CHAPTER 1

Introduction to Foucault’s Theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse:
A Critical Appraisal and Reassessment.

Michel Foucault, the most powerful thinker and philosopher of the twentieth century has cast indelible imprint on many contemporary branches of knowledge ranging from literary criticism to the history of criminology with his thought provoking writings. He was perhaps one of the single most famous intellectuals in the 20th century whose books, essays and interviews had been translated into sixteen languages and social critics treated his work as a touchstone. In a variety of academic fields, scholars were grappling with the implications of his empirical research and pondering over the abstract questions that he had raised about the reach of power and limits of knowledge, about the origins of modern responsibility and the foundations of modern government, about the character of historical inquiry and the nature of personal identity.

A remarkable French philosopher, historian and analogist Michel Foucault was born in Poitiers, France in 1926 where his father was a famous doctor and wanted his son to adopt the same profession. Foucault got his graduation from Saint-Stanislas school, attended the Lycee Henri-IV in Paris, and then in 1946 entered the Ecole Normale Superieure with a glorious academic record. He got his license in philosophy in 1948 when he was working under Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and learnt Psychology which helped him get diploma in Psychopathology. He also taught French at the University of Uppsala in Sweden and for one year he was at prestigious Warsaw University and University of Hamburg where he finished his book on madness for which he was awarded the Doctorate degree. His reputation as a voracious reader and scholar helped him to achieve the prestigious chair as Professor of Philosophy at the University of Clermont-Ferrand. In 1959 Foucault completed his doctorate under the supervision of great thinker and philosopher George Cunningham.

In the following decade Foucault became renowned as an original and provocative thinker, celebrated and criticized, paraphrased and misrepresented. He has been described as an archaeologist of western culture, a nihilist and more soberly, as a philosopher-historian whose work must be differentiated from both conventional philosophy and history. In this period he moved from the University of Clermont-Ferrand to the University of Vincennes, and finally in 1970 to the College de France where he occupied the honourable designation, ‘Professor of the
History of Systems of Thought’, so as to differentiate his work from the intellectual tradition of the history of ideas.

His reviews appeared in newspapers and journals to which he gave the title ‘the History of Systems of Thought’ earned him name and tremendous fame as these are all concerned with social dogmas, system and institutions of society and cast a great impact on the scholarly works of his contemporaries. Foucault is widely recognised for his critical studies of various social institutions like madness, medical science, and the prison system, etc. and most notably for his distinguished work on the history of sexuality. Very often Foucault is labelled as post-structuralist, and post-modernist for works on power, knowledge and discourse but after some time he kept himself away from structuralism and always rejected the tag of structuralist and post-modernist. Foucault is, as given above, generally regarded as one of the most instrumental and influential personalities of the second half of the 20th century. However, in addition to acknowledging personal influences, other intellectual figures and structures contributed to the condition of possibility necessary for the emergence and development of Foucault’s work. At the level of authors it is evident that the respective works of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche exercised a dominant influence on Foucault’s work.

Michel Foucault continues to be one of the most important figures in critical theory. His theories have been concerned largely with the concepts of power, knowledge and discourse, and his influence is clear in a great deal of post-structuralist, post-modernist, feminist, post-Marxist and post-colonial theorizing. The impact of his writings has also been acknowledged and experienced in many disciplines; from sociology to anthropology and English studies to history. However, the iconoclastic and challenging nature of Foucault’s theoretical work has meant that his ideas have not simply been accommodated. Instead, they have caused heated-and very productive debate from 1960s to 1970s, when he emerged as a key theorist.

The work of Michel Foucault is not easily understood in the concepts and fields of human sciences. Indeed, Foucault’s comments on his work, namely that he was not a Freudian, a Marxist or a Structuralist, but rather with presenting a genealogy of the modern subject as historical and cultural reality. All this suggests the significant difference in his theory, concept and approach from those forms associated with the human sciences. However, to argue that Foucault’s analyses need to be differentiated from the history of ideas, philosophy, and sociology does not mean that these disciplines have no importance in his works as his works have
profound validity in these different branches and it will not be appropriate and convincing to label Foucault merely as a sociologist, though there is great sociological relevance and significance in his works.

There is a great need to pay careful attention towards the major themes and subjects of his works so that its significance, scope, range, and development can be examined and analysed in a justifiable manner. Foucault’s works can be interpreted in a number of ways like the works of other prominent writers. Problems of interpretation do not arise only in relation to the particular texts, but also in respect of the development of Foucault’s work. For example, there are some differences of interest, formulation, and method to be found among the various works devoted to literature, madness, medicine, the human sciences, punishment, and sexuality. Recognition of such differences frequently inspired Foucault to reinvestigate his earlier works in order to reconcile them with his later developments and viewpoints. However, elements of self-criticism are also to be found in Foucault’s work, notably in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* where criticisms are presented of earlier studies, and then again in the works on sexuality where the analyses of madness and the asylum, and punishment and the prison have been described as perhaps insisting too much on techniques of the self. Nevertheless, as will become clear, there are important continuities in Foucault’s work, notably historical analyses of the various modes through which in western culture human beings have been constituted as subjects and objects of knowledge and an associated concern with the inter-relationships between forms of knowledge and power.

As stated earlier, Foucault’s first major study, his doctoral thesis, was on madness, its focus, if not its relevance, being confined principally to France. In the first book, for example, he analyses the development of distinction between madness and reason, and in the second, he traces the changes there have been in the way that societies punish those they consider to be criminals. However, his work is not simply concerned to analyse social conditions. It means he thinks that the way we approach analysis determines, to a great extent, what we find out and what we can know, in some sense, we must of necessity scrutinize the perspectives we take on the subject we are analyzing, when we undertake interpretations of those social conditions. Thus, his work is not only an analysis of the difference between madness and reason, but is also an investigation of the way that we think about insanity and lengths to which each society goes to regulate the distinction and keep the conceptual distinction in place. If the study of madness
does not quite set the agenda for Foucault’s subsequent studies, it certainly anticipates, as we will, see some of the major themes and preoccupations.

*Madness and Civilization* opens with reference to the existence of leprosariums across the entire continent of Europe during the Middle Ages. Lepers were confined in special institutions, excluded from the community by virtue of their condition. Foucault notes that as a result of such isolation and with the passage of time, the infection of leprosy disappeared completely from the western world. However, the associated structures of exclusion and division remained dominant within western culture, ready to return, as indeed happened in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when the poor, criminals, anti-social elements and people suffering from mental diseases were compelled to occupy the space of exclusion which had been vacated by lepers.

Foucault has argued that from the beginning of the nineteenth century the nature and source of the physician’s psychiatric powers have been obscured by the articulation of medical knowledge in terms of the norms of positivism. Foucault states:

In consequence, to analyze the profound structures of objectivity in the knowledge and practices of the nineteenth century psychiatry from Pinel to Freud, we should have to show in fact that such objectivity...with the end of the eighteenth century, preserved in the rites of asylum life, and overlaid by the myth of positivism. (Foucault, *Madness and Civilization* 276)

Foucault means to say that if the structures of objectivity in the knowledge and practice of psycho system of the nineteenth century are deeply observed and studied, from Pinel to Freud, one jumps to the conclusion that such objectivity was in the beginning a sort of medical nature which could be achieved by a transparent moral practice but with the passage of time it was forgotten though it was always present there. Towards the end of the century psychiatric practice was preserved in the asylum life and the myth of positivism overlaid it. To cure the mental illness, the doctor-patient relation should be very clear and intimate so that the treatment is done in order to transform the asylum system in a better way.

