

On: 20 March 2014, At: 23:43

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



History and Anthropology

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ghan20>

Introduction: Anthropology, Collecting and Colonial Governmentalities

Tony Bennett, Ben Dibley & Rodney Harrison

Published online: 03 Mar 2014.

To cite this article: Tony Bennett, Ben Dibley & Rodney Harrison (2014) Introduction: Anthropology, Collecting and Colonial Governmentalities, *History and Anthropology*, 25:2, 137-149, DOI: [10.1080/02757206.2014.882838](https://doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2014.882838)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2014.882838>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Versions of published Taylor & Francis and Routledge Open articles and Taylor & Francis and Routledge Open Select articles posted to institutional or subject repositories or any other third-party website are without warranty from Taylor & Francis of any kind, either expressed or implied, including, but not limited to, warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Any opinions and views expressed in this article are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor & Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Taylor & Francis and Routledge Open articles are normally published under a Creative Commons Attribution License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>. However, authors may opt to publish under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/> Taylor & Francis and Routledge

Open Select articles are currently published under a license to publish, which is based upon the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial No-Derivatives License, but allows for text and data mining of work. Authors also have the option of publishing an Open Select article under the Creative Commons Attribution License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>.

It is essential that you check the license status of any given Open and Open Select article to confirm conditions of access and use.

Introduction: Anthropology, Collecting and Colonial Governmentalities

Tony Bennett, Ben Dibley & Rodney Harrison

This special issue contributes to an emerging literature on the materialities of colonial government by considering the changing relations between practices of data collecting, styles of anthropological knowing and modes of governing which target the conduct of colonial and metropolitan populations. Drawing on comparative studies from Australia; the Australian administered territory of Papua; France; French Indo-China; New Zealand; North America and the UK; the papers consider the implications of different forms of knowledge associated with practices of collecting—anthropology, archaeology, folklore studies, demography—in apparatuses of rule in various late nineteenth and early twentieth-century contexts. This introduction outlines the rationale for the volume and elaborates the concept of “anthropological assemblage” which helps focus the authors’ explorations of the socio-technical agencements which connected museum, field, metropolis and colony during this period. In doing so, it points towards a series of broader themes—the relationship between pastoral power and ethnographic expertise; the Antipodean career of the Americanist culture concept; and the role of colonial centres of calculation in the circulation of knowledge, practices of collecting and regimes of governing—which suggest productive future lines of inquiry for “practical histories” of anthropology.

Keywords: Anthropological Assemblages; Collecting; Governmentality; Materiality; Museums

Correspondence to: Ben Dibley, Institute for Culture and Society, University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
Email: ben.dibley@gmail.com

© 2014 The Author(s). Published by Taylor & Francis.

This is an Open Access article. Non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly attributed, cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way, is permitted. The moral rights of the named author(s) have been asserted.

The papers brought together in this special issue of *History and Anthropology* have their origin in the workshop, “Colonial Governmentalities”, held in late October 2012 and hosted by the Institute for Culture and Society at the University of Western Sydney. The impetus for this event was the research collaboration, “Museum, Field, Metropolis, Colony: Practices of Social Governance”.¹ We provide a brief outline of this initiative as a context for situating this special issue. We then identify the intellectual rationales that cohere the papers that are brought together here, and indicate how each paper contributes to their development. We then identify a further set of connecting themes emerging from the papers which suggest productive avenues for future inquiry as a prelude to our conclusion.

Context

“Museum, Field, Metropolis, Colony” examines the changing relations between museum practices and the governance of metropolitan and colonial populations during the early development of anthropology’s fieldwork phase. Comparative in approach, it focuses on a series of case studies: the Torres Strait Expeditions and the influence of their team members, particularly Alfred Cort Haddon, in developing anthropology in Britain and the Dominions as a university discipline and an administrative science; Baldwin Spencer’s and Frank Gillen’s fieldwork in Central Australia and Spencer’s roles as director of the Museum of Victoria and as Protector of Aborigines; Franz Boas’ involvement in the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, his curatorial work at the American Museum of Natural History, and his influence on the early development of multicultural policies in the USA; Paul Rivet’s and Georges Henri Rivi re’s roles in the establishment of the *Mus e de l’Homme* and the *Mus e des Arts et Traditions Populaires* and the relationship of French ethnology to the administration of French West Africa and Indo-China and to the study and display of provincial folklore; Mass Observation as a form of “anthropology at home” and its role in the development of new forms of cultural governance in the UK; and M ori and Polynesian ethnography as it developed under the auspices of Wellington’s Dominion Museum and Dunedin’s Otago Museum, and its role in New Zealand’s assimilation policies and the administration of its Pacific dependencies.

