Governmentality, Active Citizenship and Marginalisation:

The Case of Rural Drinking Water supply in Kerala, India

Abhilash Babu

Lecturer (Temporary)

School of Gandhian Thought and Development Studies, Mahatma Gandhi University

P.D Hills P.O, Pin-686560, Kottayam, Kerala, India

Tel: 91-9846091356   E-mail: abhijnu@gmail.com

Abstract

People's participation is a buzz word in the development agenda of the national and international agencies. In the governance of water also this concept has got central role in planning, implementation and running of the projects. The process is not a linear one rather than a pluralistic strategy including the state, civil society and the local community, to include the 'people's voice' in development. The study takes the case of world Bank aided 'Jalanidhi' project of Kerala which was implemented with the active participation of the people. Drawing from the concept of 'Governmentality' by Michael Foucault, it is argued that, remote government technologies of the state by promoting localism and active citizenship that shapes the regime of action in the water supply through a variety of discourses that redefine the rights as duties which ultimately marginalises 'resistance and negotiation' from the society.

Keywords: Governmentality, Active citizenship, Participation, Water, Kerala

1. Introduction

People's participation in rural water supply evolved as a principal strategy in Kerala in the 1990s. What strengthened this shift in Kerala's water policy was the growth of the idea of decentralisation within state in the early 1990s. Part of this discursive formation was the debates on the failure of "big government" and centralised approach to basic service delivery like water. It is implemented and run with the active participation of the local people and has been hailed as a successful model to be replicated in rural areas in order to curb the scarcity of drinking water.   What is inherent in celebrating this model is the valorisation of 'active citizenship'. The paper focuses on these discourses that legitimise the concept of 'remote government' or government at a distance; in this context "government of water". Drawing from the concept of 'Governmentality' by Michael Foucault, it is argued that, remote government technologies of the state by promoting localism and active citizenship that shapes the regime of action in the water supply through a variety of discourses that redefine the rights as duties which ultimately marginalises 'resistance and negotiation' from the society. The study takes the case of world Bank aided 'Jalanidhi' project of Kerala which was implemented with the active participation of the people. After giving a brief description of the concept of 'Governmentality' and 'Active citizenship' it analyse the implication of these concepts at the local level.

2. Governementality and Remote Government

Governementality is a neologism stemming from the writings of Michael Foucault (Note 1) and has been given different connotations, not straying from the central theme, by a proliferating body of scholarship (Note 2). It is an alternative analysis of political power and government in modern societies and can be comprehended as 'the conduct of conduct' and 'Governmentalisation of the state' (Foucault, 1979, p.20) as remarked by Foucault. The discourse on Governmentality starts from the vantage point of how Political power is exercised ,not through sovereign powers, but by working through individual freedom which is made compatible with the requirements of social life"(Neale,1997,p.4). It is a "general term for any calculated direction of human conduct" (Dean, 1999, p.3) and is a 'political technology' of the state by problematizing the specific domains it needs to govern (Murdoch and Ward, 1997). In contrast with the traditional political theories on power, which focus on the Machiavellian conceptions of rule, instead conceived power "as something which circulates" (Gordon, 1980, p.98). "It is not localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as commodity or piece of wealth" (Ibid). With the notion of Governmentality, he argued, power in

modern societies are exercised through the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics (Foucault,1979,p.20). "It involve minute regulation of bodily and other visible activities and which rely for their operation on the production of knowledge about those subjected", which Foucault called as the 'disciplinary power' (Hannah, 1997, p.171).

He used the term 'government' in a comprehensive sense that goes beyond the political tracts to cover the philosophical, religious, medical, and pedagogical texts (Lemke, 2002, p.2). Apart from the administration "government is also signified problems of self control, guidance for the family and for children, management of the household, directing the soul, and so forth" (Ibid). This implied a greater control of its population and also the new concern for the biological wellbeing of the population including disease control and prevention, adequate food and water supply, sanitation, shelter, education and so on, which Foucault qualifies as 'biopolitics'. It is more concerned about structuring and shaping the field of possible actions of subjects and relations between technologies of self and technologies of domination.

Governmentality is composed of three components-"first, a centralization around the government (Army, education, governmental ministries and/or departments, justice and so on; secondly an intensification of the effects of power at the levels of both the entire population and of the individuals (*omnes et singulatim*) and thirdly, the emergence of new forms of knowledge useful for the implementation of the centralization/intensification elements" (Darier, 1996). Foucault (1979a) used the example of panopticon (Note 3) that reflects all these three aspects of the new governmental mechanism. It represents an enduring mechanisms of surveillance that oppose our traditional perspective on political power and enable us to reflects upon the "proliferation of a whole range of apparatuses pertaining to government and a complex body of knowledges and 'know-how' about government, the means of its exercise and the nature of those over whom it was to be exercised" (Nikolas and Peter, 1992, 174).

