



Citation: M. Hanif, M. Madadzadeh (2020) Foucault's Biopower and E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. *Aisthesis* 13(1): 101-114. doi: 10.13128/Aisthesis-11108

Copyright: © 2020 M. Hanif. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<http://www.fupress.com/aisthesis>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Foucault's Biopower and E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*

MOHSEN HANIF¹, MARYAM MADADIZADEH²

¹ Assistant Professor of English, Kharazmi University

² MA graduate, Kharazmi University

E-mail: mhanif@khu.ac.ir, maryammadadi1368@yahoo.com

Abstract. *Society Must Be Defended* is a collection of Michel Foucault's courses at the College de France in 1976. In this volume, Foucault discusses the emergence of a new technology of domination called biopower. It is a power that is not "individualizing", but "massifying", that is directed at man as a member of a "species". Biopolitics exerts control over relations between the human races. Yet, some critics claim that Foucault's biopower does not address colonial societies and problems. This paper argues that Foucault's theory of biopower could be applied to the postcolonial discourse, too. To trace Foucauldian biopower in postcolonial literature, the authors of this article have focused on E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. In this paper, the plot and the dialogue of Forster's novel is studied based on Foucault's theory of biopower as discussed in his *Society Must Be Defended*. It is concluded that in Forster's novel, it can be noticed that the English power, which dominated early twentieth century Indian society, employs biopower to subjugate the Indian population. The English officials control India not merely by means of disciplinary institutions, but by manufacturing norms for an entire race which are explainable in terms of Foucault's theory of biopower.

Keywords. Biopower, power, war, *A Passage to India*, E.M. Forster, Michel Foucault.

INTRODUCTION

Juridical power is exercised by monarchs and sovereignty is all about and for the royal power. Royal power could be entirely defined in juridical terms. In classic juridical power, power is regarded as a right which can be possessed and which can be transferred or alienated. This power is concrete and any individual can hold it, so it is inherited. Juridical power is defined as the right to death, the right to take life or let live. It operates on prohibitions and punishments, and in other words it prohibits and punishes. Its agents of prohibitions are institutions, like laws and governments. Indeed, it is directly exercised upon the individuals rather than an entire mass of people.

However, Sovereign power has two categories which stand in contrast to it: disciplinary power and biopower. These two do not

function through violence, but by training bodies and keeping people alive respectively. Disciplinary power is the technology of individuals, while, biopower is the technology of mass control. As Juridical power has the right over one's death, disciplinary and biopolitical power are the power over life. Foucault develops the idea of power over life to describe the other ways that power functions. Power over life includes norms, like body size and gender, and in general, any sort of measurement and statistical analysis of population. This sort of power can quantify, measure, and appraise. This power wants "better life" by managing all the little details. It is located in unofficial institutions. It is in the unwritten laws, the social norms that everybody knows them.

The first kind of power over life is disciplinary power. Disciplinary power is the normalization of individual bodies. It optimizes capabilities and makes the body function efficiently. It works through the normalization of your body and thus is enforced through surveillance. But biopower is the normalization of populations and it administers population. In fact, Biopolitics wants to make sure that not the individual life but the life of a population is most optimized; Hence, the focus is on the life of all people of a society not just the life of one person and consequently, it is not linked to the individual body but to a population.

Some critics, such as Robert Young (2001), have pointed out that there is almost a calculated absence of the colonial world in Foucault's works. It is curious that, Young writes, «for the most part he preserved a scrupulous silence on such issues and has, as a result, been widely criticized for alleged eurocentrism» (397). Yet, Foucault had the experience of living in the postcolony of Tunisia. Also, despite the fact that Foucault's career was mostly in academic institutions, he had the experience of residing in other countries such as Sweden, and even thought of moving to Zaire. This had certainly made him acquire first-hand knowledge of colonialism. He was, moreover, interested in the interrelationship between racial issues and political Marxist causes. In a letter to Canguilhem, Foucault wrote:

Nationalism plus racism adds up to something very nasty. And if you add that, because of their gauchisme, the students lent a hand (and a bit more than a hand) to it all, you feel quite profoundly sad. And one wonders by what strange ruse or (stupidity) of history, Marxism could give rise to that (and supply a vocabulary for it). (Quoted in Macey [1994]: 204)

Indeed, in Foucault's case, his transformation and politicization came about during a self-imposed exile to the neighboring colony of Tunisia. Postcolony had therefore a decisive role to play in giving shape to the work of this prominent thinker. Ahluwalia (2010) states:

Foucault's Tunisian experience provided the impetus for him to develop frameworks which could comprehend the complexity of the political scene post 1968, forcing a rethinking of key social and political institutions. This new form of analysis is one that eventually paved the way for his conceptualization of governmentality, the analysis of who can govern and who is governed but also the means by which that shaping of someone else's activities is achieved. (Ahluwalia [2010]: 6)

in addition, Foucault at some point endorsed 1979 Iranian revolution, although he modified his views on it some time later (Afary, Anderson [2005]: 260). As in September and November 1978, he visited Iran twice. The revolutionary movement in Iran and Foucault shared several passions the most prominent of which was their ardent opposition to the West's colonial policies and imperialism (9).

