fraser Institute, come across as 'technologies' that can be drawn upon for use in broader strategies of governing. Incorporating an analysis of effects could disengage the governmentality literature from the 'academic' and 'neutral' tone of much of its work (505,506) and allow for a critical analysis of the dominating aspects of such discourses, or the "dark side of liberal governance"(Valverde, in O'Malley et al., 1997:514).

This type of analysis might focus on the constraints on subjectivity entailed in certain techniques of advanced liberalism. These constraints relate to the advanced liberal technologies of accounting and responsibilization, as distinct from other forms of advanced liberal practice, such as those that refer to the place of "non-conventional communities"(Rose, 1999:195) within strategies of governing. In Chapter Three it was noted that 'communities of identity' not necessarily unified across a given area are emerging as a locus for the government of conduct. The belief that within this "new habitat of subjectification...individuals can shape an autonomous identity for themselves through choices in taste, music, goods, styles and habitus"(178) relates to Foucault's descriptions of 'techniques of the self'. These conceptions of 'community' as being linked to diverse practices of 'identity formation' stand in tension to the Fraser Institute's emphasis on economic incentives and the rational, utilitarian individual as providing the basis for community.

The notion of the economically rational individual is a totalizing conception that could place constraints on what Rose (1999) presents as the promotion of 'difference' through technologies of community. The actors and communities affected by discourses and technologies of economic rationality – as these are embodied in technologies of accounting – would not be restricted to groups commonly regarded as subjugated or marginalized. The constraints on subjectivity imposed by these technologies affect people from all types of organizations and from all walks of life. Resistances to such 'instances of power', which are 'immediate' and 'exercise their actions on individuals', may arise in unexpected places, take unexpected forms, and reveal unforeseen links across otherwise politically heterogeneous groups. However, in addition to being less than 'radical' in nature, this notion of resistance is based on making a somewhat 'artificial' distinction between techniques of domination and techniques of the self, techniques which in the governmentality analysis of advanced liberalism work together to produce governable subjects. For Foucault, government is a

> 'contact point' where techniques of domination – or power – and techniques of the self 'interact', where 'technologies of domination of individuals over one another have recourse to processes by which the individual acts upon himself and, conversely,...where techniques of the self are integrated into structures of coercion'(Foucault, in Burchell, 1996:20).

In any event, undertaking such an analysis would not be a simple matter of reorienting the governmentality perspective towards an analysis of the effects or costs of certain aspects of advanced liberal rule. As O'Malley et al. (1997) point out, a diagnostic model that assesses the "costs to existence of any form of governmentality....may not be applicable to governmentality work for epistemological reasons"(508,509), that is, because of the lack of a 'subject' upon which to base an assessment of effects. In his later

work, Foucault did reassess the status of the subject, moving away from a determinist view of the subject as an effect of discourse towards a conception that allowed for agency in terms of the cultivation of freedom through techniques of the self (Best, 1995:121). However, this reassessment does not introduce a coherent, modernist conception of the subject that could provide a foundation for broad-based forms of political resistance. For Foucault, addressing the 'problem' of the subject is not an effort

> to recover our 'lost' identity, to free our imprisoned nature, our deepest truth; but instead, the problem is to move toward something radically Other...we must produce something that doesn't yet exist and about which we cannot know what it will be (Foucault, in Best, 1995:122).

While Foucault's conception of the subject in terms of a "cultivation of personal freedom entails a break from coercive social norms and institutions and may lead to radical social action, such action is not a necessary extension of his project and is not explicitly developed"(Best, 1995:124).