What is important in applying the Governmentality paradigm in the context of the present study is that it draws our attention to the formation of knowledge that constitute 'active citizen' image of a participant in participatory development projects. It is analyzed in the context of neoliberal regimes of power that promotes individualization (under the guise of collective action). The new governmental mechanism shapes the field for proposed actions of the individuals by production, systematization and rationalization of specific knowledge on community and environment. The developments in the discourses on environmental sustainability deserve pivotal attention in this new governance system. The newly forged global-local linkage by the Global resource managers criticises the Human Ecologist's inability to see beyond the territoriality and locality (Goldman, 1997, p6). The "self interested small producer (Note 4)" metaphor is inappropriate for explaining the environmental degradation (Goldman, 1997, p.8). The commons inquiry has been, at the conceptual level, shifted from local to global (ibid, p.15). But the Human ecologist's, the development expert's and the Global resource manager's views converge at the point that, its use should be institutionalised by 'managerialism' driven either local or global.

The result is a renewed emphasize on the 'rational human being' and his capacity to make change in his own life; if put differently, reinventing the potential for calculated individual actions. In conformity with this point of view ,international and national development initiatives focuses on democratic local institutions as the basis of effective local environmental decision making, in which individuals and communities have or can develop the skills and desire to make and effectively execute the development projects. To complicate the picture, these organizational structures, levels and networks, can be seen as overlapped or penetrated by 'scapes', in which people, money, images, ideas and technology flow (Appadurai, A. 1996).

This process is not uniform and universal and the state – scaled at various levels – has a prime importance in setting and controlling the parameters for regime formation. Under pressure from market forces and neo-liberal political forces, many states are undergoing transformations which are evident in the reduced state authority in favour of market liberalization, regionalization and localization. In India the state power in the development sector, drawing authority from the 73rd and 74th amendments, has been decentralised and acted through the enhanced 'choices' and 'freedoms' of citizens. The focus has been shifted to people centred approach and 'active citizenship'. The hitherto followed centralised delivery of service through governmental institutions and bureaucratic control has been spelled out as inefficient and the failure of the development intervention since independence gave legitimacy to the decentralised approach. The debates, in line of the argument of the international development agencies and academia, were diligently manoeuvred to include 'citizen's voice' in the development process.

2.1 Active Citizenship as a Tool of Governmentality

Citizenship is a historical and comparative category that evolved in the last 200 years taken many different turns in the different countries of the world. In his classic study entitled 'Citizenship and Social Class' T.H Marshall (1950), shows its evolution as consisting basically of the progressive expansion of certain rights: civil, political and social. With the French revolution it becomes a socially acknowledged category (Beteille, 1999, p.2589).In recent years the concept of citizenship has become a ubiquitous catch-phrase for policy makers, social scientists and development experts

(Gianpaolo, 2003, p.1). It was a part of the popular recognition accrued to participatory development or participatory governance methods, which emphasizes the political participation of the citizens and includes their 'voice' in development (Gaventa, and Valderrama, C. 1999, Goetz and Gaventa, 2001; Gaventa, 2002; Cornwall, 2000). Some governments have promoted the notion of citizenship as a civic identity in an attempt to draw citizens together under a new form of commonality (Meekosha and Dowse, 1997) and Others have argued for the need to address the exclusions created by the linkage of citizenship to nation-states (Ellison, 1997; Newell, 2000). Beyond simple participation, the term "citizenship" is cobbled together by questions of rights, states responsibility, and responsibility of the non-state actors, mechanisms of power relations and dynamics of inclusion and exclusion (Gaventa, 2002)."Many of these questions have been theoretically explored within the academic literature on citizenship, which often distinguishes between the liberal, communitarian and civic republican traditions "which differed fundamentally based on individual freedom, differences in Identity and individual obligations in participation (ibid.p.6).

In order to analyse citizenship within the frame work of Governmentality it is usually seen citizenship as rights enables people to act as agents (Lister, 1998, p.228). It defines a person as a competent member of a society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups (hickey and Mohan, 2003, p.11). Expressing citizenship or agency is then extending their control over the resources that involves broader range of socio-political practices (ibid). This implies the involvement of active citizen participation rather than passive or withdrawn from the development activities. Active citizenship may be referred as "to recognize their moral responsibilities to care and provide for their needy neighbors and to meet their obligations to encourage their talents and skills in the management of public and welfare services" (Kearns Adrian, 1992, p.20). In the context of effectiveness of a primarily representative democracy is increasingly being challenged (Saul, 1997), it lays a platform for the collaborative local action for the common good (Cox, 2000, 100-107) owing to difficulty of the elected representatives in engaging in the diverse issues in their constituency. Within the Governmentality framework, active citizenship is a means of remote government where the state increasingly relies on individual capacity and subjectivity, instead of directly engaged through its apparatuses. It is envisaged to decentralize its power to the lower echelons of the society but often undermines the inherent inequalities include social, economic, cultural and political. The following section analyses the various aspects of this theoretical possibilities against the backdrop of newly emerged water governance in Kerala in which drinking water supply is decentralized with citizens participation and 'disciplining' of the space.