In fact, Foucault has had a great impact on the humanities and social sciences, as Ahluwalia (2010) concludes that «it can be argued that the post-colonial is embedded deeply at the root of post-structural thinking» (1) and «Michel Foucault's works has been highly influential within postcolonial studies, from informing Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) to the work of subaltern studies and beyond, his analysis of power, authority, modes of surveillance and governmentality have been vital to understanding the dynamics of

the colonial world» (5). Indeed, «the rendition of politics that Foucault witnessed in Tunisia is germane to his later lectures that were released as *Society Must be Defended*» (Schmitt [1985]: 40). In *Society Must be Defended*, Foucault discusses the emergence of a new technology of domination, called biopower, that is not “individualizing”, but “massifying”, that is directed not at the body of one single man, but at man as member of an entire species or a large community of people. So biopower is the control over relations between the human races (Foucault [2003]: 243). In the colonial context it is done by prioritizing one race over another. As Milne explains, E. M. Forster is one of the great figures of English literature who cast a critical and reforming eye on the abuses of the world. His main interest in his works is most often is personal relations and society. And his last novel, *A Passage to India*, portrays the relationship between the British and the Indians in colonial India in the 1920s.

In the central episode of *A Passage to India*, which occurs in the Marabar caves, Aziz, Mrs. Moor, and Miss Adela explore the caves. But Adela is terrified in the caves when she is alone. In fact, she feels that she was assaulted by something or somebody. Aziz becomes the accused of that consummate crime; and this is mostly because he is a dark-skinned Indian. The racial tension between the British and the Indians builds up when Aziz is arrested. Then Fielding, the English principal, comes to defend Aziz. But the British colonists stigmatize Fielding calling him «the blood traitor» (Forster [1924]: 71). The other British colonists, contrary to Fielding, believe that Aziz is guilty. This mystery is not resolved until Adela confesses that nothing happened in the caves and that Aziz was not even in the same cave. When Adela admits that she is wrong and Aziz is not guilty, the colonists assume that Adela is also a traitor who has betrayed the British race. Michel Foucault believes:

An important phenomenon occurred in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: the appearance, one should say the invention, of a new mechanism of

power which had very specific procedures, completely new instruments, and very different equipment. This new mechanism of power applies primarily to bodies and what they do rather than to the land and what it produces. This new type of power, which can therefore no longer be transcribed in terms of sovereignty, is, I believe, one of bourgeois society's great inventions. (Foucault [2003]: 35-36)

So Foucault (2003) calls this new technology of power, biopolitics or biopower. According to him, «it is the right to take life or let live. And this obviously introduces a startling dissymmetry» (240-241). This is the power of modern society which is not repressive. Then Foucault (2003) claims, «unlike discipline, which is addressed to bodies, the new non-disciplinary power is applied not to man as body but to the living man, to man as living-being; ultimately, if you like, to man as species» (242). Then he explains, «biopower is applied in general ways to the population, life, and living beings» (273). The power is practiced on population not individual. This invisible power, however, is not forced upon population but exists everywhere and is invisibly overserved by the population. In addition, Foucault (2003) speculates, «what we are dealing with in this new technology of power is not exactly society (or at least not the social body, as defined by the jurists), nor is it the individual as body. It is a new body, a multiple body, a body with so many heads that, while they might not be infinite in number, can not necessarily be counted». The disciplinary power and repressive power are focused on individuals to regularize them, but biopower is directed on population to normalize all the people of a society. So, biopolitics administers population and it wants to make sure that not the individual life is optimized but make sure that the population life is “improved”. For him this problem is the combination of biological and power's problem (245). So, everybody is subjected to this power and they are constructed to be normal people. Foucault (2003) argues, «what I mean is the acquisition of power over man insofar as man is a living being that the biological came under State control, that

there was at least a certain tendency that leads to what might be termed State control of the biological» (237-238). Sam Holder (2019) states, «The review of *Society Must be Defended* suggests that race theory, postcolonial investigation, and other critical interventions (and interventionists) are well-suited to heed Foucault's encouragement and deploy analyses and engage in praxis to confront contemporary political challenges» (20). Indeed, Foucault explains, «the mechanisms introduced by biopolitics include forecasts, statistical estimates, and overall measures» (246). In fact, it is the state that dominates one group of people over another group based on their biology. It is the domination of one population as superior over another population as inferior. He maintains, «it is indeed the emergence of this biopower that inscribes racism in the mechanisms of the State» (254). Therefore, Foucault describes the other way that power functions and he focused on the normalization of populations.

In this paper, the authors will look into the plot and the dialogue of *A Passage to India*, while drawing on Foucault's theory of biopower as he expounded in *Society Must Be Defended* to find the traces of what Foucault defined as biopower. By the same token, we can clarify the impact Foucault had on an important aspect of colonial or post-colonial studies; namely, the regularization of the subjected race at the hand of the colonial power. As Foucault never directly mentions the relation of his theory of biopower to the post-colonial discourse, Forster's novel portrays the surreptitious domination of the colonialists over the natives through "massifying" a large body of people/race.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In *Periphrasis, Power, and Rape in «A Passage to India»*, Brenda R. Silver (1998) arrives at the association between periphrasis, power, and rape that structures both linguistic and social relations in *A Passage to India* and provides the space for re-reading E. M. Forster's most enigmatic novel.

Drawing on Michel Foucault's *History of Sexuality*, he concludes that to a great extent, the rhetoric of power manifests itself within the novel in the use of synecdoche and metonymy to reduce the other, the signified, to a materiality, a physicality that denies the irreducibility and multiplicity of the individual subject.

Also, in «*A Passage to India*», *the National Movement, and Independence*, Frances B. Singh (1985) points out the novel's relationship to the national movement. It is asserted that «the independence is a complex issue in the novel, and reflects the viewpoints of contemporary politicians such as Mohammed Iqbal, Mohammed Ali, M. K. Gandhi, and Jawaharlal Nehru». Also it is mentioned that «the influence of the Hindu and Muslim religions can be traced in the attitudes and actions of two characters who have been shaped by these religions Godbole and Aziz» (265-278). Actually he compares Aziz with the politicians mentioned above. Singh's reading of the novel is historical and absolutely context-bound which he draws on palpable political and religious overtones of the text.