Another suggestion for steering the governmentality literature in a more 'critical' direction concerns its focus on the 'productive' nature of political power, that is, its emphasis on advanced liberal rationality as making use of people's "capacity for autonomous, self-directing activity"(Hindess, in press). O'Malley et al. (1997) suggest that genealogical method as employed in the governmentality literature has become detached from the critical nature of Foucault's approach to genealogy, and state that "the rhetoric deployed in recent governmentality literature appears more neutral than that of Foucault"(507). Curtis (1995) criticises the governmentality literature for having 'purged' Foucault's work of its "concern with government as the inscription of large scale patterns

of domination"(576). While Foucault's genealogies were directly concerned with the 'productive' aspects of power that are emphasized in the governmentality literature, his belief that both domination and freedom are always present in power relations led him to retain a focus on domination that seems to be lacking in governmentality studies. This focus is particularly evident in works such as Discipline and Punish, and is pointedly expressed by Foucault (1986) in his statement that "humanity installs each of its violences in a system of rules and thus proceeds from domination to domination"(85).

Hindess notes one aspect of liberal reason that the governmentality literature overlooks; the recognition that while "individuals may be endowed with a capacity for autonomous action...this does not mean that the capacity will always be fully realised....where this capacity is not well developed, government simply cannot afford to work through the free decisions of individuals"(in press). He goes on to suggest that while the governmentality literature's accounts of advanced liberalism "capture important aspects of liberal political reason...the government of unfreedom is more central to its concerns"(in press) than its analyses suggest. Although the governmentality literature represents the occasionally necessary use of coercive and oppressive practices as being largely 'external' to the central strategies of advanced liberal rationality, Hindess points out that such practices

> continue to play an important part in the government of Western societies: in the criminal justice system, the policing of inner-city areas and the urban poor, the provision of social services and, of course, the management of large public and private organisations (in press).

While the spaces within which individual behaviours are governed and regulated may be 'calculable', the capacities of the individuals within these spaces to become 'calculating

selves' may be limited. In such cases, government may have to operate through other means. For instance, the methods through which the behaviour of welfare recipients or individuals in certain organizational contexts are governed may lack the less oppressive elements of 'responsibilized freedom' emphasized in the governmentality literature.

An enhanced emphasis on the practices of domination at work in such situations would make possible a more complete accounting of Fraser Institute discourse, and would take in elements of Institute discourse that were not adequately dealt with in Chapter Three, such as the 'coercive' nature of the Institute's recommendations for governing the conduct of welfare recipients. Addressing the authoritarian aspects of advanced liberal rule would require a broadening of the literature's theoretical perspective beyond that of the productive aspects of power to take account of "the multiplicity of voices subject to government but not aligned with it"(O'Malley et al., 1997:513), and would require a focus on social inequality that is currently missing from the governmentality literature (504). By articulating the authoritarian practices imposed on different segments of the population, such a focus could open up new avenues for theorizing resistance.

While a renewed emphasis on the dominating aspects of power could provide grounds for theorizing resistance to contemporary forms of political domination, it is important to bear in mind that the objective of 'genealogies of the present' is not to provide a theory of resistance. Foucault (1991a) states that

> critique doesn't have to be the premise of a deduction which concludes: this then is what needs to be done....I'm not interested in constructing a new schema, or in validating one that already exists. Perhaps it's because my objective isn't to propose a global principle for analyzing society (84,85).

Similarly, Rose (1999) states that "we need no theory of resistance to account for contestation...except if we wish to use our theory to ratify some acts of contestation and to devalue others"(279). The critical objective of genealogy is to

> identify strengths and weaknesses in the networks of power, to provide in short, tools or 'instruments for analysis' and to leave the question of tactics, strategies, and goals to those directly involved in struggle and resistance (Smart, 1986:167).

---

In critiques of the Fraser Institute that emphasize the Institute's ideological function for capitalist interests, the Institute's use of terms such as accountability, responsibility, and freedom is regarded as serving to distort or conceal the underlying tensions between capitalist processes and human subjectivity. From this perspective, the real meaning or 'instrumentality' of these terms can be grasped only through identifying them with the processes of economic domination that they justify and facilitate. Such terms contribute to maintaining order in capitalist societies by constructing versions of social reality that obscure or conceal the way things really are, that is, the conditions of inequality and domination that are an integral part of life in capitalist society. When reading Fraser Institute literature from this sort of perspective, terms like 'freedom' and 'responsibility' are not central to gaining a critical understanding of the type of social order being promoted by the Institute.

