TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

TIMOTHY SCOTT JOHNSON

It is now over thirty years since François Ewald's history of the origins of the French welfare state was published in its full form and twenty since it reappeared in the abridged form translated here. If belated, this translation will allow a new audience of students and scholars to appreciate a work that has already been influential in not just French history, but also economic history, political theory, and legal history. In some ways, this delayed translation highlights the aspects of the history that may now appear dated. For instance, the history told is a purely metropolitan history, with no reference to France's imperial existence or the role the empire played in the development of modern welfare state funding and functioning. Nonetheless, the history told remains theoretically insightful, uniting aspects of legal, social, political, and intellectual history under one framework. Despite being a history primarily of nineteenth-century France, the questions and themes covered are still very much relevant to our modern world: labor relations, statistical risk analysis, insurance guarantees and regulations, the state as a source of security, and population management. Insofar as the welfare state is still an institution to be repudiated, defended, or reformed, our world is still informed by the logics Ewald relates.

Born in 1946, Ewald traversed many of the most important moments and movements in the intellectual and political history of postwar France. He was first drawn to the existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre, was politically active in the wake of the 1968 student and workers' rebellions, and became an assistant to Michel Foucault at the Collège de France, adopting many of his ideas. For this reason, this translation will be of interest to intellectual historians as well. Ewald's unique journey from postwar radicalism to state bureaucrat has been documented elsewhere.[1] So far, to most Anglophone audiences, if Ewald's name is recognized, it is as one of the editors of the many posthumous collections of Foucault's texts and lectures. This history of the genesis of welfare state thinking in France shows Ewald's own study of government techniques of power that Foucault popularized, matching the breadth and critical insight of Foucault's best work.

For the most part, the text of this translation is as it originally appeared, but I have added several notes. These notes are meant to add some context for statements and allusions that would have needed little or no explanation for French readers in the 1980s, as well as references to lesser-known thinkers and terms Ewald discusses. In some instances the citations Ewald originally gave were incomplete, inconsistent in format and style, or inaccurate. Sometimes citations appeared in the first longer book but not the shorter second one. None of the inaccuracies are major, but are rather likely due to the haplography inherent in analog research and reference. The digitization of many of the sources cited has allowed me to rather easily check the references given and track down others left out. Where a change has been made, I have provided a note explaining the change and, where appropriate, an alternate translation corresponding to the original citation and text. A number of the texts Ewald discusses and cites are classics of political theory. Where a standard translation exists for these quoted passages, I have mostly adhered to that text. In some instances, either the stylistic choices of those texts' translators or the slight differences produced by triangulating translations between multiple languages, as in the case of German texts Ewald cites in French translation, I have either amended the standard translations to fit with the style of the rest of Ewald's text or translated those passages anew. Any changes to published translations are flagged in the notes.

In addition to notes on sources, historical figures, and references not readily obvious to a younger English generation, I have added notes specifying the logic behind particular word choices, including wherever my own interpretive license might deviate from a strictly literal translation of the text. A number of translation choices bear special note. By and large, the general social, political, and economic transformations Ewald's history presents are mirrored in other nineteenth-century Western states. However, some of the terminology specific to the nineteenth-century French context sits slightly askew with modern English terms. The French word *patron*, for instance, is generally translated into English as "boss" or "employer." I have chosen to render it simply as *patron*, since "boss" would imply a level of informality not reflective of the formal and hierarchical relationship Ewald sketches; *employeur* as a French term emerges toward the end of the nineteenth century as a distinct term more neutral than *patron*, and one meant to avoid the latter's specific social implications. The same choice goes for all of *patron*'s variants: *régime du patronage* (translated as "regime of patronage"), *patronat*, etc.[2] Likewise, there

is often little to no differentiation between translations of *bienfaisance* and *charité*, both often translated into English as "charity." However, with the rise of the industrial patron in the nineteenth century, older charitable practices change in their social character. Ewald reinforces this by reserving *charité* for older, early modern practices and *bienfaisance* for the newer modern practices. Therefore, *charité* is translated as "charity" and *bienfaisance* as "benevolence" or "benevolent aid."

Two French words with particular philosophical importance pose their own issues: *dispositif* and *objectivation*. As it stands, there is no direct standard equivalent for *dispositif* in modern English. When referring to a physical object, the English words "device" and "facility" are usually accurate. However, Ewald, like Foucault, uses the word in a more figurative manner, referring more to conceptual and social arrangements and dispositions than actual material artifacts (these latter bear the imprint of the former). *Dispositif* in these contexts refers to the various immaterial (concepts, prejudices, ideologies) and material (institutions, administrative practices) arrangements that reinforce power relations. Some Anglophone historians, such as Stephen Kotkin, who, like Ewald, were influenced by Michel Foucault, approximate *dispositif* with the word "apparatus."[3] The choice is also common in many translations of Michel Foucault's works. This, however, I think still has too material a connotation in English. Further, there is a separate word in French to designate apparatus—*appareil*. As a solution, I have simply translated *dispositif* as "dispositive." My hope is that this choice clarifies the specificity of the term and does not obscure it. Similarly, I have chosen to translate the French word *objectivation* as "objectification." In some contexts the French word *objectivation* might appear to mean what "conceptualization" implies in English. However, following Foucault, Ewald uses the term to specify when an object or event is qualified in a precise manner, out of a range of possibilities. So, as Ewald's study shows, accidents could be interpreted and analyzed in a number of ways, including as dangers or unnatural phenomena. But among the different interpretations available, the insurance system that emerged toward the end of the nineteenth century will specifically *objectify* the accident as a risk.

I would like to thank those who aided me in the translation process. First and foremost, a good measure of gratitude goes to Melinda Cooper for careful readings of the translation as well as for advice on legal terminology. The final version of this translation owes much to her input. Martijn Konings,

too, read over the manuscript, offering helpful comments. François Ewald also helped clarify key issues regarding the terms and concepts he employs. Any and all inaccuracies or errors, of course, rest solely on my shoulders. Finally, I would also like to thank Michael Behrent for introducing me to Ewald's work many years ago. This translation most certainly would not have existed otherwise.