3. On Rural Water Supply in Kerala

Kerala is situated in the southern most part of the Indian sub-continent and the "Kerala model development" has won accolades throughout the world as a successful model despite its weak economic performance. The people of Kerala practiced wide range of traditional water management technologies that have been efficient and eco-friendly. They even used a crude form of modern drip irrigation in the past. Regarding the increasing scarcity, some of the traditional water management practices of Kerala still have relevance in the modern time. The major fresh water source, traditionally in use for domestic and irrigation purposes on the Malabar Coast, was the open well. The streams, springs, and ponds were also used along with the wells in certain areas. At present, more than 70 percent of the population in the State depends on open wells for meeting their domestic water requirements. Kerala may be one of the geographical locations with the highest density of open wells. Around 40,000 ha. of land in the State is irrigated by wells, and another 50,000ha. by ponds and tanks. Location-specific soil and water conservation measures appropriate for different physiographic zones of Kerala were developed, down the decades. An integrated approach considering land-water-biomass, appropriate for this humid tropical region, slowly evolved. Wherever fresh water sources, either surface or ground,were not available, people even resorted to rainwater collection.

The history of piped water systems in rural Kerala dates back to as early as 1930's. During the 70's more than 450 piped rural systems were launched. During the 80's as part of drinking Water supply and Sanitation decade programme, several projects were launched with the support of bilateral and multilateral agencies. In 1985, World Bank approved the Kerala Water Supply and Sanitation project (Cr. 16622-IN) which was an integrated project aimed, along with other things, to strengthen Kerala Water Authority, to provide piped water supply systems in selected rural areas and introduces low cost onsite sanitation pilot programmes in rural areas. Under DANIDA assistance, three schemes were taken up during the period 1983 to 1998 covering three rural areas in Kerala. Netherlands provided assistance to set up 8 water supply schemes in Kerala. The Kerala water authority, a statutory body constituted under Kerala Water Supply and Sewage (KWSS) Act, 1986 has the responsibility for water supply in the state, both rural and urban. Its main functions include state level planning for water and sewage development, financing, implementation and operation of all existing and new schemes. As of now, Kerala Water Authority operates 40 urban water supply and 1,415 rural water supply schemes in Kerala . Kerala is the first to formulate a water policy among the states in India.

3.1 Paradigm Shift in Drinking Water Supply

Historically, ground water has been considered as a private property in India. The person, who owns the land, owns the water below the land. By consensus, he obtains virtually unlimited right to pump out this water. Similarly, water supply

through private tankers, especially under water scarcity conditions, too has been a part and parcel of Indian life since long. From a slightly different angle, the prevention of dalits from using certain water facilities in the villages like wells, ponds and so on is also a form of privatisation. In this case, the "owners" are the so called "higher" castes (Krishnakumar, 2002). This unevenness in the ownership over water is not properly addressed even by the state. In public finance literature, the budgetary allocations needed for the provision of drinking water and sanitation in rural India is earmarked mainly for the poor. Naturally, the allocations, governed by non-market principles, are not on the basis of investment criteria such as social rates of return/cost-benefit ratio. Nevertheless, cost effectiveness is, whether practised or not, usually insisted for its provision (Pushpangadan, 2002).

Discourses of fresh water managements and water policies of the state have undergone a moral turn in the early 1990s. Pivotal to this is the development of new concepts like scarce economic, environmentalism, sustainability, social capital, basic water requirement (BWR), and equity. This change is largely due to the transformations in the social, political and economic, which have increasingly limited the acceptance of traditional approaches; the long-term water planning through massive water infrastructure development has increasingly become irrational. The long-term water management approaches are based on anticipated water demands, which are then compared with expected supply: they apparently are oriented around economic feasibility (GOI, 1987).