When read through the critical 'lens' of governmentality, terms such as freedom, accountability, and responsibility are seen as doing more than providing ideological justifications for capitalist processes; they come to denote actual rationalities and

methods of governing. The governmentality literature employs a conception of power that is not reducible to techniques of domination. Moving away from a negative conception of power in which human subjectivity is repressed by the exercise of power, power here operates "not by repressing subjectivity, but by promoting it, cultivating it and nurturing it....[albeit] under specific conditions, it is always a regulated subjectivity which emerges out of the process"(Miller, 1987:1).

The governmentality perspective draws out common themes running through Fraser Institute and other types of governmental discourse, that is, the discourses of accountability, responsibility, freedom, and community that have been taken up by community groups, political parties, government agencies, and political actors from across the political spectrum. While the governmentality perspective reveals a type of governmental rationality not normally attributed to the Fraser Institute, this treatment of the Institute's discourse seems to be incomplete. An enhanced focus on the sort of domination outlined in Hindess' (in press) account of liberal authoritarianism would allow the governmentality literature to supplement its analysis of advanced liberal techniques for constructing 'free' and governable subjects with a more developed critical account of the dominating aspects of advanced liberal rule. Such a reorientation could result in a more satisfactory analysis of partisan discourses such as that of the Fraser Institute.

While the genealogical approach employed in governmentality studies may not promote contestation in the same manner as other forms of critical analysis, it is far from being politically disengaged, or politically conservative as some critics have suggested. By drawing attention to the heterogeneity of authorities, rationalities, and strategies for

governing conduct that intersect the space of government, the governmentality literature disrupts the seeming 'unity' of the free-market hegemony that the Fraser Institute is customarily associated with. Its empirical concern with the specific rationalities and strategies brought to bear on particular problems of governing brings to light the practical techniques through which situations of hegemony are constituted, offering a critique of the individualizing techniques of power contained in all types of political programmes and discourses. Attention to the presence of such techniques in discourses such as that of the Fraser Institute provides a unique perspective on the relationship between free market discourse and contemporary political rationalities, and points to possible sites of contestation and resistance that may be overlooked by other approaches.

Conclusion notes

1. 'Quasi-autonomous non-governmental organizations'.

# Bibliography

Armitage, Andrew. (1996). Social Welfare in Canada Revisited. Third Edition. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Axworthy, Chris. (1999). "A Modern Socialist Approach: R and R for Socialist Policy." In David Broad & Wayne Antony (Eds.), Citizens or Consumers? Social Policy in a Market Society (pp. 278-284). Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Baldwin, Graham. (1997, September). "The Private Option as a Solution to Education Problems." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1997/september/

Barrett, Michele. (1991). The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Barry, A., Osborne, T., & Rose, N. (1996). "Introduction." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nicholas Rose (Eds.), Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government (pp. 1-18). University College London: UCL Press.

Basham, Patrick. (2000). "The Third Way: Marketing Mirage or Trojan Horse?" Fraser Institute Public Policy Source #33. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/pps/33/

Basham, Patrick. (1999, May). "After Welfare, What Comes Next? The American Experience." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1999/05/01_american_welfare_experience.html

Best, Steven. (1995). The Politics of Historical Vision: Marx, Foucault, Habermas. New York: Guildford Press.

Block, Walter & Walker, Michael. (1989). Lexicon of Economic Thought. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Blomqvist, A. (1979). The Health Care Business: International Evidence on Private Versus Public Health Care Systems. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Boucher, M., & Palda, F. (1996, July). "Who are We? How Health Care is Mired in the Canadian Sense of Community." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1996/july/index.html#are

Brunet, Robin. (1999, July 18). "Mind Over Media." The Vancouver Courier, pp. 1, 4-5.