The topic of medicine, medical knowledge and experience, occupies an important place in Foucault’s several studies of the formation and development of the modern sciences of man. In *Madness and Civilization*, as we have seen, the entry of the medical personage utilizing surveillance and judgement is identified as a pivotal figure in the arrangement which inaugurated
the emergence and development of a medical knowledge of the mind as an almost autonomous branch of knowledge. Later, in *Discipline and Punish* (1975), in which many of the themes are to be found in the earlier works are restored, developed, revised and focussed more directly in terms of an exploration of relations of power and knowledge, the institution of the hospital and the medical disciplinary practices associated with the ‘clinical sciences’ are presented as providing the conditions within which there occurred the ‘birth of the sciences of man’. *The Birth of the Clinic*, although it may appear as a rather specialized text on medical discourse, on changes in medical perception associated with shifts in the conceptions, structures, and forms of organisation of medical knowledge, is nonetheless a text which reveals the formation of the individual, or rather the individual’s body, as an object of scientific medical examination and analysis. As such the text documents the importance of medicine, as the ‘first scientific discourse concerning the individual’, to the formation of the human sciences. The importance of medicine in the constitution of human sciences arises principally from the fact that it is within medical discourse that the individual first became an ‘object of positive knowledge’. Medicine thus occupies a central place in Foucault’s writings.

*The Order of Things* (1966) may be regarded as further signifying the influence of structuralism in Foucault’s work. Unlike the study of madness, the archaeology of the human sciences is concerned mainly with the rules of organisation and formation which structure and differentiate modes of thought. Hence in *The Order of Things* little reference is made to the institutional relations with which particular structures of knowledge might be associated, preference being given instead to an analysis solely of the rules and relations internal to discourse, its formation and change. *The Order of Things* is a complex and challenging text which aims to uncover the laws, regularities and rules of formation of systems of thought in the human sciences which emerged in the nineteenth century. Foucault’s archaeological investigation reveals two moments of transformation, two mutations, two intervals of discontinuity, namely, mid-way through the seventeenth century, the beginning of the Classical Age and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the advent of the modern age.

Foucault published *The Order of Things* in 1966 and within no time the book achieved remarkable success and was considered as the bestseller in France. It is basically a study related with the natural sciences and in this book he prophesied that man who is the outcome of the arranged knowledge of centuries will soon come to an end as he is short lived. In *The
Archaeology of Knowledge (1969), Discourse is one of the most frequent used terms in Foucault’s work, and at the same time, it is one of the most conflicting and contradictory terms. Foucault himself defines it in a number of ways throughout in this text. He says in The Archaeology of Knowledge that he has used Discourse to refer to “the general domain of statements, sometimes as individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements” (Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge 80). By ‘the general domain of statements’, he means that discourse can be used to refer to all those statements which have been made, which have meaning and which have profound impact on others. He has used the term to refer to ‘individualizable group of statements’, that is, utterances which seem to form a grouping, such as the discourse of femininity or the discourse of racism. The notion of exclusion is very important in Foucault’s thinking of discourse, particularly in 'The Order of Discourse'. When Foucault discusses discourse, he focuses much on the notion of constraint and restriction; he is aware that man can potentially utter an infinite variety of sentences, but the amazing fact is that he has to speak within narrowly confined limits. Thus in deciding to say something on a particular subject; man must as speaker, focus on that subject carefully and then decide whether it will be relevant and appropriate to speak on that topic or not and during this process, we certainly refine ways of thinking and talking about that subject. Moreover, Foucault argues regarding his investigation and analysis of discourse by emphasizing that it is always organised and regulated and in this context he comments, “In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers” (Foucault, The Order of Discourse 52).

Foucault’s first genealogical analysis is to be found in Discipline and Punish, a text which in some respects marks a return to general themes to be found in such earlier works as Madness and Civilization. Just as the latter text was concerned with confinement and the birth of the asylum, the division between reason and unreason, and the constitution of a condition ‘madness’ which became the subject of the discourses of psychopathology, so Discipline and Punish focuses on incarceration, the transformation in forms and punishment associated with the birth of the prison, the distinction between ‘good boys’, and the constitution of a condition of ‘delinquency’ which has become an object of the human sciences. In Discipline and Punish, discourse, discursive relations, are not accorded priority; on the contrary there is a shift towards
an analysis of social institutions and practices, to a consideration of non-discursive practices and relations. In both *Madness and Civilization* and *The Birth of the Clinic*, Foucault addressed particular historical relationships between forms of knowledge and forms of power bearing on the body without actually articulating a conception of power/knowledge relations and without explicitly identifying the body as the immediate object of the operation of power relations in modern society. With *Discipline and Punish* conceptions of power/knowledge relations and of the body as the object of the exercise of technologies of power became explicit and, though Foucault’s discussion addresses the transformation in forms of punishment and the emergence of the modern penal institution, the prison, the principal focus of analysis falls upon “the power and knowledge relations that invest human bodies and subjugate them by turning them into objects of knowledge” (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 53)

Foucault’s analysis of the operation of disciplinary technologies of power and their relationship with objectifying sciences of the individual was followed by an essay on sexuality. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1* constitutes an introduction to a series of further works on sexuality and complements. *Discipline and Punish* in so far as it addresses relations of power and knowledge and the exercise of technology of power on the body. However, whereas in *Discipline and Punish* it is disciplinary technologies of power, and in the series of studies on sexuality it is the form of power and ritual of knowledge through which a human being turns himself or herself into a subject. Similar to his work in *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault asserts that prisons came into being because of some institutions like the schools, the factories, the army, which train and discipline the bodies of men through surveillance method for giving birth to a civilized society and its new theory of power. For keeping surveillance Bentham's model of Panopticon was used which was an architectural model to keep invisible watch on the inmates of the prison. Thousands of people could be watched by a few guards or observers, such was the design of Bentham's prison which gave informational knowledge of the subjects and in this way power and knowledge are linked.

During the 1970s and 1980s the name and fame of Foucault increased and he delivered lectures in many prestigious universities and colleges of the world. In the year 1976, he wrote his well known work *The History of Sexuality Vol. I: An Introduction* and the second and third volumes were published in 1984, a few months before his death. In these works, Foucault states that the views regarding the morality of human beings are related to their sexuality. In *The
History of Sexuality Vol. II he considers that in Greek society, pleasure was related with power in social relations as it was linked with immoral and illicit relations. In The History of Sexuality Vol. III, Foucault defines and elaborates the system of rules and regulations in Greek social set-up which were related to sexual and other forms of social conduct. He asserts that the rules of controlling oneself lead to truth and enjoyment. In this type of social structure where the life of man is linked with the care of the self, excess of everything was regarded against Christian norms. In all his books, Foucault highlights a system of control; not understood by traditional theories of power concerned with authority or rule, which he terms bio-power. Bio-power can be seen as the right of the state authorities to allow people to live and die according to the will of the king, ruler or sovereign. This attitude became the new trend for understanding the power structure in western society. Foucault's The History of Sexuality professes that pleasure is not found in lust and in satisfying sensual desires but in self-discipline, as this regulation brings resistance to the state with the sense of morality and self-discipline. We must consider ethical laws better than the state laws to avoid so many physical ailments and maladies as we know Foucault himself died of AIDS related illness in 1984.

A very significant element which we lack in Foucault's theoretical work is his curiosity to know why some things happen in that particular way in which they happen. It is a childlike desire to ask tough questions which seem to be very clear and self evident but actually Foucault wants that some more ways and means should be found to answer those questions. Another feature which adds to his popularity is that he does not impose any systematic structure to link the ways of thinking rather than following the fully studied theory or any set rigid mode of thinking. He wants readers to form their own opinion about his work instead of following anything slavishly and beat the already trodden path; thus he prefers individuality and originality in his readers.