Moreover, in *Materiality and Mystification in «A Passage to India»*, Benita Parry (1998) mentions, «alongside its many material and sentient Indians, which act to estrange the time-honored topos of a mysterious land, the novel also constructs an obfuscated realm where the secular is scant, and in which India's long traditions of mathematics, science and technology, history, linguistics, and jurisprudence have no place». Then he adds, «But although Forster does juxtapose a mystified to a material and historical India, he did not follow the utopian writers in affirming India as the Wisdom-land of Carpenter's expectations, or in designating it as that farthest destination» (174-194). Parry therefore argues that «the fiction, far from rendering India as epistemologically vacant, reconfigures the sub-continent as a geographical space and social realm abundantly occupied by diverse intellectual modes, cultural forms, and sensibilities» (185).

In another article, titled *Towards an Extended Theory of Face Action: Analyzing Dialogue in*

E.M. Forster's «A Passage to India», by R.A. Buck (1997), the interaction of Brown and Levinson's social principle of face action with speech acts, and the cooperative principle, with general principles of conversational exchange structure are examined in a discourse analysis of selected dialogue between non-intimate characters of unequal power relation in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. He concludes that «the notions of face act and speech act must be kept distinct, and that a social principle of face action not only directs and constrains the linguistic choices made at the level of the sentence but also explains how and why linguistic utterances cohere in large units of extended discourse» (83-106). Indeed, Buck studies the novel linguistically to investigate the social interactions between the characters.

In *Symbolism in E. M. Forster's «A Passage to India»*: Temple, V.A. Shahane (1963) stresses on the unexplored elements of Forster's symbolism, and aims at expounding the significance of the third section of the novel, Temple. He declares, «The three sections: Mosque, Caves, Temple, represent the three seasons of the Indian Year. Mosque is associated with arch, Caves with echo, Temple with sky. These symbols have a positive as well as a negative meaning» (423-431). Here Shahane studies the novel linguistically and literally and examines the symbolism of Marabar caves from an Indian viewpoint.

In *Hinduism in E. M. Forster's: «A Passage to India»*, Michael Spencer (1968) attempts to answer the questions: Is the religion very important in the purpose of the novel or is it more a part of the cultural pattern which forms the background of the lives of the characters? And is Mohammedanism actually more important to the novel than Hinduism, in view of the fact that Aziz is more central in the story than any Hindu? Actually, he mentions, «Hinduism plays the key role in the nature of the character of Godbole, a man whose greatest role is in the third section of the novel. [and] a variety of images [with strong overtones in Hinduism], such as sun, bird, snake, echo, arch, and wasp, run through the novel». Then he continues, «to turn to the novel itself-the best

method of dealing with such an issue we can see Mohammedanism dismissed with the comment that it, like Christianity, does not penetrate very far into the mysteries of reality» (265-278). All in all, however, no considerable writing exists about the study of *A Passage to India* based on Michel Foucault's lecture in *Society Must be Defended* and especially his notion of biopower. And this study is almost the first concentrated attempt to explicate the novel in light of biopower.

DISCUSSION

Forster in *A Passage* tries to show the interaction between Indian and British cultures. The relationship between Major Callendar and Aziz shows how the British elites mistreated the Indians. In chapter two, a servant arrives, bearing a note from the Civil Surgeon; Callendar wishes to see Aziz at his bungalow about a medical case. We notice Callendar resents Aziz's superior skills, and expects Aziz to come immediately as he says, «Why Aziz had not come promptly when summoned» (Forster [1924]: 24). Examples as such illustrate how the British power dominated the Indians no matter if they are from among the educated or upper-class strata of the society. According to Foucault,

In the case of the classic juridical theory of power, power is regarded as a right which can be possessed in the way one possesses a commodity, and which can therefore be transferred or alienated, either completely or partly, through a juridical act or an act that founds a right; it does not matter which, for the moment, thanks to the surrender of something or thanks to a contract. Power is the concrete power that any individual can hold, and which he can surrender, either as a whole or in part, so as to constitute a power or a political sovereignty. (Foucault [2003]: 13)

The life of Indian people in *A Passage* is under power, which is not visible. In fact, the British believe and act in a way that the Indians are not under their control and they are equal to them. Yet, as we study the novel we figure out that this is not true and in fact a hidden mechanism of con-

trol and rule runs through the society. Foucault continues:

Power must, I think, be analyzed as something that circulates, or rather as something that functions only when it is part of a chain. It is never localized here or there, it is never in the hands of some, and it is never appropriated in the way that wealth or a commodity can be appropriated. Power functions. Power is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in those networks; they are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power. In other words, power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them. (Foucault [2003]: 29)

So every individual has got the power but nobody exerts it over others directly. as Danaher et al. (2000) believe, «power for Foucault is not a thing that is held and used by individuals or groups. Rather, it is both a complex flow and a set of relations between different groups and areas of society which changes with circumstances and time» (14).