The perceived inefficiency of above-mentioned approaches has noticeably reorganized the discourses on water, by coining new concepts. In most cases, apparatuses for supplying water are neither defined within public or private sector in Kerala; they are lumped together under the label of "informal sector" (Sridhar, 2006). Along with the greater popularity of informal sector, as a force for possible economic development, in the development literature, the retreat of state from welfare services has increasingly being celebrated. This paradigm shift has brought the resurging civil society and social capital into the orbit of development. It is in this changing context that the participatory strategies for sustainable water management evolved as an alternative. Further, the participatory strategies for sustainable water management got legal legitimacy in the Government of India's water policy of 2002; it envisages the diffusion of appropriate water and sanitation technologies with the active participation of the user communities.

The Panchayati Raj Act of 1993 was moral boost to the efforts for citizen participation for sustainable water management. The major concerns behind this change are the environmental and economic outcomes of large water supply projects. The extensive contamination of the available water resources, due to the large-scale urbanisation, unscientific interventions and uncontrolled population growth, has been a political issue from the early 1990s in Kerala. Consequently, people started suffering acute drinking water shortages during the summer months, despite being blessed with adequate water resources that are being replenished by annual rainfall of over 3000 mm (Krishnakumar, 2002).

The citizen participation strategies for sustainable water management essentially are structured on the judgments about which public "needs" and "wants" can and should be fulfilled. Here, water is not only a common good and community resource, but also a private good or economic commodity. It is not only a necessity for life but also a recreational resource; it plays a part in the social life of the communities, therefore, is imbued with cultural values (Gleick, 1998, p.571). Thus from this standpoint, ensuring greater community participation is pivotal to the success of this scheme of water management. Kerala has been acknowledged worldwide, with some of its initiatives being considered as modals of replication, for initiating participatory strategies for sustainable water management. Here the study takes the example of "Jalanidhi", a world bank aided rural water supply programme in Kerala as an example to examine the dynamics of the concept of 'Governmentality' and active 'citizenship' in basic service delivery.

3.2 Jalanidhi and the Issues in Remote Government of Water Supply

The *Jalanidhi* project of the Kerala Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency (KRWSA) has been initiated in 1998 in the four northern districts of Kozhikode, Palakkad, Malappuram and Trissur with the assistance of the World Bank, which is expected to cover three lakhs of households benefiting a population of over 15 lakhs in the 80 selected lowest levels of Local Self Government/Grama Panchayaths. Among the capital cost, 15% are borne by the beneficiary community, 10% by the Grama Panchayaths and 75% is the share of the government. Once implemented the beneficiary communities are expected to meet the maintenance costs by themselves.

It is one of the frequently referred sustainable water management projects operating with the participation of user community implemented and celebrated as a successful rural community movement to sustainable drinking water provision. In cooperation and technological assistance from the "Kerala Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency", local self government institutions and the NGOs, water here is pumped from wells, springs and streams up to a reservoir and then delivered to homes through a network of pipes. Responsibility for the planning and implementation of this plan lies with the local people. Jalanidhi initiative is repeatedly romanticised as an alternative to the failing state-run and private schemes.

3.3 Panopticism in the Water Sector

In the water sector, Control and surveillance is operated at two levels; at the macro level, i.e. at the policy level and the

micro level i.e.; at the local level. Institutional centralisation is made very powerful through the establishment of a separate ministry of water resources, ground water departments and engineers. State's control over the natural resources is evident in the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Cess Act, 1977 and the Environment (Protection) Act (1986). The Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) in 1972-73, the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) during the fifth five year plan (From 1974-75), the "International Water Supply And Sanitation Decade (81- 90) Programme" in 1981, and the Technology Mission for drinking water in 1986 , which was renames as Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water   Supply Mission in 1991 were also intended to the 'biopolitical' control of the population with the support of scientific and technological knowledge.

Surveillance through policy stems from the water policies of India (1987 and 2002) and Kerala and the international agreements. The water policies of India relates to the declared statements as well as the intended approaches of the central and state governments for water-resource planning, development, allocation, and management. It includes statements not only on the overall policy framework but also on specific policy issues such as project selection, water pricing and cost recovery, and user and private participation. But it is again under the 'super panopticism' of the agenda of the international agencies. For example, the basic philosophy of the Jalanidhi project is taken from the 1999 Cochin Declaration on Rural Water Supply Policy Reforms which spoke of:

- Adopting "Demand- Responsive Approaches through use of participatory processes.

- Changing the role of Government from provider to facilitator.

- Establishing financial viability and sustainability of rural water supply services; and

- Promoting integrated water resource management

Based on this the Project is designed on the redefined premise of delivery of water and sanitation services with a demand driven approach. According to the web site of jalanidhi, the project is "conceptualised, planned and implemented by the users themselves as against the "top-down approach". This will be owned, operated and maintained by the users themselves on a total cost- recovery basis".