Thus Foucault has transformed and almost brought a revolution in the sphere of English studies by writing on the subjects of power, knowledge, discourse, giving it a distinct shape that when a contemporary trend in language and literature is to be established, one has to depend on Foucault. His quest into the philosophy of academic departments is beneficial and helpful to explore English as an academic discipline. Prominent critics and thinkers like Diana Fuss, Stuart Hall, David Bartholomew have tried hard to develop discourses which doubt the harsh rules and regulations for textual analysis and have found that Foucault was a very significant authority on
this subject. In his essay 'Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms' Stuart Hall employs Foucault as the pivot and focal point of his hypothesis that the culture of structuralism using power/knowledge as the fundamental rule to legitimize Foucault as a touchstone and an unshakable authority on how knowledge is produced through the organisation of cultural and social institutions.

Foucault's thought shaped the idea of David Bartholomew that teaching in the university should be helpful in initiating discourse in students by organising communities to increase the vocal discussion by challenging the already established structures of language and literature. It will be very helpful to broaden the scope of English studies about the theory of power structure on which Foucault was regarded a key figure. He emphasizes on the organisation of academic fields to bring the desired changes by rejecting the existing system or principles. When we analyse the relation of knowledge and consciousness as far as the textual creation of Foucault is concerned, we observe that knowledge is not a fixed target for consciousness. Foucault himself also escapes from the traditional forms of academics and does not concentrate his study on consciousness and knowledge but further expands it through inter-connected discourses. The dialect of Hegel can be replaced with aimless and motiveless intention of participants in interaction but knowledge is produced and developed gradually. There is no doubt that Foucault is a remarkable figure for the students of English literature because he emphasized his opinion about the nature and functions of academic disciplines in a weighty and suggestive manner. His approach towards the textual analysis has undergone a complete transformation because of his radical and revolutionary ideas of literary theories. Moreover in the field of literary studies in contemporary times, there is almost a flood of literary theories and new approaches like postcolonial, diaspora, gender, Dalit or the racial studies which have affected the textual analysis to a great extent.

Foucault also wrote on the impact of institutional and discursive forces on the body, particularly in his works such as *The History of Sexuality*. He suggests that the body should be seen as the focus of a number of discursive presences. He also analyzed in *The Order of Things* and in *Discipline and Punish* the impact of what he termed the ‘bio-power’ or the ‘metaphysics of power’ on the individual and his subjectivity. Many analyses of power have focuses on the role of institutions but Foucault analyses the operations of power largely outside the realm of institutions. For this reason the body is one of the sites of struggle and discursive conflicts upon which it focuses. Rather than the downward power relations which examine the way the state or
institutions oppress people, he is concerned to develop an upward model where the body is one of the sites where power is enacted and resisted. In short, Foucault is concerned to describe the interaction of institutions and the individuals without giving preference to either. It is one of the major effects of power that some bodies, some discourses and some desires come to be regarded and acknowledged as individuals. Thus rather than see individuals as stable entities, he analyses the discursive procedures through which bodies are constituted. This has turned out to be a useful notion for Feminists, queer theorists who want to theorize the forms of oppression of women, gays and lesbians without falling into a false assumption about essentialism or sexual or biological difference. The focus on the body as a place where discourses are acted out and acted upon is one of the ways that power relations produce particular types of identities. He does not see power simply as a site of oppression that determines identities, rather it is through negotiation and play that identities are formed. Further, he suggests that it is possible to construct what he calls counter-discourse and counter-identification i.e. individuals can confront their stigmatized individualities, that they have been assigned and seen them positively to reconstruct them rather than taking them in negative terms. To close, Foucault’s concentration on the body and sexuality forms an important part of his discussion on power and power relations.

Though one can say to quite some extent that Foucault is not strictly a literary theorist, however, his philosophical analysis of history, civilization, sexuality, western institutions and other areas can become useful grounds for analyzing works of literature. Foucault’s works may not be easily or directly applicable to understand literary texts, yet Foucault’s thinking makes possible in understanding a new ground on which the analysis of literature could be undertaken. In his famous essay – ‘What is an Author’, Foucault talks about the construction of the author’s identity and function through a number of aesthetic, historical, philosophical and linguistic instances. Foucault is more concerned with the way literature is produced, and the sense in which it is made to appear distinct from other textual practices. At best, Foucault’s analysis of Power/Knowledge Discourse can be fruitfully applied to show that these ideas are consciously or unconsciously played out in literature at a thematic or technical level which further demonstrates many similarities in literary texts to Foucault’s ideas. If these arguments may not be sufficient, one can observe how Foucault’s theories have been used by Edward Said who argues that literary texts are a part of larger discursive formations, rather than literary texts having a privileged status in relation to other texts. This can be viewed along with New Historicist critics.
such as Stephen Greenblatt who was instrumental in theorizing that literary texts were best studied alongside other texts such as travel writing, scientific writing, history etc in order to relate literary texts to their discursive contents. Similarly Hayden White, the well known historian argued that historical texts have to be seen to share linguistic codes with literary texts and the use of narrative and point of view, and this is how we can see the discursive angles from which literary texts are constructed. Above all, we can say with certainty that literary texts (in the case of this project, Novels) invariably involve themselves in social, political, economic and cultural confrontations which are strikingly similar, at least in some cases, with the way Foucault analyses of Power/Knowledge Discourse works out its impact on subjectivities, identities and bodies. In all the literary texts that are proposed to be undertaken in the present project, there is the subterranean theme about the deep relationship between the Knowledge and Power. These works show that knowledge is not dispassionate but rather an integral part of struggle over power. The texts undertaken for analysis illustrate, albeit in different cultural, national and historical contexts, that these two elements depend and impinge on each other.

Social critics treated his work as a touchstone. In a variety of academic fields, scholars were grappling with the implications of Foucault's experimental research and considering the abstract questions that he had raised about the reach of power and the limits of knowledge, about the origins of moral responsibility and the foundations of modern government, about the character of historical inquiry and the nature of personal identity. He was the centre of attraction for the girls as he was different from others and very smart in his looks because he shaved his skull properly to give the impression of a courageous man but this appearance was not liked by those institutions who suppress the free spirit of man and do not allow the men to be different from their conventional looks. In France, he was regarded as a national treasure and in the wake of the global student revolt in 1968, he developed an abiding passion for politics. For the rest of his life, he routinely commented on current affairs, signed petitions, and participated in demonstrations, always ready to protest the plight of the wretched and powerless: French prisoners, Algerian immigrants, Polish trade unionists and Vietnamese refugees.

Arguably, since his death, Foucault’s academic stock has only risen and now holds an unequalled and unique position as a thinker and his analysis regarding the many significant aspects of the development of western civilization. Historians studying psychiatry and medicine crime and punishment, sexuality and the family can scarcely proceed without reference to him,
even if only to correct or dismiss his findings. He has similarly set new agendas for research in sociology and political theory. His hypothesis about the constructive impact of social beliefs and practices on the human body and its desires has played a key role in stimulating debates over gender identity, and has also given a sense of direction to a great many gay activists in the United States and Europe. Analyzing the interplay of knowledge and power, he has raised fresh doubts about the meaning of truth, the scope of reason, and the proper regulation of human conduct, inspiring some of the world’s foremost philosophers – Giles Deleuze in France, and Jurgen Habermas in Germany – to use his work each in quite different ways as one of the basis for their own critical thinking. An expert of poetry, music, literature and painting, Foucault has undoubtedly left his imprint on more than one generation of artists and literary critics.
This introductory chapter deals with all the existing literature applying the theory of power as it begins with the historical survey of the thought about power in the social sciences. The works of Thomas Hobbes and Nicollo Machiavelli are the prominent political writings and the contrast in their thought process shows the difference in their plans and strategies. Machiavelli says that absolute power is the ultimate and desired objective which is seldom achieved, the social sciences started taking interest in power and sociologists like Max Weber formed the rational power on the lines of Hobbes and developed organisational power in the interest of authority. After Weber, the theories of power moved in the direction of illegitimate power of the bureaucracy and hierarchy within the formal and legitimate framework as this was the only source of mechanising human life, though it was a threat to the freedom of the spirit. He feared that this organisational form would harm the democratic forms of organisation if it is used as power instrument.