These case studies are examined with the intention of investigating: first, how museums became more closely involved in the governance of colonized populations during the early fieldwork phase of anthropology’s history; and second, the differences and similarities between the roles of museums in these respects in “settler” and conquest colonial contexts. The project also advances a number of theoretical concerns that (a) explore the implications of Foucault’s account of liberal government for approaches to the practical histories of anthropology in both colonial and metropolitan contexts, as well as across and between them; and (b) develop and apply new theoretical concepts and methods for the analysis of museums by exploring the relations between governmentality theory, assemblage theory and actor-network theory for the light they throw on the institutional properties and entanglements of museums.

The workshop brought together an international group of researchers that included the project's team and invited participants to share work that addressed these concerns.² Participants were invited to examine questions of colonial governmentalities by investigating the ways in which practices of collecting cultures were connected with those targeting the conduct of colonial subjects and populations: that is, with the implications of different kinds of knowledge associated with practices of collecting—anthropology, archaeology, folklore studies and demography—for the functioning of apparatuses of rule in various late nineteenth and early twentieth-century colonial contexts. This special issue brings together a selection of these papers, revised and developed since their workshop presentations.

Rationales

The literature bringing a Foucaultian analytics of government to colonial situations is now rich and well advanced (Scott 1995; Stolar 1995; Bennett 2004; White 2005; Legg 2007; Petterson 2012). A significant contribution has been made by investigations of the role of anthropology in colonial government (Thomas 1994; Pels 1997; Pels and Salemink 1999). These have supplied important insights into the processes through which colonial subjects and populations come to be constituted both as objects of knowledge and as sites of intervention. However, the recent “material turn” in cultural analysis informed by assemblage theory and actor-network theory has given cause to qualify and refine these arguments (Bennett and Joyce 2010; Bennett and Healy 2011). In particular, this turn has insisted that greater attention be paid to the technologies, techniques and devices through which relations of knowledge and power are composed, and, through which relations between the governors and the governed are assembled. With regard to the analysis of colonial rule this has demanded more fine-grained investigations that trace the socio-technical assemblages in which particular expert knowledges are implicated and specific forms of authority are exercised (Bennett 2009, 2010; Dias 2010; also see Otter 2007). This special issue contributes to this emerging literature on the materialities of colonial government by taking as its focus a particular type of practice: the collection of anthropological data.

The essays gathered here deploy this optic to investigate how collecting practices are enmeshed in particular networks of relations (see also Bennett 2013; Harrison 2013). These concern the assemblages of human and non-human elements—of the human bodies, recording devices, paper techniques, theoretical statements and so on—through which anthropological data are gathered, distributed and made calculable. Although regionally dispersed, drawing on the colonial experiences of Britain, France, North America, Australia and New Zealand, the case studies examined share a particular chronological focus, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In these different national contexts, this period is significant for the emergence of anthropology as a disciplinary knowledge formation, for the advancement of “native policy” as a scientifically informed administrative practice, and for related conceptions of its application “at home”. As their point of departure, contributors have focussed on specific mechanisms of data gathering—whether they be those associated with the

museum collection, the photographic archive, the population census, the social survey or the anthropologist's office. By focussing on the socio-technical assemblages in which particular collecting practices are enmeshed, these papers map the trajectories of various “immutable and combinable mobiles” (Latour 1987)—the photographic image, the collected object, the survey form and so on—through which ethnographic data become knowable, portable and programmable as they circulate from sites of gathering to centres of calculation and, once transformed by the ordering practices of such centres, back to the field in a variety of forms.