It reveals the strong commitment of the governments policies to the international discourses and agencies related with the governance of water. As early as 1977, United Nations Water Conference held at Mar del Plata, Argentina, confirmed that: "[a]ll people have a right to have access to drinking water". The New Delhi Declaration of 1990 endorsed the principle of "some for all rather than more for some", which reflects the fundamental human rights principle of universality. It marks the official birth of the community management paradigm in India. The Dublin Statement on Water and Sustainable Development (1992) states that water is an "economic good". As explicit in the international policies on development, efficiency and sustainability are the major two aspects that has been adopted by the external agencies as a viable solution to the drinking water scarcity. It is also reflected in both the national water policies in 1987 and 2002. It states that,

> "…….efforts to develop, conserve, utilise and manage this important resource in a sustainable manner, have to be guided by the national perspective".   But the issue of efficiency and sustainability has been manifested through the proxy of "community participation" or "user participation".

In line of this, the Kerala water policy (2007) states that,

> "Access to water is a human right. As water is a common heritage having economic value, the responsibility for its regulated use and conservation is vested with every citizen and community…..it is important to make sure that the right of every citizen to equitable access to water for his or her basic needs is protected and enforced through appropriate policy, legislative and programme initiatives".

It asserts water as a human right and but it is the duty of the citizen to determine its availability and use. Kerala water authority, established in 1986, which is responsible for the public drinking water supply is now almost redundant due to corruption and bureaucratic apathy. Ensure people participation is necessary but the inherent dangers behind it invite concern in to the issue. For example the 2007 Kerala water policy states that water has an economic value. The whole debates centres around economical sustainability of water with strategies of cutting off of subsidies and efficient cost recovery mechanisms. The discourses are pointing to the efficient use of water using business management principles and its reliance on individual rationalities and market mechanisms in the water governance (Salskov, Dorte, Krause & Sven, 2000, p.3).

The role of the expert has been changed from a technocratic approach to a social centric approach. Concept of technology also shifted to new environmentally sustainable technologies that prevents over exploitation of water. It is evident from the project documents that the regime of action is defined and the rules are fixed for the government of water.

3.3.1 Spatial Disciplining Through Education

Disciplining power of modern government systems were a focal concern of Governmentality. It is exercised though an interface of power/knowledge put forwarded by Foucault (1980) which is relevant in this context. A closer examination of the projects through samples taken from three districts of Kerala i.e. Kozhikkodu, Malappuram and Palakkadu during 2006 ,it is evident that the remote government of water supply through citizen participation is merely a staged drama were the regimes of action is created and shaped deliberatively by the state. The project has adopted the basic tenets of Cochin declaration (1999) which promulgates demand responsive approach and changing the role of the government from provider to facilitator. According to this, the projects are implemented areas where people have come forward and demanded water under this scheme. The demand is created through well articulated participatory development strategies including awareness generation programmes conducted by the NGOs and other agencies. The experts are divided in to two sections. One section constitutes of social workers mostly armed with a post graduation in social work or similar disciplines take care of the community empowerment or capacity building programmes. The second is a technical section with engineers and other technicians.

The social worker's responsibility is to bring the community in a common platform where they instil their 'expert knowledge' to ensure the active participation of the citizen. A noted feature of this awareness programmes is imparting 'critical consciousness' (Note 5) of the individual responsibility (Freire, P, 1973) and create contempt towards the government run mechanisms for drinking water supply. Drawing inspiration from the Participatory rural Appraisal (PRA) (Note 6) of Robert chambers (1983), the empowerment programmes included various techniques like transect walks, videos and participatory resource mapping. During the exercise, the people were encouraged to identify the problems and possibilities related with drinking water in their locality by themselves. Through this process, the individuals are subjected to formulate knowledge on their locality. The next step is to conducting many meetings in different parts of the panchayat. The participants are made subject to self criticism through questions like "have you noticed the broken pumps and public taps which causes days long leakage in your locality? Have you ever done anything to rectify that?. If no; why it become like that?" The debates are carefully directed towards lack of responsibility of the people in rectifying it and the inefficiency of the government institutions. The moderator, who is from an NGO, locates their irresponsible behaviour in lack of monitory and physical participation and community monitoring in it. Exhorting to put aside political differences in the overall running of the projects is another noted characteristic of these awareness programmes.

Promoting health consciousness is another component of the project. The participants are made aware to the bad health habits they are following by using science and technological knowledge. Water samples would be collected from the project villages and checked in the laboratories and possibilities of leakage of faecal matter from septic tanks and open areas to the drinking water sources revealed. Behavioural changes of the community in the matter of hygiene like Importance of washing hand after defecation, dangers of open defecation were also targeted through the education of the community by the experts.