Burchell, Graham. (1996). "Liberal government and Techniques of the Self." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nicholas Rose (Eds.), Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government (pp. 19-36). University College London: UCL Press.

Chappell, Rosalie. (1997). Social Welfare in Canadian Society. Toronto: ITP Nelson.

Chera, Satinder & Mihlar,Fazil. (1998). The Government of British Columbia, 1991-1998: An Assessment of Performance and a Blueprint for Economic Recovery. Available: http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/critical_issues/1998/bc_report/education_policy.html

Cowley, Peter & Easton, Stephen. (2000). Third Annual Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/pps/36/section_01.html

Curtis, Bruce. (1995). "Taking the State Back Out: Rose and Miller on Political Power." British Journal of Sociology, 46(4), pp. 575-589.

Dobbin, Murray. (1998). The Myth of the Good Corporate Citizen: Democracy Under the Rule of Big Business. Toronto: Stoddart.

Donzelot, Jacques. (1991). "The Mobilization of Society." In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (Eds.), The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality (pp. 169-179). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Donzelot, Jacques. (1988). "The Promotion of the Social." Economy and Society, 17(3), pp. 395-427.

Ernst, A. (1992). "From Liberal Continentalism to Neoconservatism: North American Free Trade and the Politics of the C.D. Howe Institute." Studies in Political Economy, 39, pp. 109-140.

Ewald, Francois. (1991). "Insurance and Risk." In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (Eds.), The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality (pp. 197-210). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel. (1997). Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984, Paul Rabinow (Ed.). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, Michel. (1991). "Governmentality." In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (Eds.), The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality (pp. 87-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel. (1991a). Remarks on Marx. New York: Semiotexte.

Foucault, Michel. (1990). The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel. (1984). "Neitzche, Genealogy, History." In Paul Rabinow (Ed.), The Foucault Reader (76-100). U.S: Random House.

Foucault, Michel. (1983). "The Subject and Power." In Dreyfus, Hubert L.(Ed.), Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics (208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel. (1980). "Two Lectures." In Colin Gordon (Ed.), Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings (78-108). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel. (1977). Discipline and Punish. New York: Vintage.

Fraser Forum. (1999, August). Challenging Perceptions: Twenty-five Years of Influential Ideas. A Retrospective. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Fraser Institute. (2000). BC Secondary Schools Report Card, 2000.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/pps/36/section_01.html

Fraser Institute. (1998). Annual Report.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/about_us/annual_reports/1998/index.html

Fraser Institute. (1997). Annual Report. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Fraser Institute Press Release. (1997, December 12). Government-Sponsored Training Programs not a Solution for Unemployed Canadians.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/media/media_releases/1997/19971212.html

Fraser Institute Press Release. (1996, August 15). Transfusion of Incentives and Competition Needed to Resuscitate Canada's Health Care System: International Lessons Show Canada's Current Reforms Only Band-Aid Solution.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/media/media_releases/1997/19960815.html

Fraser Institute. (1983). Annual Report. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Friedman, Milton. (1988). "Capitalism and Freedom." In Michael Walker (Ed.), Freedom, Democracy and Economic Welfare: Proceedings of an International Symposium (pp. 47-57). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Galt, V. (2000, April 19). "Board Condemns Teacher Tests in Ontario. Calls Tories' Plan 'Discriminatory Attack.'" Globe and Mail. Available: www.globeandmail.ca/

Gibson Gordon. (1995). Thirty Million Musketeers: One Canada, For All Canadians. Fraser Institute.

Giddens, A. (1998). The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goldberg, Kim. (1997). "Who's Who at the Fraser Institute?" Canadian Dimension, vol. 31(1), pp. 27.