The papers also address questions of “the conduct of conduct” central to the analytics of government, examining how technologies of collection are implicated in shaping the conduct of both the governors and the governed. In this regard, it is important to note that the rubric, “colonial governmentalities”, under which these essays are gathered, does not refer exclusively to situations of formal colonialism. Rather, it is used to evoke two connected but distinct sets of relations—one spatial and one political. The first concerns a regional distinction between the metropole and colony, which includes (though is not limited to) a geopolitical distinction, between, say, Britain and its dependencies. We are also concerned with the role of anthropology in the production of similarly organized relations within metropolitan powers between the capital city and its various hinterlands. The second concerns the distinction, which is central to Foucault's conception of liberal government, between those mechanisms of governing that work through the forms of freedom they organize and those which operate coercively. We are particularly interested in the divisions that colonial governmentalities work through in designating colonized populations—or sections thereof—as being below the thresholds required for freedom's rule to be applied. Not limited to colonial subjects alone, such targets can also include the working classes, rural populations as “folk” subjects, as well as women and children. These groups have been subjected to directive forms of rule in which they too are denied—through similar logics to which their colonial counterparts were subject—the attributes deemed necessary for liberal subject-hood: the capacity to practice a responsabilized freedom.

What these papers share, then, is a concern with the analytics of colonial governmentality which seeks to investigate the regimes of practices through which particular anthropological entities—“the dying Native” (Rowse 2014), the habits of “the masses” (Harrison 2014), or the secret/sacred *tywerrenge* (Batty 2014), for examples—emerge, stabilize and change as they work the interface between the governors and the governed. To draw out in more detail some of the key historical and theoretical coordinates that the papers engage, it is useful to consider the particular relationship between governmentality and anthropology in this period, and to elaborate on the concept of “anthropological assemblages” which implicitly or explicitly informs the approaches taken by each of the authors to their empirical material.

Governmentality and Anthropology

The period considered by the authors—from the late nineteenth century through to the Second World War—is a period during which the relationship between anthropology

and the state was transformed. Contributors discuss a range of initiatives in which anthropologists were initially involved outside of the state early in this period which later became aligned with state-sponsored programmes. In this they document a process Foucault (2007, 109) termed “the governmentalisation of the state” where relations come to be “established between political rule and other projects and techniques for the calculated administration of life” (Miller and Rose 2008, 69). However, read collectively, the papers also constitute an attempt to disconnect arguments about “the practical history of anthropology” from the assumption that the relationship between anthropology and governmentality can only be identified under circumstances where there is a direct or identifiable impact on the administrative practices of the state. Of course there are a number of instances where this can be demonstrated (see Dibley 2014, for example), but arguments about governmentality have a broader orientation: that of the respects in which knowledge practices provide means of acting on populations and individuals on the part of experts whose relations to state administrative practices might take many forms—as parts of administrative bureaus, or as agents outside such bureaus whose activities nonetheless impinge on and effect in various ways the discourses and apparatuses which such bureaus employ in conceptualizing, organizing, and legitimizing their practices (see Bennett 2014; Harrison 2014).

Tony Bennett’s formulations on the role played by the post-Boasian concept of culture in providing a “working surface on the social” offer a useful example. Here, Bennett, quoting John Dewey, argues that “culture” constitutes:

the mediating surface on and through which government, guided by science, must seek to shape passions, desires and interests by acting not “directly upon individuals but indirectly through their incorporation within culture” ... in ways that allow a balanced apportionment of the relations between government and freedom. (Bennett 2014, 151–152)

Culture in this sense becomes what Foucault has termed a “transactional reality”, mediating the interface between the governed and the governing. But it would be misleading to limit our analyses of the relationship between governmentality and anthropology to the particular contours of the “culture” concept. Indeed, anthropology’s distinctive contribution to processes of governing has consisted precisely in the *variability* of the conduits it has organized for acting on populations. Boasian “culture” provides one strong example of this (Bennett 2014), but contributors to the special issue identify a number of other transactional realities which served to mediate relations of governmentality: “the dying native” (Rowse 2014), “native culture” (Dibley 2014), and “morale” (Harrison 2014) are all examples of entities that have emerged to work this interface.