In the definition of power and in its attribution to human factor the approach of Weber is supported by Robert Dahl who found the discussion of power within the limits of a community. The ruling class which came in power after the Second World War was given much importance because the theory of power signifies that it should be exercised by a dominant individual, others should be made to obey that individual. Those who possess power should be considered as very significant people whose preferences and priorities should be respected by those who are the subject or the ruled ones. Power creates obedience because it is the ability to make others to do something for those who hold power otherwise they would never have respected the personal or other preferences of the ruling class. This organisational behaviour of people is the essence of Dahl's definition of power but in response to this, Peter Bacharach and Morton Baratz developed a model of the overt and covert faces of power. The connection between these is that overt face helps to make the decision and the covert face prevents from taking decision. This approach was further developed by Steven Lukes in the seventies who shifted the discussion from community power to a focus on three dimensional power and the third one was the latent one. The overt dimension of power is concerned with declared political preferences which reveal themselves through complaints and political issues and the third dimension of power is concerned with the political preferences and real interests. Lukes says that power is judged by the ability to inculcate in people's mind the interests which are opposed to their own personal interests.
The concept of power is extended from sociology to nearly all the fields of social sciences and humanities in the works of Michel Foucault. The activity of identification of those who have power and locating power loses all significance because Foucault thought of decentralising power as his significant innovation. Anthony Giddens also developed his approach on Foucault's lines; it was a continuation as well as a critique. An inclusive social theory was constructed which he called 'duality of structure or structuralism' in which he emphasised that power is an important part of social structure; it is created and exercised by human agents and is a social factor which has a great impact on society. How the discussion of power exceeded the boundaries and limits of organisation and entered into the realm of social discourse is the total result of this survey.

After the Second World War, power was the pivotal concept in social sciences to which eminent writers like Giddens and Lukes contributed significantly to establish the relevance and importance of this concept in the contemporary social discourse. Stewart Clegg examines power as a circular process that flows in three channels which he calls circuits of power and each of these circuits has a dynamic and forceful form of its own.

1. *The overt circuit of power* – The first circuit is overt one which is solid and concrete as well as very simple one as it takes place in the decision making field. In this circuit, a human agent exercises power in a traditional manner or we can say that one activates means and resources to influence the other who would not have acted that way had he not any relation with the first one. It means that it is the way to influence others to do things willingly which in other circumstances, they would never have done.

2. *The social circuit of power* – The second circuit of power is called the systematic circuit which is abstract one and in this circuit, rules are formed to keep order and relations in the society.

3. *The systemic-economic circuit of power* – The third abstract circuit is called the systematic-economic circuit of power in which both the material and non material resources are created.

Power relations are carried on in different but complex manner in these circuits and it should be noted that the most efficient power is that which does not require struggle against the rules and to achieve the goal, no social resources are required. Power and resistance are separate as well as
interdependent aspects of social life. This model of circuits highlights the difference between the two major kinds of resistance which are illustrated as under:

1. **Effective Resistance**: Effective resistance is organised in such a way that it ensures victory, it emerges as a new power and forms altogether new relations. In May 1968 the events which took place in France in which the students organised demonstrations against the government is the best example of effective resistance

2. **Episodic Resistance**: The most simple and common form of resistance is Episodic resistance which is generally against the exercise of power. It strengthens the durability of power and supports its representational quality. This type of resistance is based on conformity on social and economic circuits which decides the division of means and resources and the rules of power relations. A hunger strike by the prisoners or a procession by the wives of policemen against the deterioration in the service condition of their husbands are the examples of episodic resistance.

To deal with the subject of power without relating it to Foucault will not be justified and convincing. The question of power is the focal point of his thought regarding individuals, groups, and social institutions. He thoroughly probed through this subject in his writings as well as interviews. The basic idea evolving from his works is that the optimum spot to observe the power in action is the relation between the individual and the institution or the society. How the institutions assert their power on individuals or groups and how they assert their own identity is called the 'analysis of power' by Foucault. He adopted Nietzsche's idea about the connection between knowledge and power, a connection which cannot be separated. For many years power was fascinating and predictable, but it was not an ordered doctrine. Though Foucault was influenced by Weber and Marx but he did not feel committed to toe the line and conform to their ideology. He applied his ideas to new fields like psychiatry, medicine, sexuality and penal system. He himself lived in peace with the contradictions that his approach creates and says that anyone who applies his approach should be always ready to face new difficulties.

The issues of power and knowledge have occupied a central position within sociological analysis and debates. From the works of Weber, the exercise of power and domination has been conceptualized within sociology as a constitutive feature of social life. There is an underlying thematic unity or continuity in Foucault’s work which may be described as the analysis of
particular modes of objectification, of the forms of knowledge and relations of power through which human beings have been constituted as subjects. In 1970, Foucault delivered his inaugural lecture ‘The Order of Discourse’ in which he outlined a series of ideas on discourse and power and set a provisional agenda for a related series of studies on the forms of control by which in every society the production of discourse is governed, namely ‘prohibited words’. Although references to power within this text are relatively limited, it is clear that the issue of the powers associated with or attached to discourse has been placed on the research agenda. With the publication of *Discipline and Punish*, the theme of power became an established component in Foucault’s work, as Lois McNay remarks:

Foucault’s interest was not directed at the expression of power in its most central and institutionalized forms such as class relations rather, he was concerned to examine how power relations of inequality and oppression are created and maintained in more subtle and diffuse ways through ostensibly humane and freely adopted social practices. (McNay 2)

In the works of Foucault, the concept of the body as a fundamental element on the operation of power relations has got a significant place. Foucault’s congenital or genealogical examination shows that body is the targeted aim for wielding power and it is the object of knowledge. In political field, it is endowed with power relations that make it productive as well as obedient which gives political and financial benefits. Foucault starts his genealogical analysis asking the question how power is exercised and what is the relation between power and knowledge, so the answer to all these queries will decide the nature of modern power relations.

It is clear from the studies in which the question of relations of power occupies a prominent place, notably *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality Vol.1*, that there can be no general formulation of the relationship between power and knowledge; indeed these studies are concerned precisely with examining the various historical relations between forms of knowledge and forms of the exercise of power. In both cases analysis is clearly based upon an assumption that knowledge is inextricably associated with networks of power:

Power produces knowledge; that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not
presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 27)

Foucault has provided an outline of his conception of power in several texts. Before proceeding to a detailed consideration of power, a brief overview might prove helpful in establishing some of the general points of difference between Foucault’s conception of power and of others - past and current - within the field of the human sciences.

The foremost questions about power indicated by Foucault are how power is exercised and by what medium or technique. He is also concerned with the effects of the exercise of power rather from where it comes from and what its nature is. In a nutshell, power is not comprehended as a personal property or possession of a ruling/domineering class, institution or state. Power should be considered as a strategy having certain tactics and techniques. The effects of dominance or suppression related with the power arise not from the implementation by a subject but due to the use of certain procedures and methods. It is something very essential to understand that the exercise of power does not enforce or impose any kind of constraint or prohibition upon the powerless and subalterns. Summarily, Foucault visualized power neither as an institution nor as a structure but defines and elaborates power as a multiplicity of force relations which are intentional as well as objective. He further mentions the significant aspect of power regarding its co-existence with resistance as Foucault contends, “where there is power, there is resistance, that power depends for its existence on the presence of a multiplicity of points of resistance” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1* 92-93).