Gordon, Colin. (1991). "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (Eds.), The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality (pp. 1-51). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grubel, Herbert & Walker, Michael. (1978). "Moral Hazard, Unemployment Insurance and the Rate of Unemployment." In Herbert Grubel & Michael Walker (Eds.), Unemployment Insurance: Global Evidence of its Effects on Unemployment (pp. 1-35). Canada: Fraser Institute.

Hackett, Robert & Zhao, Yuezhi. (1998). Sustaining Democracy? Journalism and the Politics of Objectivity. Toronto: Garamond.

Hall, Peter. (1990). "Policy Paradigms, Experts, and the State: The Case of Macroeconomic Policy-Making in Britain." In S. Brooks & A. Gagnon (Eds.), Social Scientists, Policy, and the State (53-78). New York: Praeger.

Hall, Stuart. (1986). "Variants of Liberalism." In J. Donald & S. Hall (Eds.), Politics and Ideology (34-69). England: Open University Press.

Harden, J. (1999). "Making the Links: Neo-Liberalism, Medicare and Local Control in an age of Globalization." In David Broad & Wayne Antony (Eds.), Citizens or Consumers? Social Policy in a Market Society (169-183). Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Havemann, Paul. (1986). "Marketing the New Establishment Ideology in Canada." Crime and Social Justice, 26, pp. 11-37.

Hess, Melanie. (1996). "Major Directions and Proposals for Reform from the Federal Government: A Listing." In Jane Pulkingham & Gordon Ternowetsky (Eds.), Remaking Canadian Social Policy: Social Security in the Late 1990s (33-51). Halifax: Fernwood Pub..

Hayek, F. (1944). The Road to Serfdom. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hindess, Barry. (in press). "Power, Government, Politics." In Kate Nash & John Scott (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology.

Hindess, Barry. (1996). "Liberalism, Socialism and Democracy: Variations on a Governmental Theme." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nicholas Rose (Eds.), Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government (pp. 65-80). University College London: UCL Press.

Holton, Robert J. (1992). Economy and Society. New York: Routledge.

Howlett, Michael & Ramesh, M. (1992). The Political Economy of Canada: An Introduction. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.

Is the Party Over? (1999, March/April). Canadian Dimension, pp. 12.

Isin, Engin F. (1998). "Governing Toronto Without Government: Liberalism and Neoliberalism." Studies in Political Economy, 56, pp. 169-191.

Kachur, Jerrold. (1999). "Quasi-marketing Education: The Entrepreneurial State and Charter Schooling in Alberta." In David Broad & Wayne Antony (Eds.), Citizens or Consumers? Social Policy in a Market Society (129-150). Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Lorinc, John. (1994, March). "Hold the Fries and the Social Programmes." Saturday Night, pp. 11-12, 15-16, 61.

Low, William. (1996). "Wide of the Mark: 'Targeting' and Work Incentives to Direct Social Assistance to Single Parents." In Jane Pulkingham & Gordon Ternowetsky (Eds.), Remaking Canadian Social Policy: Social Security in the Late 1990s (188-201). Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Major Education Report Released. (2000, February 21). Canadian Council of Ministers of Education. Available: www.cmec.ca/releases/20000221.en.stm

Marshall. G. (1994). The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McArthur, W. (1999, April). "Federal Budget Offers No Cure for Ailing Health Care System." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/199/04/fed_budget.html

McArthur, W., Ramsay, C., & Walker, M. (1996). Healthy Incentives: Canadian Health Reform in an International Context. Fraser Institute.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/books/health_reform/

Mihlar, F., & Smith, D. (1996). "Government-Sponsored Training Programs: Failure in the United States, Lessons for Canada." Critical Issues Bulletin.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/critical_issues/1996/training.html

Miller, Peter. (1994). "Accounting and Objectivity: The Invention of Calculating Selves and Calculable Spaces". In Allan Megill (Ed.), Rethinking Objectivity (239-264). London: Duke University Press.

Miller, Peter. (1987). Domination and Power. New York: Routledge.

Miller, Peter & Rose, Nikolas. (1990). "Governing Economic Life." Economy and Society, 19(1), pp. 1-31.