“Anthropological Assemblages”

Assemblage theory has been invoked in numerous ways to illuminate the practical histories of anthropology, perhaps most notably by Ong and Collier (2005) in the attention they have drawn to its role in deterritorializing global assemblages of varied kinds. The term “anthropological assemblages” is proposed as a means of engaging with the ways in which, in their early twentieth-century forms, anthropological museums

operated at the intersections of different socio-material networks: those connecting them to the public spheres of the major metropolitan powers, those linking them to the institutions and practices of colonial administration, and those comprising the relations between museum, field and university. With regard to the last of these, Bennett (2013) has proposed the concept of “fieldwork *agencement*” to cover much the same ground as Clifford’s (1992, 100) concept of “the *préterrain*”, but with two important differences.³ Bennett uses the term in a more restricted sense to refer to the more immediate forces—transport systems, the mediating roles of missionaries or colonial administrators, the technologies of filming or recording, the use of tents as locations in close proximity to but distinct from “the field”—organizing the fieldwork situation (Bennett 2013). Clifford’s concept of the *préterrain* is more expansive, including the role of discursive factors and that of the longer set of networks—from point of conception and origin through to the fieldwork situation itself—which organize the anthropological encounter. However, the concept of *agencement* adds something that Clifford’s account does not accentuate: a stress on the distribution of agency across the relations between human actors (anthropologists, Indigenous “subjects” and “informants”) and non-human actors, particularly in recognizing the role of the various technical instruments and devices (film and sound recording instruments, cameras, callipers, anthropometers, etc.) which, depending on how “data” are defined, determine how they are collected and processed.⁴

We intend the concept of “anthropological assemblages”, then, to encompass (i) the whole set of relations and processes, from origin and conception, which condition anthropologists’ routes to, conceptions of, and modes of entry into “the field”, including the role of anthropological discourses—of culture, of “Man”, of the environment, of race—within such processes; (ii) the relations between the anthropologists and the other agents—human and non-human—in the more immediate fieldwork contexts in which data are collected and subjected to initial processing; (iii) the routes through which the anthropologists return to “base”, the mechanisms through which the materials and data they have collected are subjected to institutionally specific processes of ordering and classification; and (iv) the manner in which such materials and data are connected to the institutions and networks through which, whether in the public sphere, in relation to the tasks of colonial administration, or those of social management “at home”, anthropology is governmentally deployed, by either state or non-state actors, to bring about changes in the conduct of specific populations. This concept provides a distinctive empirical and conceptual orientation to the papers collected in this special issue.

The Papers

In the opening paper Bennett investigates anthropology’s changing affiliations with the apparatuses of the field, the museum and the university over the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Examining these relations, he is concerned to analyse anthropology’s place in relation to liberal governmentality. To this end, Bennett examines the different governmental rationalities informing the deployments of anthropology across the relations between museum, field, public and administrative practices associated

with the early twentieth-century formations of Australian, American and French anthropology. He pays particular attention, in the last two cases, to the ways in which the relations between field and museum affected the exhibition practices of the *Musée de l'Homme* under Paul Rivet and the American Museum of Natural History under Franz Boas. Working with these formulations, Bennett traces the ways in which anthropology was implicated in liberal rule, particularly through its role in differentiating populations with respect to their varying capacities for freedom. He focuses particularly on varied aspects of the post-Boasian career of the culture concept in this regard.

The next two papers are concerned with the complex and ambivalent ways particular ethnographic technologies were folded into apparatuses of colonial rule. In her paper Elizabeth Edwards examines the photographic collecting practices of the Colonial Office over the 1860–1870s. Tracing the epistemic procedures through which photography and its role in colonial government operated, she qualifies arguments that posit a ready fit between colonial photography and colonial rule. Rather, Edwards provides an account of a more fragile colonial project in which the purpose and use of photographs were marked by uncertainty, where their acquisition was far from systematic and their evidential quality far from secure. Edwards argues that the photographic archive of the Colonial Office did not constitute information to be mobilized in colonial action, but rather served as a “form of reassurance” in the face of the radical contingencies of colonial rule. In her paper, Nélia Dias, provides an analysis of a research trip to former French Indo-China, which Paul Rivet, director of the *Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro* (MET), conducted in the early 1930s under the auspices of the *Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient* (EFEO). Dias is concerned to investigate the affinities between administrative ethnographic practices and ethnographic research. She does so by examining the ethnographic surveys conducted by the EFEO and the relationships between local collectors in the field and the MET. In drawing out the geographical dimension of Rivet's Indo-China research and the role of colonial infrastructure in securing the submission of Indigenous populations, Dias argues that administrative ethnographic practices were oriented towards the management of territory, while ethnographic research focused on listing and registering ways of controlling the territory. Here the ethnography/administrative nexus was already so strongly forged as to render the project of an ethnographic museum redundant.