When Foucault poses the question 'how power is exercised', he has two important things in mind; first the discourse of right which has crossed the limits of and has authenticised the use of power in the west since the Middle Ages; second is the effect of truth which is the natural outcome of this type of power. In every social set up these power relations are the constituents of society and such relations are established with the production and circulation of real discourse. In the west, the system of law and the discourse of right, in the beginning, proclaimed the rights and powers of the sovereign rulers, which later on put some limitations on the exercise of these powers. Foucault has given methodical cautions about the form, level, effect, direction and knowledge to expose and reveal power relations which are concealed by the discourse of right.

The basic thought evolving from the works of Foucault is that power is seen at work when it is judged through the relations of the individual and the society, so he calls it 'the
analysis of power’. Foucault contends that it is not appropriate to examine power as something that the institutions possess and use repressively against persons or groups, so he tries to move the investigation one step ahead viewing power as the mere domination of the powerless by the powerful, focusing to observe how it functions in day to day communication between people and institutions. In *The History of Sexuality Vol.1*, he establishes the notion that power is not only oppressive but is productive and creative also as it gives a scope for the development of new ideas. Foucault does not agree with the Marxist thinkers that power has oppressive aspect; he is concerned with those who resist the power when it is exercised on them. Louis Althusser professed "how people are oppressed by the state institutions and how they build themselves as individuals through the mystifying action of the ideology" (Althusser 68). As per the observation of Althusser, individuals are just tools or puppets of the ideological and oppressive model where power is seen as functioning from top to downwards in a descending form. Foucault suggests a different model in which power is used and contested, as well as an analysis focussed upon the human being as an active subject, not as a plain object for the power. In this context, the statement of Lois McNay is significant and noticeable:

> Most of the social analysts tend to regard power in an essentially negative manner, as a repressive force which is the property of an elite and is used to maintain social hierarchies. Foucault rejects such a uni-directional and repressive notion of power, replacing it with a concept of power as an essentially positive force which permeates all levels of society, engendering a multiplicity of relations other than those simply of domination. (McNay 90)

Generally, power is appreciated and regarded as the capacity of an agent to impose his wish over the will of the defenseless, or the ability to force them to do things which they do not want to do. In this way, power is considered as possession, as something retained or held by those people who are in a position of power and can dominate others. But in Foucauldian sense, power is not something that can be owned or held but cannot be held or possessed, it rather acts and reflects itself in a specific way; in reality it is more a strategy rather than a possession of an individual or groups. “Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or as something which only functions in the form of a chain…power is employed and exercised through a netlike organization…individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 98). This type of power has two main attributes which Sara Mills explains in
the following words, “(a) power is a system, a network of relations involving the whole society, rather than a relation between the oppressed and the oppressor; (b) individuals are not just the objects of power, but they are the locus where power and the resistance to it are exerted” (Mills 35).

These features and characteristics are elucidated in the words of Mark G.E. Kelly when he says Foucault’s conception of power has the following traits: “1. The impersonality of power, which means that it is not guided by the will of individual subjects; 2. The rationality of power, meaning that power is always a case of power relations between people; 3. The decentredness of power, means that it is not concentrated on a single individual or class; 4. The multidirectionality of power, meaning that it does not function only from the more powerful to the less powerful, but rather comes from below, 5. The strategic nature of power, meaning that it has a dynamic of its own” (Kelly 37).

Foucault asserts that power must be examined and understood differently than mere oppression, which simply forces the people to obey meekly and silently. “If power was never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you really believe that we should manage to obey it” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 119). For this very reason M.G.E. Kelley proclaims that Foucauldian power is “coextensive with resistance, productive, producing positive effects; ubiquitous, being found in any kind of relationship” (Kelly 38). In *The History of Sexuality Vol. I*, Foucault maintains, “where there is power there is resistance” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1* 93). It clearly explains the Foucauldian hypothesis that power relations between individuals cannot be understood as master-slave relations, in fact, they are productive relations, because they signify resistance, without which no power relations can be imagined, as Foucault forcefully argues that power is certainly and always resisted.

Foucault’s contention is that the state holds power as well as creates relationship with human beings so that the political system runs and functions smoothly. Foucault scrutinizes the ways in which power was used in different phases of European history and reflects how the monarchical power system was substituted and replaced by the democratic system. He uses in a very suggestive way the punishment imagery in the form of open display of violence and punishment which is the symbol of monarchical power and is entirely opposite to the democratic power in disciplining the individual in the form of exile, banishment, imprisonment or house arrest. The meaning of this change is how criminals are punished, and is a marked transformation
in the power system running through society. The public punishment was the visible image of royal power exercised from top downwards (the king stood for the power of the nation), but with the passage of time it is replaced by democratic forms of punishment like imprisonment, which informs how power is employed and exercised by the whole nation. To help us understand the difference, Foucault draws a line to contrast the two methods of using power. Foucault remarks:

This new mechanism of power is more dependent upon bodies and what they do that upon the earth and its products. It is a mechanism of power which permits time and labour, rather than wealth and commodities… It is a type of power which is constantly exercised by means of surveillance. It presupposes a tightly grid of material coercion rather than the physical existence of a sovereign.

(Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 104)

Foucault means to say that this new theory of power is centred upon bodies and it is a system which allows time and labour to be exercised on bodies or individuals. This form of power functions through the technique of constant surveillance and it signifies complete obedience, coercion and discipline over individuals rather than the presence of a sovereign who used to exercise physical power. Foucault then investigates how discipline, as a type of self-control supported by institutions, becomes the model in modern societies and the French thinker strongly supports his arguments subsequently. Foucault comments, “We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes’, it ‘represses’, it ‘censors’, it ‘abstracts’, it ‘masks’, it ‘conceals’, it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth” (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 104) The institutions use different modes of power execution, with special procedures and methods. Foucault further explains how the hospitals, the prison houses and the schools share some of these disciplinary techniques and mechanisms. Discipline is related with concern for control which is attributed by each individual, indicating to bodily posture and functions, checks on one's desires and emotions. All these are the effects of the disciplinary techniques and the actions lead to the self discipline of the individual and ultimately to the production of the individual himself as a subject. In this context Alec McHoul contends:

The most significant feature of Foucault’s thesis is his stress on the productive aspect of power’s modern exercise. His main aim was to turn a negative conception…exercise of power in the modern times. (McHoul 64)
McHoul means to say that the most striking feature of Foucauldian hypothesis is his focus on the positive and productive aspect of power. His main intention was to reject the negative conception of power which is related with oppression, suppression and domination. He stressed much on the productive form of power structures in the modern times and evidently renounces the negative conception of power.