O'Malley, Pat; Weir, Lorna & Shearing, Clifford. (1997). "Governmentality, Criticism, Politics." Economy and Society, 26(4), pp. 501-517.

Palda, Filip. (1993, September). "Worker Training or Business Handout?" Fraser Forum.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1993/september/index/html

Polanyi, Karl. (1957). The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. U.S.A: Beacon.

Pulkingham, Jane & Ternowetsky, Gordon. (1999). "Neo-liberalism and Retrenchment: Employment, Universality, Safety-net Provisions and a Collapsing Canadian Welfare State." In David Broad & Wayne Antony (Eds.), Citizens or Consumers? Social Policy in a Market Society (84-98). Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Raham, H. (1997, September). "Accountability: Measuring School Performance." Fraser Forum.
Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1997/september/

Rose, Nikolas. (1999). Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, Nikolas. (1999a). "Inventiveness in Politics." Economy and Society, 28(3), pp. 467-493.

Rose, Nikolas. (1996). "Governing 'Advanced' Liberal Democracies." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nicholas Rose (Eds.), Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government (pp. 37-64). University College London: UCL Press.

Rose, Nikolas. (1996a). "The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government." Economy and Society, 25(3), pp. 327-356.

Rose, Nikolas & Miller, Peter. (1992). "Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government." British Journal of Sociology, 43(2), pp. 173-205.

Sabatini, R. (1996). Welfare – No Fair: A Critical Analysis of Ontario's Welfare System (1985-1994). Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Saint-Martin, Denis. (1998). "Management Consultants. The State, and the Politics of Administrative Reform in Britain and Canada." Administration and Society, 30(5), pp. 533-555.

Sarlo, C. (1997, November). "Self Interest and Society." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1997/november/society.html

Sarlo, C. (1995, January). "Thinking About Social Policy Reform." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1995/january/jan95.html

Scott, Beverley. (1994). "Against Social Programs: The Campaigns of the Fraser Institute." In John Crane (Ed.), Directions for Social Welfare in Canada: The Public's View (pp. 109-129). University of British Columbia: UBC Press.

Simons, Jon. (1995). Foucault and the Political. London: Routledge.

Smart, Barry. (1985). Michel Foucault. London: Tavistock Pub.

Smith, A. (1976). An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stanford, Jim. (1996). "Discipline, Insecurity and Productivity: The Economics Behind Labour Market Flexibility." In Jane Pulkingham & Gordon Ternowetsky (Eds.), Remaking Canadian Social Policy: Social Security in the Late 1990s (130-150). Halifax: Fernwood Pub.

Walker, M. (1984). Probing Leviathan. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Weber, Max. (1968). Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society. Rheinstein, Max (Ed.). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Weber, Max. (1958). From Max Weber. Gerth, H & Mills, C. Wright (Trans & Eds.). New York: Galaxy.

Williams, Walter. (1991, October). "War Against the Poor." Fraser Forum. Available: www.fraserinstitute.ca/publications/forum/1991/october/FF-10-91.html#war

# VITA

Surname: Shaw Given Names: Murray

Place of Birth: Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Educational Institutions Attended:

| | |
|---|---|
| Laurentian University | 1987 to 1988 |
| University of British Columbia | 1993 to 1996 |
| University of Victoria | 1998 to 2000 |

Degrees Awarded:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B.A. Sociology | University of British Columbia | 1996 |

Honours and Awards:

| | |
|---|---|
| University of Victoria Fellowship | 1998 to 2000 |

Publications:

William K. Carroll & Murray Shaw. (in press). "Consolidating a Neoliberal Policy Network in Canada, 1976-1996." Presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Annual Meeting, University of Alberta, Edmonton, May 28-31, 2000.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis:

Freedom, Domination and the Liberal Art of Government: Advanced Liberal Technologies in Fraser Institute Discourse

Author 

Murray Shaw

August 14, 2000