Indeed, Forster repeats a particular view towards knowledge as power through most of the characters, as Nawab Bahadur says in a part of the novel, «India advances by what is the opposite of superstition which is knowledge that can be gained only by means of education» (Forster [1924]: 100). Fielding is an English school-teacher and is Forster's top man to demonstrate the kind of understanding that the world needs. He believes not only Englishmen, but also educated Indians should help in education as he says, «well-qualified Indians also need jobs in the educational» (Forster [1924]: 114). The need for education as the power is very urgent for Indians according to Aziz as he says, «Mr. Fielding, we must all be educated promptly» (Forster [1924]: 274). Again in another part, Forster insists on his belief in education that gives power to people and he repeats it through Fielding's words as this: «My job's Education. I believe in teaching people to be individuals, and to understand other individuals. It's the only thing I do believe in» (Forster [1924]: 124). Of course, the other English officials look at Indians as a mass, or group, Fielding, however, is

a good-intentioned person. The other educated Indian is Professor Godbole, a Hindu who is separated from the Muslims by his religion and from the English by both his religion and nationality. And then he becomes the Minister of Education at Mau because he loves his people and his aim is to help them by means of education as he mentions, «I am returning to my birthplace in Central India to take charge of education there. I want to start a High School there on sound English lines, that shall be as like Government College as possible» (Forster [1924]: 183). Indeed, Godbole knows that few Indians think education is good, and because the Indians do not believe in the power of education they cannot help themselves. According to Lemm (2017), «Foucault discovered that power went much deeper because it was deeply intertwined with Knowledge» (40). Fielding and Godbole aim to offer a kind of education which is «on sound English lines». So, Aziz believes they can save India in the future by means of education which will be revealed not now but in the future and he makes a statement about future generations driving the English out of India (Forster [1924]: 51). So according to Foucault (2003), «the delicate mechanisms of power cannot function unless knowledge, or rather knowledge apparatuses, are formed, organized, and put into circulation, and those apparatuses are not ideological trimmings or edifices» (33-34). Therefore, this normalizing power exists in society and scientific organizations such as schools and universities are the source of this power because they construct and educate people to be normal. Thus knowledge entails power. This knowledge is not specifically the way of knowing about facts, but is contingent on knowing the discourse and convention of society in order to be considered a "normal" member of society. If they do not acquire this knowledge they are simply ostracized and excluded.

In chapter sixteen, the climactic event happens when Adela is lost in Maraber caves, and then becoming accused of assaulting Adela in the cave, Aziz is sent into prison. Different from other British officers, Mr. Fielding seems to understand the most realistic assessment of colonial system

in India. It is only Fielding who believes that he is innocent and it was impossible for Aziz to have committed this (Forster [1924]: 70). McBryde, the English police superintendent, believes Aziz attacked Adela, even though Adela never tells that he did; as he declares, «the darker races are physically attracted by the fairer, but not vice versa not a matter for bitterness this, not a matter for abuse, but just a fact which any scientific observer will confirm» (Forster [1924]: 96).

Sovereign power for Foucault (2003) is associated with the monarch and it is repressive as the way that prisoners were punished (36). But, Foucault believes there is also a disciplinary power in modern society. There is no violence in it but its punishment is about supervising, controlling and training. Power is not made visible in disciplinary power. So here violence is not used but rules and regulations are used. Above and over the disciplinary power is a «new mechanism of power» (35) which he calls, «biopower» (246). This power «does not exclude disciplinary technology» and it combines with sovereign power. In fact, «this new technique does not simply do away with the disciplinary technique, because it exists at a different level, on a different scale, and because it has a different bearing area, and makes use of very different instruments» (242). In fact, this power is everywhere and it is invisible. And here it is not only powerful people possess power, but everybody is subjected to power. In fact, it is not about laws but about norms and statistics. So, in biopower the opinions are regulated. As in *A Passage* the English opinions are regulated in a way that the Indians are guilty and inferior.

During Aziz' trial we can recognize that Aziz should be guilty because he is Indian. Indeed, he is the symbol of Indian-ness and how a species with dark complexion is destined to behave. So he is judged based on his species. Foucault remarks:

So after a first seizure of power over the body in an individualizing mode, we have a second seizure of power that is not individualizing, but, if you like, massifying, that is directed not at man as body but at man as species. After the anatomo-politics of the human

body established in the course of the eighteenth century, we have, at the end of that century, the emergence of something that is no longer an anatomo-politics of the human body, but what I would call a "biopolitics" of the human race. (Foucault [2003]: 243)

In juridical power, punishment is done on the individual. But biopower administers life and population. And it is focused on species of body. then for optimizing the life of population the groups that are not normal are considered as threats for the population so they should be vanished. So biopolitics or biopower is what Foucault discussed as a new technology of power that we can trace it through *A Passage*. As a matter of fact, Forster depicts the society of India in the novel in a way that we can feel the presence of this new technology of power. In fact, Foucault (2003) declares, «biopolitics last domain is control over relations between the human race, or human beings insofar as they are a species, insofar as they are living beings, and their environment, the milieu in which they live» (244-245). It can be noticed through the relationship between Indian and British people and how the British treat the Indians.

So Foucault (2003) calls «biopower» a power that is applied in general ways to the population, life, and living beings. As Campbell and Sitze (2013) mention, «biopower is, quite simply, a complex web of systems targeting populations and the overall administration of life as its subject» (20). And he explains, «this technology of power, this biopolitics, will introduce mechanisms with a certain number of functions that are very different from the functions of disciplinary mechanisms. The mechanisms introduced by biopolitics include forecasts, statistical estimates, and overall measures» (246). Therefore, biopower includes norms such as color of skin, IQ scores, body size or any measurements. So the society is a normalizing society and People want to appear normal.