The fourth and fifth papers consider how particular museum and museum-like collecting practices, and their associated styles of knowledge, came to be aligned with various administrative practices governing colonial milieus and metropolitan publics. Fiona Cameron turns to a formative moment in the history of anthropology in New Zealand as it was institutionalized as both disciplinary and administrative knowledge directed at the material conditions of Indigenous life. She considers the anthropological apparatuses emerging under the auspices of the New Zealand state during the opening decades of the twentieth century, focussing on H. Devenish Skinner and his work on Māori and Pacific artefacts at both the Otago Museum and Otago University. Cameron traces the networks in which Skinner's collecting, teaching and research practices were located, emphasizing in particular the importance of Clark Wissler's “culture

areas” concept for these. Cameron considers how Skinner’s research was linked with particular centres of calculation, especially through his association with the Board of Māori Ethnological Research. In his paper, Rodney Harrison reviews the project of Mass Observation by investigating its epistemic procedures, collecting practices and its connection with surrealism. He contends that Mass Observation was a “‘museological’ project”, arguing not only from its conception that Mass Observation was an institution committed to the museal tasks of collecting, ordering, archiving and exhibiting, but that it also “conceptualized itself in museological terms”. Harrison considers the ways in which Mass Observation brought together museological methods of collecting and assembling with new mechanisms of individual and collective self-watching, and the ways in which these “oligoptic” mechanisms became implicated in the emergence of new forms of metropolitan governance in Britain during the Second World War.

The sixth and seventh papers are concerned with how practices of collecting data regarding colonial populations were complexly entangled in regimes of colonial rule in ways that tested the veracity of the propositions of that rule. Tim Rowse considers “the dying Native story” as it was articulated in three settler societies, Canada, the USA and New Zealand, from the late nineteenth to the mid twentieth century. He investigates how census data on Indigenous populations came to adjudicate on the truth of this narrative and particularly in the ways in which Indigenous intellectuals mobilized such data in their arguments. Rowse teases out three senses in which the dying Native story could be taken as true or false. These concerned the ways in which Indigenous people might be said to be dying out or disappearing through catastrophic mortality, through miscegenation, or through the rapid attrition of native society. Rowse gives two examples of Indigenous intellectuals who, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, identified the first sense of “dying native” as the colonial narrative that they had to address and to falsify. This falsification was both discursive (they pointed to census data showing population recovery) and practical (they exhorted their people to change their ways, so that this population recovery would be sustainable). Implicitly or explicitly, this Indigenous project marginalized the scenarios of genetic adulteration and cultural loss that, at that time, preoccupied many anthropologists. Against the gloomy predictions of anthropology, the Indigenous intellectuals studied by Rowse asserted the knowledge claims of a demography that was rooted in the colonial state’s capacity to manage and measure their people. In the seventh paper, Ben Dibley explores the development of government anthropology in the Australian Administered Territory of Papua during the interwar period. He argues that this corresponded with the assemblage of a new kind of anthropological actor: one which was framed in relation to new articulations of the administrative, museum and academic networks associated with the emergence of functionalist anthropology and one which was implicated in the new forms of rule associated with the doctrine of humanitarian colonialism, formally sanctioned by the League of Nations. He focuses on the collaborations and contestations of the government anthropologist, Francis Edgar Williams, and the Lieutenant Governor, Hubert Murray, as they negotiated competing anthropological claims for “being in the true” and their different governmental implications.

The closing papers are concerned with questions of ethnographic expertise and Indigenous agency in programmes of colonial rule in two different antipodean settler formations. Conal McCarthy traces the circulation of objects, personnel and ideas through a series of institutions central to the administration of Indigenous populations in New Zealand and in its Pacific dependencies during the opening decades of the twentieth century, in particular, the Department of Native Affairs, the Dominion Museum, the Board of Māori Ethnological Research and the Polynesian Society. Focusing on the role of prominent Māori intellectuals and politicians, key among them Te Rangi Hiroa and Āpirana Ngata, McCarthy charts a simultaneous and paradoxical process of resistance and accommodation, contestation and collaboration between Indigenous leadership and the settler state. In the final essay, Philip Batty explores how a particular class of Aboriginal object, the secret/sacred *tywerrenge*, has been enrolled in colonial and post-colonial programmes directed at the government of Indigenous populations in Central Australia. For missionaries, these objects were impediments to Indigenous “salvation”; for anthropologists, like Baldwin Spencer, they were evidence for evolutionist formulations on the transformation of “primitive” religious beliefs into science; while, more recently, possession and knowledge of a *tywerrenge* have been used to determine ownership to traditional land and legal rights to it. To consider the complex folding of traditional Aboriginal religious belief into forms of colonial rule in which *tywerrenge*s have been instrumental, Batty investigates two events—one a missionary intervention in 1928, the other a land claim hearing in the 1990s.