Foucault argues that it is the objective of power to control and check the threatening powers and perils of discourse so that its certain aspect may be disciplined. He further clarifies this idea by stating that it is due to fear power wants to civilize, docile, organise and control discourse. Foucault mentions certain methods to control discourse like exclusion, constraints, prohibition, banning the subjects, idealization of speeches and legal incapacitation or exclusion of the insane, etc. Now Foucault examines the first kind of power is exclusion which also means rejection or abandonment. For example, the expulsion of the insane in the Renaissance period who were simply expelled from the society and similarly the lepers were also discarded or left alone in leper colonies outside the town during the Middle Ages. Foucault further clarifies his argument by affirming that exclusion also means confinement and illustrates the example of Plague victims who were settled and treated in isolated conditions under proper care and supervision. This last method for the use of power proved to be very useful and effective because in this strategy of power, there was no need to use any kind of punishing measures. Roy Boyne remarks, ”Power demands obedience. Power, ultimately is repression; repression ultimately is the imposition of the law, the law, ultimately demands submission” (Boyne 125)

The new understanding of Foucauldian theory of power indicates power not as oppression in the form of exclusion as a negative and repressive force. Even the second type of power traces a positive and productive purpose or aspect which Foucault did not assess and evaluate instantly. The third type of power is known as productive discipline which is symbolised and represented by productivity. This third kind of power combines the characteristics of power from the first and the second types, namely exclusion and transforming integration.

Foucault now analyses sovereign power and disciplinary power and states that in the foregone days, people were under the control of sovereign power of king but in the contemporary period, disciplinary power has gained popularity everywhere in society. Lois McNay remarks, “This new regime of power centres around the production of docile bodies: the organization,
disciplining and subjection of the human body in such a way as to provide a submissive, trained
and productive source of power” (McNay 92). The transformation of western societies from
sovereign power to disciplinary power is further exemplified in Foucault’s description of the
Panopticon as stated earlier, an architectural device propagated by Bentham towards the close of
the eighteenth century. Foucault explains that the Panopticon is an apparatus in which everyone
is supervised continuously without the knowledge of the inmates. Disciplinary power is contrary
to the sovereign power as it is a system of surveillance based on constant watch and observation
Dobson and Fisher comment, “The invisibility of Panopticon is an assurance of orderliness. If
the inmates are culprits, they cannot hatch a conspiracy and if they are school students, they
cannot make a noise, indulge in gossip, or waste time in the examination” (Dobson and Fisher
307).

Foucault also says that state institutions direct, control and discipline physical, mental
and emotional conditions of individuals through consistent surveillance. He anticipates Jeremy
Bentham’s idea of the Panopticon as the illustrative example of a disciplinary technique of the
state institutions. James E. Crimmins states, “Panopticon is the spontaneous exercise of power
without noise, often without any need of intervention at all and the constant power of one mind
over many” (Crimmins 74). It is an evident example of how power functions. Panopticon is a
kind of architecture which has a huge courtyard with a tower in the centre and on all sides of
building there are cells in which the prisoners are confined who can be seen only by the
supervisors in the tower but they have no contact with other prisoners or inmates. The
architectural pattern is so perfect that even if there is no overseer observer or guardian present,
the mechanism of power is still functional. Foucault remarks:

A perimeter building in the form of a ring. At the centre of this is
a tower, pierced by large windows opening on the inner face of the ring.
The outer building is divided into cells each of which traverses the
whole thickness of the building. The cells have two windows … which
afforded after all a sort of protection. (Foucault, Power/Knowledge 147)

Foucault means to say that Panopticon is a form of architecture which has a spacious courtyard
having an observatory tower in the centre surrounded by cells for the inmates. These cells have
two windows as one window is used to enter sunlight in the cell and the other is facing the tower
from where the guards or observers can keep an eye on the activities of the inmates. In this way,
the supervisor who sits on the top of the tower can monitor the mad or patients or criminals and thus the watcher can pay more attention towards the inmates more effectively and constantly.

Moreover, this design was the requirement of a capitalistic society so that continuous inspection of dishonest workers may be done and in this way the capitalists can avert their losses. The design of Panopticon proved highly profitable and valuable and with the passage of time schools, prison houses and hospitals, etc. were constructed on the same pattern. Foucault manifestly remarks, “Panopticon brings together knowledge, power, the control of the body, and the control of space into an integrated technology of discipline” (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 157). Foucault argues that power and knowledge are not opposite to each other as they are the two sides of the same coin. Foucault mentions, “We should admit…that power and knowledge directly imply each other, that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (Dreyfus and Rabinow 115). In reality, the practice of punishing criminals or prisoners was replaced by their constant examination and surveillance by means of the prison rules. Foucault defines and illustrates this change not as a humanizing of punishment, as is generally observed, but as a more correct economy of power. The change refers to the development and implementation of a new mechanism or technology, which he called disciplinary power. Foucault asserts that disciplinary power does not exert its influence in society regularly or in a particular system, rather the major social institutions like prisons, hospitals, factories and schools are infected by it. Power is exercised; not located or measured, so the major question is how it functions and what it produces. The answer to it is that it produces discipline, obedience, docility and knowledge about the inmates of the building. Dandekar further elaborates the effect of Foucauldian theory of disciplinary power: “Power as visible coercion was supplanted by detailed disciplinary practices and sustained observation and monitoring of conduct” (Dandekar 25)

An additional and no less significant observation that might be made is that Foucault has not conceptualized power as an irresistible force; it may exert pressures but in turn these may be resisted. Related to this is the question of violence or the obtaining of consent when the power relations are brought into play. Foucault does not rule out the use of violence when power is exercised. According to him, “The exercise of power can produce as much acceptance as may be wished for: it can pile up dead and shelter itself behind whatever threats it can imagine”
(Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 120). However in itself, the exercise of power is not violence, nor is it by consent. In the end, it is a total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions – “a set of actions upon other actions” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1* 127).

Foucault coined the term ‘Bio-power’ which he visualised as the major system of social control in the present day western society. He emphasised that bio-power operates on and regulates body by self discipline and self control. They adopt certain cultural rules and norms voluntarily regarding health, hygiene and sexuality. Moreover political order is maintained by making the individuals passive, controlled and productive with the help of schools, hospitals, prisons and family etc. These institutions make bodies habitual to external regulation working to discipline and in this context, Foucault maintains, “to discipline the body, optimize its capabilities, extort its forces, increase its usefulness and docility, integrate it into systems of efficient and economic controls” (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 139), and thus produces the required type of social bodies.

Foucault argues that Bio-power is a technology of power which is a way of managing the people as a group. The distinctive quality of this technology is that it allows for the control of the entire population. Simon During comments, “Bio-power is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior … power can achieve an effective command over the entire life of the population only when it becomes an integral, vital function that every individual embraces and reactivates of his or her own accord” (During 24). He further says that it is a technology which appeared in the late 18th century for controlling and managing populations. It incorporates certain aspects of disciplinary power. If disciplinary power is related with the actions of the bodies, bio-power is about maintaining the record of births, deaths, and illnesses of the whole population. G. Duncan divides Foucauldian Bio-power into two basic forms or modes, and the first of these forms is described as “a disciplinary power of the human body, the purpose of which is the subjugation and administration of the bodies” (Duncan 48). The second of these poles is seen as “regulatory control or bio-politics of the population, the aim of which is the calculated management of life” (Duncan 48). Both these poles may be further defined in the words of Marcelo Hoffman as “the micro technology and the macro technology of the same power” (Hoffman, 45) The first of these poles can be understood roughly as power over body. It operates through controlling the individuals. The second of these two poles – bio politics (macro technology) can be seen as operating on the level of the collective population.
The concept of governmentality has adequately been acknowledged as a “key notion” (Allen 431) or a “deranging term” (Keenan 36) of Foucault’s work. It plays a significant role in his analysis of power in several regards: it offers a view on power beyond the angle that focuses either on consent or on violence, it connects the technology of the self with technologies of domination, and ultimately it helps to understand and differentiate between power and domination. Governing people, in the strict sense of the word does not mean a way to force the people to do what the governor wants; it is always an equilibrium, through which the self is modified or adjusted by himself. Government refers to more or less organised, regulated techniques of power that go beyond the spontaneous exercise of power over others, following a precise and specific form of rationality which defines the adequate means to achieve it. Government then is “the regulation of conduct by the more or less rational application of the appropriate technical means” (Hindess 106).