On the surface of the novel, there is peace in the society and people have no objection. But as we read it, we can feel the existence of a silent war. Most of the characters are aware of this war but they do not talk about it. Here the reader feels

this war through the behavior of the characters. There are two hypotheses according to Foucault (2003); as he claims, «First hypothesis, which is that the mechanism of power is basically or essentially repression» (15), and the second hypothesis, «Power is war, the continuation of war by other means» (15). In fact, the war exists in a civil society, in all its power relations. Foucault (2003) explains, «according to hypothesis one, the mechanism of power is repression, for the sake of convenience; I will call this Reich's hypothesis, if you like. And according to the second, the basis of the power-relationship lies in a warlike clash between forces, for the sake of convenience, I will call this Nietzsche's hypothesis» (16). Then he continues, «according to this hypothesis, the role of political power is perpetually to use a sort of silent war to re-inscribe that relationship of force, and to re-inscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals» (16). As a result, Foucault (2003) mentions, «war is about two things: it is not simply a matter of destroying a political adversary, but of destroying the enemy race, of destroying that sort of biological threat that those people over there represent to our race» (257). As Downing (2008) believes, «Foucault gestures towards a fruitful reading of class struggle and racial tensions, which are habitually subsumed under the operations of peacetime bio-politics» (19).

India that Forster describes in his novel is suffering from chaos and disorder. In the first part the author describes it as a dead and sad area as he mentions, «the streets are mean, the temples ineffective, and though a few fine houses exist they are hidden away in gardens or down alleys whose filth deters all but the invited guest» (Forster [1924]: 1). Also in Chapter five, Adela tries to see the “real” India. She is a kind of person who wants to see things as they really are. As Baranay (n.d.) asserts, «Adela is eager to embrace the experience of India, with a naïve passion to see the real» (1). Then her curiosity to see the real India makes Turton give a bridge party for her in that he invites some rich Indian families and British foreigners. The Bridge Party was not a success at

least it was not what Mrs. Moore and Adela were accustomed to consider a successful party. «They arrived early, since it was given in their honor, but most of the Indian guests had arrived even earlier and stood massed at the farther side of the tennis lawns, doing nothing» (Forster [1924]: 18). This party did not help Moore and Adela to see the “real” India, because here Forster wants to show the death of Indian people in such gatherings. That is why they could not see the real Indian people as they are not treated as alive people. As Foucault (2003) writes, «power has no control over death, but it can control mortality» (248). This is Foucault's power over life. Here in *A Passage* we can see the power over the life of the Indians. Therefore, Foucault (2003) believes, «broadly speaking, racism justifies the death-function in the economy of biopower by appealing to the principle that the death of others makes one biologically stronger insofar as one is a member of a race or a population, insofar as one is an element in a unitary living plurality» (258). This is considering a group of people as a threat for the normalized population. So it is right to kill them. Therefore, it is the function of biopower through investment and disinvestment. So, race is used for differentiating between who is invested, whose life is optimized and whose life is left to die. Indians are otherized and pushed to believe that potency and life is dead among them. The picture we are given of India and the Indians is of a cleanly sterilized people whose spiritual potency is administered by the British ruling power.

In chapter eighteen, Forster introduces Mr. McBryde, who is the District Superintendent of Police. During the trial of Aziz, he claims, «all unfortunate natives are criminals at heart, for the simple reason that they live south of latitude 30. They are not to blame, they have not a dog's chance we should be like them if we settled here» (Forster [1924]: 73 *emphasis ours*). In fact, according to McBryde, all the Indians are victims because they live in this country. So he assumes Indians have no political right as if they are dead and not being considered alive. It is what Foucault (2003) insists, «When I say “killing”, I obvious-

ly do not mean simply murder as such, but also every form of indirect murder: the fact of exposing someone to death, increasing the risk of death for some people, or, quite simply, political death, expulsion, rejection, and so on» (256). Indeed, Forster portrays the political death of Indians. Here racist acts do not mean the treatment of an individual anymore, it is an institutionalized and deeply fossilized procedure of literal and metaphoric “mass murder” and zombification. It is performed by shifting resources from the inferior group; by not giving them sources they need to have a successful life. In this way they are protecting the life of the English by keeping away the right of a living entity from the Indians.

Adela wishes to see «the real India» (Forster [1924]: 12). She complains that they have seen nothing of India, because she wants to find out the Indian culture and be among the Indian civilians and talk with them. But she faces India which is governed by the English, rather a replica of England. In fact, Forster describes this country clearly that we can understand through Adela's curiosity and effort to see the real India with the effect of ruling state in this country. The English state controls the country as a replica of England without giving them the right of originality. In Chapter Five, during which Foucault critiques the Hobbesian theory of sovereignty, he also briefly refers to the “boomerang effect” of colonial practice, beginning in the late sixteenth century. «A whole series of colonial models was brought back to the West... and the result was that the West could practice something resembling colonization, or an internal colonialism, on itself» (Foucault [2003]: 52).

At the end Forster (1924) notes, «Indians should be citizens of their own nation» (340). He concludes India does not need English officials and interference, but it needs an Indian state that can provide the basis of education for Indians. So this novel states Indian people are able to make their own country without the English forces. Forster expresses this idea in the words of Aziz as he says, «India shall be a nation! No foreigners of any sort! Hindu and Moslem and Sikh and all shall be one!» (Forster [1924]: 340). Obviously, Aziz is the

young Indian doctor whom Adele accuses. He is politicized, as we would say now, by his arrest. He comes into the novel already bitter about the English and after the trial goes to live in an Indian-ruled state. Then in another part of the novel Aziz says, «what does unhappiness matter when we are all unhappy together?» (Forster [1924]: 72). So, Aziz excitedly declares that India must be united and the British be driven out. This would have been a fervently ideal desire that, even if materialized, surely would not have put things way where they used to be before the colonial rule. Bio-politics, in fact, functions even when a race is physically absent in a previously colonial area.