Connecting Themes

What all these papers share, then, is a concern with the ways the processes of data collection and modes of anthropological expertise on which they are dependent are enrolled in various governmental practices targeting the conduct of colonial and metropolitan populations and subjects. There are three further substantive themes that cut across the papers which are suggestive of future lines of inquiry.

Pastoral Power and Ethnographic Expertise

A number of the papers touch on the role played by ethnographic expertise in the relations between pastoral and governmental forms of power. This is substantially so in Batty’s (2014) consideration of the ethnographic practices of a Lutheran mission, but it is also raised indirectly in Harrison’s (2014) and McCarthy’s (2014) papers which share a concern with the ways in which forms of ethnographic expertise were folded into the practices of an emerging social welfare state. The point of connection here is Foucault’s analysis of pastoral power, which he investigates as one of the modalities of power constitutive of his genealogy of governmentality. With its roots in the Christian tradition, the distinctiveness of pastoral power lies in the techniques that it mobilizes that simultaneously minister to the individual and to the community, “so as to improve the lives of each and every one” (Foucault 1981, 235). One of the key insights of Foucault’s account is to distinguish between institutional pastoral power

and functional pastoral power. While the former, associated with religious institutions, has diminished in significance historically with increasing secularism, this has not witnessed a concomitant decline of the latter. Rather the techniques of pastoral power have become dispersed across other institutional forms, of which the practices of the welfare state have been a significant historical instance (Foucault 1981, 235). What the question of pastoral power opens in terms of the material discussed by contributors to this issue, then, are: first, the various ways in which ethnographic practices are implicated in its institutions—be it the mission (Batty 2014) or the health department (McCarthy 2014) or the Ministry of Information (Harrison 2014). Second, and relatedly, it points to the ways in which techniques of pastoral power come to cut across practices of both colonial and liberal government inasmuch as ethnographic knowledge has come to concern itself less with the limits of freedom and more with pastoral care of the colonized—particularly with regard to their hygiene and morality. Third, it raises the question of “counter-conduct”. It is in the context of his discussion of pastoral power that Foucault introduced the notion of counter-conduct to capture struggles over conduct that marked the theological contestations of the Reformation (Foucault 2007, 227–248). There would seem to be utility in this concept for the history of anthropology, not only in relation to syncretic religious practices that marked Indigenous resistance movements, but also the practices that McCarthy (2014) describes in this issue, in which Māori elites practiced modalities of Indigenous governmentality which contested the Pakeha prescriptions of Māori conduct in the contexts of an emerging social welfare state.

The Antipodean Career of the Americanist Culture Concept

Another point of connection that emerges between a number of papers concerns the different governmental up-take and deployment of the Americanist concept of culture across the USA and New Zealand. This is particularly so around arguments concerning the plasticity of culture, one of the distinctive legacies of Boas’s work. These connections occur in Rowse’s (2014) and in McCarthy’s (2014) papers, in relation to the arguments made by Māori intellectuals, Te Rangi Hiroa and Ngata and others, about the plasticity and adaptability of Māori culture. They also inform Cameron’s (2014) paper which charts the contrasting influence of Wissler’s culture area concept on New Zealand anthropology through the work of Skinner. The New Zealand case looks to provide the occasion to reflect on the ways in which different aspects of the Americanist tradition were picked up and used by different groups—Māori and Pakeha—in often contrasting programmes of government.