It is noteworthy to examine that Foucault’s theory of power is a contradiction of the conventional interpretation of power as oppressive, top to down, repressive and owned by a group or institution. While referring to this system of power which Foucault terms as ‘governmentality’, he does not mean the end of sovereign power or state power but the health, happiness and welfare of maximum number of people by developing a triangle of sovereignty-discipline-government. This sovereignty is influenced and replaced by the developing discipline and governmental technique which regulate and discipline the behaviour of people. Foucault’s work on governmentality does not develop in any systematic and well ordered form, rather it is developed in a series of lectures delivered at the College de France. In these lectures, Foucault is still clearly thinking though the concept is reflected in what he says about governmentality is given in a lecture where his main focus and intention was to talk about bio-politics.

It is worth mentioning that for flexible and liberal administration, the idea of governing well is related with the plea to respect freedom of the people where government allows things to take their natural procedure. It works from a distance through direction of the free conduct. This type of power works through a series of techniques as Senellart comments – “of observation, calculation and administration and is expressed itself through an ensemble of institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific and complex power” (Senellart 108). It means that governmentality is the
governing and disciplining of minds of the people through institutions like schools, hospitals, prisons, so on and so forth.

Most of the social scientists will agree that Michel Foucault starts his analyses of power with the publication of *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* in 1975 and accomplishes his study of power in *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction Volume 1* one year later. However as a matter of fact, the first time when Foucault publicly mentions his conception of power should be dated in 1970 at the College de France where he delivered his inaugural lecture – 'The Order of Discourse'. In his speech, Foucault expounds his speculations not only on discourse but also on power. Although the issue of power is just relatively and limitedly illustrated there, Foucault still provides a brief introduction to power as well as a general skeleton of Foucauldian conception of power. Foucault links the construction of discourse to the exercise of power in 'The Order of Discourse' and points out the inseparable relation between them. Accordingly, a discourse which can be heard and spoken is the production and operation of power. Foucault asserts in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* that discourses are not simply grouping of utterances, grouped around a theme or an issue but that discourses are highly regulated grouping of utterances or statements with internal rules. Foucault proclaims:

In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality. (Foucault, *The Order of Discourse* 52)

The study of discourse is not simply the analysis of utterances and statements; it is also a concern with the structures and rules of discourse. Foucault termed this type of analysis of discursive structures as ‘archaeology’. Foucault further argues that discourses are those sets of sanctioned statements which have some institutionalized force, which means that they have a profound influence on the way that individuals act and think. As Foucault comments, “Whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functioning, transformations), we will say …that we are dealing with a discursive formation” (Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* 38). What constitutes the boundaries of discourse is very unclear. However, we can say that discourses are those grouping of statements which have similar force i.e. they are grouped together because of some
in institutional pressure, because they act in a similar way. As Lois Tyson states, “Discourse is a social language created by particular way of understanding human experience” (Tyson 281).

Foucault’s essay ‘The Order of Discourse’ examines the problems of entering oneself within a discourse. It was originally delivered as an open lecture at the College de France where he explains the way that discourse is organised and regulated by institutions so that its dangerous aspect may be checked. He depicts the methods and procedures of exclusion which operate on discourse to check what can be said in a given domain. The first of the methods of exclusion he mentions ‘prohibition’ or forbidding which means that in western social set up, certain subjects cannot be debated or discussed openly like sex and death, etc. It is noteworthy that in British culture, many people have complaint that they have treated or felt as neglected and avoided when their closest ones have died. Similarly during the Victorian era in England, it was not easy to discuss the topic of sex openly and remained dignified and respectful as sexual subjects were completely avoided in a cultured society at all costs. A second type of exclusion on what can be said or not, moves around the discourse of those who are regarded insane and therefore abnormal and unreasonable. Foucault argues that in different historical periods, the speech of a mad man was considered either to the level of divine vision or totally meaningless because generally when a ‘mad’ person speaks, no one pays any attention towards his utterances and they are ignored. So it is usually assumed that the ideas and views of judicious and rational people have more significance.

The third exclusion which determines what statement can be counted as true and that which is considered to be false in a discursive framework. Foucault clarifies the history of this division by giving the example of the Greeks during the sixteenth century and states that in those days there was no guarantee regarding the content of a statement whether it was true or false but the circumstances under which it was delivered were of greater significance. In this context Foucault argues, “a day came when the truth was displaced from the ritualized influence and just act of expression towards the utterance itself, its meaning, its form, its object and its relation to its reference” (Foucault, The Order of Discourse 54).

In addition to these exclusionary or prohibitive methods, Foucault continues his argument that discourses also have internal and external components which keep certain discourses in existence or present in this world. The first significant component is commentary i.e. those discourses which are evaluated or commented upon by others have great authority, legitimacy
and value. For example, the Bible can be regarded as a text of this nature, upon which commentaries have been written and will continue to be written in the coming times. In this way, such commentaries keep the Bible in existence so that it may spread its rightful and appropriate knowledge. Commentary ensures firmness, richness, consistency and permanence to the text because of its valuable qualities. The second internal component to regulate discourse is the notion of academic discipline which determines what can be said or what should be regarded true in a given domain. Then Foucault in his seminal essay 'The Order of Discourse' ultimately focuses on the rarefaction of discourse as an external discursive constraint and further clarifies the rarefaction of discourse by stating that though the statements could be produced by any person; but they should be within the boundaries of societal norms. In theory, a person can say anything what he wishes to say, but people remained controlled and restricted as far as the topic of conversation is concerned and they have to use socially approved words. In a sense, what a person wants to say, he has to act in a restricted sets of parameters and framework. Foucault avers that these limits are known as discursive limits; we speak or act within certain boundaries what discourse determines for us. Here Foucault is absolutely clear that discursive limitations are those restrictions which are approved by some institutions. Foucault is more concerned with the effects of these limitations rather than the interests or benefits of these limitations. Moreover, discourse is also checked and restricted by customs and rituals which constraint the people who can deliver certain types of statements. For instance, in Britain only a priest or a registrar has the privilege to marry a couple legally and similarly only the monarch can open the Parliament. Foucault means to say that if someone else who is not authorized pronounced or uttered the same words, the statement will not be considered as legitimate and can never produce the desired effect. In this context, Foucault states:

"Discourses are at once and for all subservient to power … discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, (Foucault, The History of Sexuality Vol.1 101)"

The significant aspect of Foucault’s analysis of discourse in ‘The Order of Discourse’ so knowledgeable is that he focuses on constraint – the way that we act within discursive limits rather than thinking that people are free to express their opinions whatever they wish. This focus
on constraint may be seen outwardly as negative, but when taken together with his significant work, *The History of Sexuality*, this sense of constraint can be observed as productive and it should be noted that only through this process of constraint that knowledge can be produced. Discourse gives knowledge about the person who is speaking and what is his intention behind the discourse. From the analysis of a discourse gender, sexuality, class, position and even the relationship with the people to whom discourse is given can be judged. The discourse of a doctor with patient, a lawyer with a client, a teacher with a student can be easily differentiated. Foucault was particularly interested in “looking at the modes of discourse that not any one had the right to use or that requires specific locations to gain authority” (Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* 50). Foucault further asserts that discourse is never fixed as nothing is permanent in discourse and everything is in a state of flux or evolution. Discourses are multifarious because they go on changing because when new discourses take place, they make their own rules replacing the already existing ones and when this continues, discourses undergo a complete transformation.