It also includes inculcating contempt towards the governmental institutions like water authority, in rural areas panchayat wells and ponds etc. it can be seen as a tactics where the state is encouraging citizen participation by projecting public drinking water supply as inefficient at the same time it promotes the "pastoral care" (Note 7) techniques through minute control and change of their 'mentalities'. It is articulated through the individuals will to rectify/control their own actions in availing the drinking water while made them retain total obedience to the state.

3.3.2 Normalisation of Dutiful Citizen

Once a consensus is formed among the participants, politicians and defying voices, participants were encouraged to organise as small beneficiary groups. This implies that the right to minimum requirement of water would be materialized only if they perform their duty as "active participants" through out the project. These groups are the manifestation of social capital hailed by the World Bank in its literature and is interpreted as a proxy for the ineffective centralized supply-driven water supply by the state, which lacks accountability and efficiency. Here the individual is responsible for his own basic water requirements and he has to act in tandem with the group dynamics. The user group often consists of ten to twenty households and has its own rules and responsibility as prescribed by the funding agencies which is operated through the grassroots level NGOs. Each group is registered under the 'charitable societies and registration act' and has a president, secretary and treasurer. They were selected by the majority decision and were given training in book keeping, accountancy etc by the NGOs. In all the cases people who have, economic, cultural or political capitals were seen selected in to these positions. The 'less active' individuals have no voice in the decision making process at all. All the decisions are taken by the selected leadership of the group, the NGO worker and other officials.

By bringing concepts like cost recovery, efficiency, effective utilisation, it goes in hand with the business management principles and Water is conceived here as an 'economic good' that has to be managed with minimal state intervention. It is contingent with the concept of "rationale economic man" in neo-classical economics. Here each individual is

responsible, self-controlled and would monitor each other's actions. This 'Panopticism' is more effective than the direct state control and the local spaces are literally under surveillance without using violence, which is the ultimate form of Governmentality. Through the 'technologies of self' the state can efficiently exercise the 'Biopolitical' control of its populations with minimum coast. The state, which has the authority and responsibilities on its citizen, has started widening its horizon to include these "scapes" to the efficient delivery of the safe minimum water requirements. The image of the local people has been deliberately transformed/highlighted form passive receptors of benefits to active citizens; who have greater control of their livelihood and they have been given more decision making power on issues related with them and their community to meet the political ends of the state.

The process of normalisation of citizen participation has two dimension; firstly it uphold the notion that water is an 'economic good', for which each individual has to pay for it, secondly it is duty of the citizen to actively participate in its delivery and monitoring. Pivotal to the debates on active citizen participation in cost-efficiency and user-community charging is the redefinition of the role of state in development. State eventually has become a mere facilitator, rather than a legitimate provider of rights and justice. Active citizenship for sustainable economic development calls for the institutionalisation of communities for effective utilisation of human capital and resources. Here, supplying economic goods and assisting the overall progress of the society become a duty of the community. Naturally, this has immense political implication, as it breaks the Hobbesian 'social contract.' 'Active citizenship' strategies reorganise some of the fundamental rights, like social and economic security or the right of poverty or of being in bad health, which the community surrendered before the state in a social contract, to duties of the community. However, this breaking of the social contract is not visible by and large, because it is reinforced by a well-built discursive formation: "economism" (Note 8), the debates on ethnic market, social capital and so on. With the discursive restructuring, some of the central concerns of development, like social justice, economic inequality and democracy are evidently marginalised. Moreover, active citizenship strategies for sustainable development operate around a politics of consensus, at least in the economic sphere. This can certainly develop a kind of democracy based on popular participation, but without inconvenience of contestational politics, as John Harriss (2001) observed. For him, participatory strategies for sustainable development increasingly marginalise the conflicts of values and ideas necessary for democratic politics.

4. Conclusion

The concept of Governmentality introduced by Michael Foucault to analyses the modern forms of power can be applied to a variety of social issues. The concept of Governmentality is coincided with the concept of active citizenship which can be used as a tool to implement the 'remote control' technologies of the government. In the case of water and sanitation the paper used this concept to show inherent dangers of valorising the concept of "active citizenship" in decentralised water supply. The analysis based on the World Bank aided 'Jalanidhi' project shows the implication of these concepts at the grass root level. These target based projects constantly encourage the participation of the people. The proclaimed idea is the inclusion of the 'unheard voices'. But the underlying agenda is to find alternatives to avoid the responsibilities of the government. The entire process is a pedagogically inclined one, which includes conscentisation at the local level through various level awareness programmes. It is in tandem with the global discourses on health, hygiene, basic water requirements etc. or more specifically it is a process of implementation of the preconceived ideas developed by the global discourses on water governance. It uses culturally imbibed techniques or customization of the objectives at the local level, set by the transnational funding organizations. 'Participatory Rural Appraisal' techniques are a classic example, which promotes the active participation of citizens to meet the political ends of the state. In short, it serves the dual purpose of enhancing people's involvement with the projects and softens the reluctant voice by the process of inclusion which redefines the right of the citizens over water as duty of the citizen and marginalises 'resistance and negotiation' from the society.