Colonial Centres of Calculation

Finally, papers share a concern with the varied and distinctive functions of offices, archives, collections, museums, storerooms and depots, particularly with the ways in which these different “sites” are related to the circulation of knowledge, practices of collecting and regimes of governing. In contending with these relations two concepts

have been significant for contributors, the connected notions of “centre of calculation” and “centre of collection”. In a number of papers, particularly Dias’s (2014) and Dibley’s (2014), the question of the relationship between such centres is raised in ways that come to qualify Latour’s initial formulations. In this they challenge the implicit centre-periphery logic that would seem to accompany Latour when he posits centres of calculation exclusively in the metropole, as sites distant from the field as a site of collecting. Rather, in different ways these two papers identify and stress the importance of local centres of calculation for various articulations of colonial rule. In this there is the implicit suggestion that the exercise of rule in these particular colonial situations enjoyed a degree of independence from their respective metropolitan centres. This resonates with arguments made in a different intellectual tradition by Steinmetz (2007) with regard to the relative autonomy of “the colonial state field”. Edwards’ (2014) paper also contributes to this argument in the sense in which it suggests that the role of immutable and combinable mobiles which were collected at centres of collection and calculation, such as the Colonial Office, was much more complicated than it might first appear; that in some cases, such objects provided material assurances which were perhaps more important than their discursive functions, which have tended to receive greatest attention.

Conclusion

The papers in this special issue each provide rich discussions of the complex and changing relations between practices of data collecting, styles of anthropological knowing and modes of governing associated with a number of different anthropological data collecting projects in both colonial and metropolitan contexts. Taken collectively, they point towards new directions for “practical histories” (cf. Pels and Salemink 1999) of anthropology in their sensitivity to the socio-technical (and biopolitical) *agencements* which connected museum, field, metropolis and colony, and the ways in which “anthropological assemblages” became densely entangled in apparatuses of rule throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the important contribution of the late Henrika ‘Riki’ Kuklick, who passed away in May 2013, not only to the workshop which formed the origin of this special issue, but also to the history of anthropology and the human and field sciences more generally. Although some of us had only met her for the first time during the workshop, while others were old friends, we all nonetheless benefited from her contributions to the workshop, her insightful comments on each of the papers presented in this collection, and her intelligence, wit and collegiality over the few days we spent together as a group in Sydney in October 2012. Her work on the sociology of knowledge and history of science leave a substantial legacy to which this special issue makes a small, but we hope nonetheless significant, contribution.

Notes

- [1] “Museum, Field, Metropolis, Colony: Practices of Social Governance” is an Australian Research Council Discovery project (Award Number DP110103776). The project was awarded to Tony Bennett (convenor) and Fiona Cameron in the Institute for Culture and Society at the University of Western Sydney as Chief Investigators, and to Nélia Dias (University of Lisbon), Rodney Harrison (University College London), Ira Jacknis (University of California, Berkeley), and Conal McCarthy (Victoria University of Wellington) as International Partner Investigators. Ben Dibley was the Research Fellow appointed to the project. The project was also supported by research assistance from Michelle Kelly. For an overview of this project see http://www.uws.edu.au/ics/research/projects/museum_field_metropolis_colony.
- [2] The invited participants were Philip Batty (Melbourne Museum), Elizabeth Edwards (Durham University), Henrika Kuklick (University of Pennsylvania), Tim Rowse (University of Western Sydney), Paul Tapsell (University of Otago), Julie Thorpe (University of Western Sydney) and Paul Turnbull (University of Queensland).
- [3] While occasionally used by Deleuze, the term *agencement* has been most fully elaborated in the work of Callon (2005) to engage with the active role played by market devices in structuring market relations. The concept has also been applied to varied processes of collecting and gathering, including censuses which, as Ruppert (2009) shows, often had a close relationship to anthropological fieldwork practice in the early twentieth century.
- [4] For a related account, see Candea (2013).