Said (1994) maintains that «imperialism is not about a moment in history; it is about a continuing interdependent discourse between subject peoples and the dominant discourse of the empire. Despite the apparent and highly-praised end of colonialism, the unstated assumptions on which empire was based linger on, eliminating visions of an “Other” world without domination and restricting the imaginary of equality and justice» (35). In the novel the Indians are treated as an inferior race. The English interact with the Indians as if they interact with their servants. In chapter three, when Ronny explains about the Indians to his Mom, he scorns them:

It's the educated native's latest dodge. They used to cringe, but the younger generation believes in a show of manly independence. They think it will pay better with the itinerant M.P. But whether the native swaggers or cringes, there's always something behind every remark he makes, always something and if nothing else he's trying to increase his izzat in plain Saxon, to score. Of course there are exceptions. (Forster [1924]: 14)

According to Downing (2008), «Foucault's discussion of race is strangely silent on the subject of colonialism» (19). But as we read Foucault (2003), he clearly states that «racism first develops with colonization, or in other words, with colonizing genocide» (257). Also, he declares,

The other race is basically not the race that came from elsewhere or that was, for a time, triumphant

and dominant, but that it is a race that is permanently, ceaselessly infiltrating the social body, or which is, rather, constantly being re-created in and by the social fabric. In other words, what we see as a polarity, as a binary rift within society, is not a clash between two distinct races. It is the splitting of a single race into a super-race and a sub-race. (61)

Said (2003), who was seriously engaged with Foucauldian methodologies, also believes, «there are Westerners, and there are Orientals. The former dominate; the latter must be dominated» (36). In chapter five, Mrs. Turton's idea exemplifies the racism as she says, «You're superior to them, anyway. Don't forget that. You're superior to everyone in India except one or two of the Ranis and they're on equality» (Forster [1924]: 19). Likewise, Foucault (2003) comments:

It is a way of separating out the groups that exist within a population. It is in short, a way of establishing a biological-type caesura within a population that appears to be a biological domain. This will allow power to treat that population as a mixture of races, or to be more accurate, to treat the species, to subdivide the species it controls, into the subspecies known, precisely, as races. That is the first function of racism: to fragment, to create caesuras within the biological continuum addressed by biopower. (Foucault [2003]: 255)

In fact, society is divided by the binary mode of race war. Species are divided to subspecies by studying their biology. In chapter three, Mrs. Calendar says that the kindest thing one can do to a native is to let him die (Forster [1924]: 12). This is what Foucault (2003) points out, «racism is the break between what must live and what must die. The appearance within the biological continuum of the human race of races, the distinction among races, the hierarchy of races, the fact that certain races are described as good and that others, in contrast, are described as inferior» (254-255). So, this is how killing is justified in order to defend society. In all, Foucault (2003) states, «the very fact that you let more die will allow you to live more» (255). In such situation the Indians are the threat for the English. Even though, they are in

India that is not the English people's country; the English protect their race by letting more Indians die. In addition, Foucault (2003) remarks,

On the one hand, racism makes it possible to establish a relationship between my life and the death of the other that is not a military or warlike relationship of confrontation, but a biological-type relationship: The more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as a whole, and the more I, as species rather than individual, can live, the stronger I will be, the more vigorous I will be. I will be able to proliferate. The fact that the other dies does not mean simply that I live in the sense that his death guarantees my safety; the death of the other, the death of the bad race, of the inferior race (or the degenerate, or the abnormal) is something that will make life in general healthier: healthier and purer. This is not, then, a military, warlike, or political relationship, but a biological relationship. (Foucault [2003]: 255-256).

«I know all about *him*. I don't know *him*» (Forster [1924]: 38 emphasis ours). Although Fielding presumes that he knows Aziz's race, he is unsettled when he realizes that Aziz is an individual whose traits and characteristics might be at odds with a general preconception the British have about the Indian race. This is where biopolitical strategies of a dominating race fails, albeit for a short moment, to hold to its presumably categorically indubitable ideological cornerstones.

However, as a matter of fact, this racism, through the exertion of biopolitics, controls the population. Here it protects the English population from the Indians who are "inferior" to them. So, they do this by isolating and excluding the bad race. Hence, a surreptitious war for power and retrieval of the rights breaks out between the opposing races.

In chapter eight, it is remarked that Ronny has a racist conclusion about Indians as he expresses his opinion about Aziz's collar-stud:

Aziz was exquisitely dressed, from tie-pin to spats, but he had forgotten his back collar-stud and there you have the Indian all over: inattention to detail; the

fundamental slackness that reveals the race. Similarly, to "meet" in the caves as if they were the clock at Charring Cross, when they're miles from a station and each other. (Forster [1924]: 35)

Ronny massifies Aziz, only to remind us that in spite of all what Aziz does to show how tidy and formal he is clothed, still he «reveals the race», by his «inattention to detail». However, Foucault (2003) emphasizes that

It will become the discourse of a centered, centralized, and centralizing power. It will become the discourse of a battle that has to be waged not between races, but by a race that is portrayed as the one true race, the race that holds power and is entitled to define the norm, and against those who deviate from that norm, against those who pose a threat to the biological heritage. (61)

Modern racism does not deal with the individual only. This is different from what we read about the dark-skinned people who had no right many centuries ago. As Foucault (2003) asserts, «in the biopower system, in other words, killing or the imperative to kill is acceptable only if it results not in a victory over political adversaries, but in the elimination of the biological threat to and the improvement of the species or race» (256). Therefore, race is the biologization of war. This racism is not only prejudice. It functions as recognition of worthy and unworthy life. And it operates within biopower. Here the Indian race is the biological threat to the English.