References

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Beteille Andre. (1999). Citizenship, State and Civil Society. *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 4: 2588-2591.

Bourdieu P. (1985). The Forms of Capital, Chapter 9 in Richardson J.G. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press: 241-258.

Chambers, R. (1983). *Whose Reality Counts?: Putting the Last First*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Colin Gordon (ed). (1980). *Power/Knowledge –Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Brington: Harvester Press.

Cornwall, A. (2000). *Beneficiary, Consumer, Citizen: Perspectives on Participation for Poverty Reduction*. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).

Cox, E. (2000). Creating a More Civil Society: Community Level Indicators of Social Capital. *Just Policy: A Journal of Australian Social Policy,* No 19/20: 100-107.

Darier Eric. (1996). Environmental Governmentality: The case of Canada's Green Plan. *Environmental politics*, 5 (4):587-588.

Dean, M. (1999). G*overnmentality.* London: Sage.

Ellison, N. (1997). Towards a New Social Politics: Citizenship and Reflexivity in Late Modernity. *Sociology,* 31(4): 697–711.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* (pp. 87-104.) Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for Critical Consciousness.* New York: The Seabury Press.

Gaventa John. (2002). Introduction: Exploring Citizenship,Participation and Accountability. *IDS Bulletin,* 33(2), P5.

Gaventa, J. and Valderrama, C. (1999). *Participation, Citizenship and Local Governance*. Background Paper for Workshop: Strengthening Participation in Local Governance, Brighton :Mimeo, IDS,: 21–24.

Gianpaolo Baiocchi. (2003). Emergent Public Spheres: Talking Politics in Participatory Governance, *American Sociological Review*, 68 (1–xx):1.

Gleick H Peter. (1998). Water in Crisis: Paths to Sustainable Water Use. *Ecological Applications*, 8(3): 571-579.

Goetz, A.-M. and Gaventa, J. (2001). *From Consultation to Influence: Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus into Service Delivery. IDS Working Paper* 138, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Goldman Michael. (1997). Customs in common: The Epistemic World of Commons Scholars. *Theory and society,* 26(1):6.

Government of India. (1991). Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water   Supply Mission, Department of Drinking Water Supply, Ministry of Rural development. [Online] Available: http://ddws.nic.in/arwsp.htm, (November 14,2007).

Government of India. (2002). National Water Policy, Ministry of Water Resources. [Online] Available: http://wrmin.nic.in/index1.asp?linkid=201&langid=1 (January 1, 2007).

Government of India. (2008). Legislations on Environment, Forests, and Wildlife, Ministry of environment & forests. [Online] Available: http://envfor.nic.in/legis/legis.html (October 8,2008)

Government of Kerala, Kerala Water Authority. [Online] Available: http://keralawater.org/home.htm (June 2, 2008).

Government of Kerala. (2007). Kerala state water policy. [Online] Available: http://www.kerala.gov.in/waterpolicy/index.php (July 7, 2008).

Hanna G Matthew. (1997). Space and the Structuring of Disciplinary Power: An Interpretive Review. *Geografiska Annaler,* 79, B (3):171-180.

Harriss John. (2001). *Depoliticizing Development: The World Bank and Social Capital.* New Delhi: Left Word Books.

Hickey Sam and Mohan Giles. (2003). *Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development: Citizenship and Radical Modernism*, Draft working Paper prepared for conference on Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?.Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development, Manchester University.

Hobbes, Thomas. (1985). *Leviathan*. C.B Macpherson (Editor). London: Penguin Books.

K. Pushpangadan. (2002). Social Returns from Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Education: A Case Study of Two Coastal Villages in Kerala. [Online] Available: http://www.cds.edu/download_files/333.pdf (January 27, 2008).

Kerala Rural water supply & sanitation Agency. [Online] Available: http://jalanidhi.com/policy.htm (May 24, 2008).

Krishnakumar S. (2002). Decentralised Planning and Sustainable Development-A Study with Special Reference to Water Resource Harvesting at the Local Level in Kerala. *Journal of Rural Development*, 21(3): 351-367.

Lemke Thomas. (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, 14(3): 49-64.

Lister, R. (1998). Citizen in Action: Citizenship and Community Development in Northern Ireland Context. *Community Development Journal*, 33(3): 226-235.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Cambridge University.

Meekosha, H. and Dowse, L. (1997). Enabling Citizenship: Gender, Disability and Citizenship, Australia, *Feminist Review,* 57:49–72.