References

- Batty, Philip. 2014. “The *Tywerrenge* as an Artefact of Rule: The (Post) Colonial Life of a Secret/Sacred Aboriginal Object.” *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 296–311.
- Bennett, Tony. 2004. *Pasts Beyond Memories: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, Tony. 2009. “Museum, Field, Colony: Colonial Governmentality and the Circulation of Reference.” *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2 (1–2): 99–116. doi:10.1080/17530350903064097.
- Bennett, Tony. 2010. “Making and Mobilising Worlds: Assembling and Governing the Other.” In *Material Powers: Essays Beyond the Cultural Turn*, edited by Tony Bennett, and Patrick Joyce, 190–208. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, Tony. 2013. “The ‘Shuffle of Things’ and the Distribution of Agency.” In *Reassembling the Collection: Ethnographic Museums and Indigenous Agency*, edited by Rodney Harrison, Sarah Byrne, and Anne Clarke, 39–60. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
- Bennett, Tony. 2014. “Liberal Government and the Practical History of Anthropology.” *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 150–170.
- Bennett, Tony, and Chris Healy, eds. 2011. *Assembling Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, Tony, and Patrick Joyce, eds. 2010. *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*. London: Routledge.
- Callon, Michel. 2005. “Why Virtualism Paves the way to Political Impotence: A Reply to Daniel Miller’s Critique of The Laws of the Markets.” *Economic Sociology: European Electronic Newsletter* 6 (2): 3–20. Accessed September 26, 2013. <http://econsoc.mpifg.de/archive/esfeb05.pdf>
- Cameron, Fiona Ruth. 2014. “From ‘Dead Things’ to Immutable, Combinable Mobiles: H.D. Skinner, the Otago Museum and University and the Governance of Māori Populations.” *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 208–226.
- Candea, Matei. 2013. “The Fieldsite as Device.” *Journal of Cultural Economy* 6 (3): 241–258. doi:10.1080/17530350.2012.754366.
- Clifford, James. 1992. “Travelling Cultures.” In *Cultural Studies*, edited by Grossberg Lawrence, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, 96–116. New York: Routledge.

- Dias, Nélia. 2010. "Exploring the Senses and Exploiting the Land: Railroads, Bodies and Measurement in Nineteenth-Century French colonies." In *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*, edited by Tony Bennett, and Patrick Joyce, 171–189. London: Routledge.
- Dias, Nélia. 2014. "Rivet's Mission in Colonial Indochina (1931–1932) or the Failure to Create an Ethnographic Museum." *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 189–207.
- Dibley, Ben. 2014. "Assembling an Anthropological Actor: Anthropological Assemblage and Colonial Government in Papua." *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 263–279.
- Edwards, Elizabeth. 2014. "Photographic Uncertainties: Between Evidence and Reassurance." *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 171–188.
- Foucault, Michel. 1981. "Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of Political Reason." In *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Vol. II, edited by Sterling McMurrin, 225–254. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2007. In *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*, edited by Michel Senellart, translated by Graham Burchell. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2013. "Reassembling Ethnographic Museum Collections." In *Reassembling the Collection: Ethnographic Museums and Indigenous Agency*, edited by Rodney Harrison, Sarah Byrne, and Anne Clarke, 3–35. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2014. "Observing, Collecting and Governing 'Ourselves' and 'Others': Mass-Observation's Fieldwork Agencements." *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 227–245.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Legg, Stephen. 2007. *Spaces of Colonialism: Delhi's Urban Governmentalities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McCarthy, Conal. 2014. "'Empirical Anthropologists Advocating Cultural Adjustments': The Anthropological Governance of Āpirana Ngata and the Native Affairs Department." *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 280–295.
- Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose. 2008. *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ong, Aihwa, and Stephen J. Collier, eds. 2005. *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Otter, Chris. 2007. "Making Liberal Objects." *Cultural Studies* 21 (4–5): 570–590. doi:10.1080/09502380701278962.
- Pels, Peter. 1997. "The Anthropology of Colonialism: Culture, History, and the Emergence of Western Governmentality." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 163–113.
- Pels, Peter, and Oscar Salemink, eds. 1999. *Colonial Subjects: Essays on the Practical History of Anthropology*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Pettersson, Christina. 2012. "Colonial Subjectification: Foucault, Christianity and Governmentality." *Cultural Studies Review* 18 (2): 89–108. Accessed September 26, 2013. <http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/csrj/article/view/2758/2948>
- Rowse, Tim. 2014. "'Rooted in Demographic Reality': The Contribution of New World Censuses to Indigenous Survival." *History and Anthropology* 25 (2): 246–262.
- Ruppert, Evelyn. 2009. "Becoming Peoples: 'Counting Heads in the Northern Wilds.'" *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2 (1–2): 11–32. doi:10.1080/17530350903063909.
- Scott, David. 1995. "Colonial Governmentality." *Social Text* 43: 191–220.
- Steinmetz, George. 2007. *The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa, and Southwest Africa*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Thomas, Nicholas. 1994. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government*. Cambridge: Princeton University Press.
- White, Melanie. 2005. "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance." *Economy and Society* 34 (3): 474–494. doi:10.1080/03085140500111964.