This new technology of power surely includes modern racism. Similarly, Foucault (2003) notes, «so you can understand the importance, I almost said the vital importance, of racism to the exercise of such power: it is the precondition for exercising the right to kill» (256). Then he continues, «the specificity of modern racism, or what gives it its specificity, is not bound up with mentalities, ideologies, or the lies of power. It is bound up with the technique of power, with the technology of power» (258). In the novel we find out that racism is an aspect of the social organization of the colonial state. In fact, there is no sovereign power

and there are no laws about the right to exclude Indians. But through biopower, the power of the English over life of Indians, it is right to disinvest the Indians or not to consider right for them. As Foucault (2003) tells us, «so racism is bound up with the workings of a State that is obliged to use race, the elimination of races and the purification of the race, to exercise its sovereign power» (258). And he continues, «racism is the indispensable precondition that allows someone to be killed, that allows others to be killed. Once the State functions in the biopower mode, racism alone can justify the murderous function of the State» (256). Indeed, the racism that Forster depicts in the novel is not the one that is depicted repeatedly like slavery of a group of people as in Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Kelly (2004) adds, «when Foucault claims that "the modern state can scarcely function without becoming involved with racism at some point, within certain lines and subject to certain conditions..." he is not talking about "ordinary racism", which is to say, the simple hatred of other races, but rather, state racism, biological racism» (3).

In the novel, Forster shows us a big chaos in India which is made at the hands of the British. Ronny best exemplifies English officials who thinks nothing is private in India as if he looks at India as a prison not a society in which life goes on and he thinks Indians have no right, not even having private things, as Ronny believes, «India isn't home» (Forster [1924]: 29). In fact, there is a feeling of superiority of the British ruling class and the sting the Indian feels as the subject race. Or in bridge party Forster depicts Indian guests as shy and timid people who think they are oppressed by English foreigners even in the party, that Turton compares the Indians in the party to an island which has no change and is not allowed to grow, as he says, «an island bared by the turning tide, and bound to grow» (Forster [1924]: 37). Here the Indians know they are being watched. So, they monitor themselves too to make sure they are following norms. and this is the internalization of gaze in biopower. Basically society supervises people but everyone is supervising him/herself too.

In another part of the novel Aziz says «I wear collar to pass the police because they think I am an Englishman so they do not notice me» (Forster [1924]: 28). Also Foucault (2003) remarks, «it is no longer: “We have to defend ourselves against society”, but we have to defend society against all the biological threats posed by the other race, the subrace, the counterrace that we are, despite ourselves, bringing into existence» (61). Lemm agrees as he supports Foucault, «this division is instrumental to conceiving the distinction between self and other, friend and enemy, no longer in military terms but in biological ones» (43). So, there is always an ongoing war that is a biological war. Its aim is the life of a population that should be defended and protected against another population that is a threat.

In the other part Fielding, who is an educated Englishman confesses that «England holds India for her good» (Forster [1924]: 114). Indeed, the most obvious example of injustice and chaos in India is the trial for Aziz before which Ronny sends away his mother to England who is a witness. So, Adela's supposed assault becomes an excuse for the British officials to exercise authority over their Indian subjects with Aziz as the example. Chakraborty (n.d.) asserts, «Forster intended to show how officialism worked to corrupt the English, whether they began as decent fellows or not» (5). Similarly, Foucault (2003) declares, «a state racism is a racism that society will direct against itself, against its own elements and its own products» (62). As Kelly (2004) notes, «the coexistence of biopolitics and the sovereign right to kill is a fact. Hence there needs to be a way in which this killing can be squared with biopolitics. This is where state racism comes in» (3). So, it is a decision for mass murder of Indians, who are inferior race for the English.

According to Lemke (2011), the health of higher race depends on the death of lower race (65). During Aziz' trial in chapter sixteen, it is noticed that the British court insists that Aziz is guilty. Aziz is just a symbol of Indian people that the state accuses without any sensible justification. This is what Foucault (2003) wants to tell us, «in

one sense, to say that the sovereign has a right of life and death means that he can, basically, either have people put to death or let them live, or in any case that life and death are not natural or immediate phenomena which are primal or radical, and which fall outside the field of power» (240). And he continues, «it is the power to make live and let die. The right of sovereignty was the right to take life or let live. And then this new right is established: the right to make live and to let die» (241). We see in the novel that Indian people live in their own country, apparently there is no slavery, and there is peace in their lives, but there is a big shadow of racism in their lives and their life and death is closely administered by disciplinary and bio powers. In the words of Foucault (2003):

It is indeed the emergence of this biopower that inscribes racism in the mechanisms of the State. It is at this moment that racism is inscribed as the basic mechanism of power, as it is exercised modern States. As a result, the modern State can scarcely function without becoming involved with racism at some point, within certain limits and subject to certain conditions. (Foucault [2003]: 254)

In chapter three, when Adela is asking about how to keep in touch with Indian people, Turton answered her, «well, we don't come across them socially, he said, laughing. They're full of all the virtues, but we don't and it's now eleven-thirty and too late to go into the reasons» (Forster [1924]: 12). Forster displays his objection to this way of thinking which negligently otherizes the Indians and is done through most of the English characters such as, Turton, Burton, McBryde, and Major Callendar. Through the novel we understand that it is normal for Indians, too. This kind of rude behavior towards Indians become normalized in their society. According to Foucault (2003), «the norm is something that can be applied to both a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize» (253). «Norms seem to have their place primarily in the knowledge of populations, since they demarcate distributions» (Gutting [2005]: 118). Forster successfully depicts this regularization in the society of India. In the

words, as Lemm (2017) holds, «when one does not follow norms, one is not breaking them; one is simply showing dysfunctional or abnormal behavior» (42). Also, Gutting (2005) states, «Foucault most often discussed normalization as a technique of power» (119). Indeed, the English primarily changed the norms of society instead of punishing and setting disciplines for Indians. As Foucault (2003) asserts, «it is, in a word, a matter of taking control of life and the biological processes of man as species and of ensuring that they are not disciplined, but regularized» (246-247). So, this invisible power in Indian society is not repressive, it is normalizing. In fact, nobody has forced the power upon people. The power makes people do what they have to do. Indeed, the normalizing society regulates people.