Murdoch, J. and Ward, N. (1997). Governmentality and Territoriality: The Statistical Manufacture of Britain's 'National Farm'. *Political Geography* 16: 307–324.

Neale, Alan. (1997). Organising Environmental Self-Regulation:Liberal Governmentality and the Pursuit of Ecological Modernisation in Europe. *Environmental Politics*, 6(4), 1–24.

Newell, P. (2000). Environmental NGOs and Globalisation: The Governance of TNCs, in R. Cohen and S. Rai (eds), *Global Social Movements*. London: Athlone Press: 117–34.

Politicians for Reform: proceedings of the State Water Ministers' workshop on rural water supply policy reforms in India. (1999). [Online] Available: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000094946_01092504005142 (May 25, 2006).

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

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

Salskov Iversen Dorte Hansen Krause Hans & Bislev Sven. (2000). Governmentality, Globalization and Local Practice:Transformations of a Hegemonic Discourse. [Online] Available: http://ep.lib.cbs.dk/download/ISBN/x648030775.pdf, P-3 (September 27, 2007).

Sridhar Lalitha. (2006). Water: The Privatization Debate [Online] Available: http://www.indiatogether.org/2003/nov/env-wtrdebate.htm (August 24, 2008).

The Dublin Statement on Water and Sustainable Development. (1992). [Online] Available: http://www.gdrc.org/uem/water/dublin-statement.html (April 13, 2007).

The New Delhi Statement. (1990). 1972 - 2006: From Stockholm to Mexico. UNESCO. [Online] Available: http://www.unesco.org/water/wwap/milestones/index.shtml (March 3, 2007).

United Nations Conference on Water. (1997). [Online] Available: http://wwap.unesco.org/ev.php?URL_ID=7365&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201&reload=1217192601&PHPSESSID=bc12e5d7e7f78af5 (March 4, 2007).

Notes

Note 1. For more details, see, Foucault, Michel (1979), 'Governmentality', Ideology and Consciousness, No.6, Summer 1986,pp.5-21., Foucault, Michel (1981), *'Omnes et Singulatim*: Towards a Criticism of "Political Reason"', in The Tanner Lectures of Human Values. Vol.11, Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press/

Note 2. Mitchell Dean (1999) has offered a conceptual clarification on this topic in his book, *Governmentality* , see also, Miller, P. and N. Rose. 1990. 'Governing Economic Life.' *Economy and Society* 19(1): 1–31., Hindess, B. 1996. Discourses of Power; From Hobbes to Foucault. Oxford: Blackwell, O'Farrell, C. ed. 1997. *Foucault: The Legacy*. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.

Note 3. An efficient prison model designed by Jeremy Bentham involves an annular ring of black-lit cells surrounding a central observatory tower from which each prisoner is potentially visible to unseen guards.   See, Foucault M (1977), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Modern Prison,* Vintage Books, New York.

Note 4. Garret Hardin's parable imagines a set of pastoralists who destroy the future viability of their pastoral commons by each of them selfishly deciding to increase their herd size for individual short-term benefit, until the commons becomes over gazed. For more details see, "Hardin Garrett (1968), "The Tragedy of the commons", Science (162), pp-1243-1248.

Note 5. The term "critical consciousness" was coined by Brazilian educator Paulo Freire in the 1960s. Critical consciousness was defined by Dr. Freire as a state of in-depth understanding about the world and resulting freedom from oppression, was at first applied mainly in the field of adult education. Dr. Freire explored liberating educational methods that he believed could promote the development of critical consciousness, especially among poor and illiterate people, a process that would lead to their emancipation and fruitful advancement. His theories have greatly influenced thinking about participatory development (Freire, P 1973).

Note 6. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) comprises a set of techniques aimed at shared learning between local people and outsiders. During this time, PRA has moved from the margins to the development mainstream, opening up space for a diversity of meanings and applications. During 1990s it has been adopted in accordance with the general debate on governance as a new form or even substitute of the traditional government and considered as a strategy to open up spaces otherwise closed off to citizen engagement. For more details, see, Robert Chambers (1983)

Note 7. The Foucauldian concept of care, which locates its origin in the ancient Hebraic conceptions of pastoral power modelled on the shepherd-flock relation (Dean,). "The pastoral techniques meant that the 'shepherd' (the church and now the state) 'took care of the population, while guiding them instilling in each technique of control" (Darier, 1996).

Note 8. Economism is a term used to criticize economic reductionism, in which supply and demand are the only important factors in decisions,   and   reduce all social facts to economical dimensions. For more details, see Duncan Hallas, "Controversy: What is Economism*?*" *International Socialism (1st series),* No.56, March (1973), pp.18-19.