CONCLUSION

Biopower that Foucault discusses is a new mechanism of power that has been a matter of utmost importance in colonized societies. In the (post-)colonial era, the colonizers do scarcely use force or violence for controlling a large population. This new mechanism of power functions surreptitiously by fossilizing its ideological bases in the mind of an entire race. One side of this “war” comes to believe that they have the right to administer the life/death of the other race and, on the other hand, the subjugated race begins to struggle with the idea that if they truly deserve to be kept under the surveillance of the “superior” race. Biopower is more impressive than other forms of power such as sovereign and disciplinary, because it is not the technology of controlling individuals, but of a large population. It actually affects an entire society not just an individual. In *A Passage to India*, it can be noticed that the English power which dominated the Indian society, is more than mere sovereign or disciplinary power. Apparently, the English officials try to manage the country in the way of improving it. But we realize that the English power is in fact subjugating the Indian race to improve their own and this is done

through massifying and controlling the population of the “impure” Indian race. Through the exertion of biopower, although the Indian people are portrayed as if they live, work, breathe, talk, etc. they have in fact, been spiritually mass-murdered by the ruling colonial power. Overall, the English officials control India not by means of prejudiced disciplines, but by normalizing the colonial power and domination. The biopower as defined by Foucault and as illustrated in *A Passage* thus can help to explain how for decades the colonial powers managed to regulate and normalize their stay in and domination over a nation.

REFERENCES

- Afary, J., Anderson, K. (2005), *Foucault and the Iranian revolution*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ahluwalia, P., 2010: *Post-structuralism's colonial roots: Michel Foucault*, “Social Identities Journal” 16(5).
- Baranay, I., n.d.: *Aspects of Two Novels: E.M. Forster's A Passage to India and Neem Dreams*. n.p, n.p.
- Buck, R.A., 1997: *Towards an Extended Theory of Face Action: Analyzing Dialogue in E.M. Forster's A Passage to India*, “Pragmatics J.” 27, pp. 83-106.
- Campbell, T., Sitze, A. (eds.), 2013: *Biopolitics: A Reader*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- Chakraborty, B., n.d.: *East is East and West is West, and Never the Twine Shall Meet*. In Rev. of *A Passage to India*, by E. M. Forster, pp. 1-9.
- Danaher, G., Schirato, T., Webb, J., 2000: *Understanding Foucault*, ALLEN & UNWIN pub, Australia.
- Donahue, T., n.d.: *Orientalism in E M Forsters A Passage to India*, “SOAS University of London”.
- Downing, L., 2008: *Life, Texts, Contexts*, in the Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault, Cambridge university press, Cambridge, pp. 19.
- Forster, E. M., 1924: *A Passage to India*, Orlando, HarcourtPrint.

- Foucault, M., 2003: *Society Must Be Defended* in Lecture at the College De France 1975-76, ed. By A. I. Davidson, Transl. by D. Macey, Picador, New York.
- Gutting, G., 2005: *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Cambridge University Press, USA.
- Haviara-Kehaidou, E., 2005: *Arthur Miller's Ethics of Art and His Cold War Family Drama*, "Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies" 11 (2), pp. 7-28.
- Hegel, G.W.F., 1977: (Translated by) *Phenomenology of the Spirit*, transl. by A.V. Miller, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Holder, S., 2019: *Revising Society Must be Defended by Michel Foucault*, "Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal" 16 (4), pp. 20.
- Kelly, M., 2004: *Racism, Nationalism and Biopolitics: Foucault's Society Must Be Defended*, "Contretemps Journal" 4, p. 3.
- Lemke, T., 2011: *Biopolitics: an Advanced Introduction*, transl. by M. Z. Goharpour, F. S. Mirahmadi, Sales, Tehran.
- Lemm, V., Vatter, M., 2017: *Foreword*, in *Handbook of Biology and Politics*, ed. by S.A. Peterson, A. Somit, Edward Elgar Pub, UK.
- Macey, D., 1994: *The lives of Michel Foucault*, Vintage, London.
- Parry, B., 1998: *Materiality and Mystification in A Passage to India*, "NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction" 31(2), pp. 174-194.
- Said, E., 1994: *Culture and Imperialism*, Random House, New York.
- Said, E., 2003: *Orientalism*, Penguin Books.
- Schmitt, C., 1985: *Political theology: Four chapters on the concept of sovereignty*, trans. by G. Schwab, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Shahane, V. A., 1963: *Symbolism in E. M. Forster's A Passage to India: Temple*, "Journal of English Studies" 44(1-6), pp. 423-431.
- Silver, B.R., 1998: *Periphrasis, Power, and Rape in A Passage to India*, "NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction" 22(1), pp. 86-105.
- Singh, F.B., 1985: *A Passage to India, the National Movement, and Independence*, "Twentieth Century Literature" 31(2), pp. 265-278.
- Spencer, M., 1968: *Hinduism in E. M. Forster's: A Passage to India*, "The Journal of Asian Studies" 27(2), pp. 281-295.
- Young, R., 2001: *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*, Blackwells, Oxford.