*Characteristics of Power/Knowledge Discourse*

Power relations are determined by various factors like culture, place and time, and therefore Foucault deals with power discourse in contemporary Western society and its salient characteristics and features are as under:

A. Power is not a commodity, a position, a prize or a conspiracy. Power not only functions in specific domains of social life, but appears in everyday life. Power exists at all levels and sizes, including the most minute and most intimate, such as the human body.

B. Power relations are mobile, changeable and unbalanced. One should not try to find a stable logic in power, or a possibility of balance in its sphere.

C. Power is not a thing which is under the control of a specific group or institutions. The purpose of the researcher of power is to explore how it functions in a society in the everyday life of the people.

D. Power has a clear and decisive role in our social life. It is multi-directional as it moves from upward to downwards and from bottom to top. As Oliver expresses it, “relations of power are internal conditioned of differential relations: economic, sexual etc.” (Oliver 182).
E. Power is positive, dynamic and productive in nature and it will not be appropriate to think of power as only coercive, repressive and constraining. In this context, the viewpoint of J. G. Merqiour is worth quoting, “Foucault no longer believes that power suppresses, ignores, separates, conceals or hides instead he proposed that power is productive” (Merqiour 156).

F. Power is a general standard of power relations in a given society at a given time. No-one is outside this standard and no-one is above it. For example, there are certain rules for the jailors and criminals yet the jailors enjoy some benefits or advantages being the incharge of prisons or the designer of the prison structure.

G. Mere domination is not the nature or character of power. Domination is there, but power is exercised upon the dominants also and not only upon the have nots or marginalized ones.

H. Power is a fundamental element of human agency. Absolute lack of power means ceasing to be a human agent. Power is the human capability to interfere in events and to make a difference.

I. Power is an integral part of the social communication and it is an indispensable feature of social life.

J. Power is a process and an element which meddles between social framework and human agency and their relation is systematic, organised and forceful.

K. Power is undoubtedly related with oppression and domination but power is also productive and makes development possible. Power is positive and productive and it should not be considered only as repressive and suppressive.

L. Power is closely linked with knowledge like the two sides of the same coin. In this regard, Townley comments, “Mechanisms of power are simultaneously instruments for the formation and accumulation of knowledge” (Townley 48).

M. Power/Knowledge functions through discourse. Relations of power “cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of discourse which operates through and on the basis of this association” (Foucault, Power/Knowledge 93).

N. Discourse is that specific and organised statement which has some influence, force and authority. But discourse is not uniform everywhere as it changes from person to person and from place to place because nothing is permanent in discourse and everything is in a state of flux and evolution.
O. Discourse produces power and knowledge but the notion of constraint and exclusion is very significant in Foucault’s investigation of discourse

In conclusion, the conceptions of Power/Knowledge Discourse have been the main issues in which many political and sociological philosophers have been interested for a long time. Power is a key element in discussion of discourse and Foucault investigates the question of power and provides a new analysis. Rather than simply assuming that power is a possession or that power is the violation of someone’s rights, or as the Marxist theorists have assumed that power relations are determined by economic relations, Foucault affirms that power is no more an object which can be possessed by someone or some groups. Foucault argues for the implications of power with knowledge so that all of the knowledge we have is the result or the effect of power struggles. Foucault has described this connection between the production of knowledge and power relations as ‘power/knowledge’. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction Volume 1*, can be taken as a companion to *Discipline and Punish*. In this book, Foucault spends the space of more than two chapters on illustrating his conception of power. We can safely conclude that Foucault’s conception of power has developed to be much more complete and comprehensive than before at this time. David R. Shumway states, “In *Discipline and Punish*, we saw how the disciplinary techniques could constitute the individual as an object to be judged, measured and examined. In *The History of Sexuality*, we saw how the individual is constituted as a speaking and desiring subject with an inner realm of experience that the confession reveals” (Shumway 146). Our social fabric is knitted by power relations. Power, Foucault proclaims, is everywhere. In fact the web of power is spread everywhere and it has affected the most intimate relations—Husband-wife, parent-children, teacher-student, doctor-patient and employer-employee all are engulfed by power. Thus power relations are rooted in the system of social network as Dreyfus and Rabinow rightly point out, “A society without power relations can only be an abstraction” (Dreyfus and Rabinow 222).

It is the aim of power to control the threatening force and dangers of discourse, to check and exorcise its unpredictable sensational side and to avoid its materiality. Out of fear power wants to docile, reduce, control and organize discourse. Foucault lists a number of practices to control discourse: exclusion, prohibition, banning of themes, ritualization of speeches, legal incapacitation of the insane, establishing boundaries between what is right and wrong. Power works through discourses and discursive formations. In policing of abnormal behaviour, the
power of the human sciences derives from what they claimed to be knowledge. Such a cluster of claims to knowledge is what Foucault calls a ‘discourse’. Discourse produces claims to knowledge and it is these claims which we accept that gives its power. There is an intimate relationship between knowledge and power. Knowledge is a way to define and categorize others and it leads to surveillance and discipline. Knowledge is for Foucault the product of a certain discourse which has enabled it to be formulated and has no validity outside it. Foucault’s knowledge is produced by power, by the means that a discourse has its disposal to establish its credibility. Moreover, power is never repressive or negative, but positive and productive. John Gaventa forcefully argues that Foucault is one of the few writers on power who recognize that “power is not just a negative, coercive or repressive thing that forces us to do things against our wishes, but can also be a necessary, productive and positive force on the society” (Gaventa 2)

There is no society without power and therefore no one can live outside the relations of power. Foucault examines the relation of individual and society thinking that individual is not powerless against groups or social institutions. He does not reduce the constraints imposed to individuals, but links that power is not limited to a particular sphere, but is scattered throughout the society. In this way one can observe the way in which each human interaction how resistance produces. Power is often seen as an unstable element, which can be always challenged and as a result, power relations must be permanently maintained and acknowledged.

In this research project, I have taken up the fictional texts from different cultures and literary traditions. There are Indian, British, Caribbean and African texts. But something is common in these texts is that there is a confrontation with power, there is an underlying focus with power operations and power relations, directly or indirectly. These are based on colonialism, caste system or racism, etc. So the issues are common, how human beings confront the oppressive power which is exercised by State or institutional authority or religion. Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse can be fruitfully and adequately applied to many of these literary texts as they inform us about the power structures in different times, cultures, societies and countries. Literary texts as we understand now are never apolitical as they are always loaded with some kinds of problems. Edward Said also pointed out that literary texts are not disinterested documents and that is why literary texts are best analysed alongside other texts like journalism, travel writing, essays, and history, etc. Foucault's theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse is not purely concerned with literature, as it is broadly concerned with sociology,
politics and philosophy. He analyses sexuality, penal system, madness, discipline and punish and repression on human beings. These things I have attempted to substantiate in this research project, although these are not the only texts, for there may be hundred other texts. But I have taken up some representative texts because it is not logically possible to take all the texts in a research project.

Chapter I entitled: "Introduction to Foucault's Theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse: A Critical Appraisal and Reassessment" designates and illustrates the Foucauldian theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse. Many of the critical positions related to Foucauldian theory of power, knowledge and their relationship within the larger social, civil and human contexts have already been specified in the earlier part of this chapter. In sum, the introductory chapter examines and capsulates in detail the above theoretical and philosophical positions critically, and their comprehensive significance in interpreting literary texts, besides the immense influence of Foucauldian approach to Power/Knowledge in the multiple sense.

Chapter II entitled: "The Politics of Economic Power and Exclusion: Charles Dickens's Hard Times" is devoted to identify the relevance of Foucauldian theory of Power. In the nineteenth century, England saw the dawning of Industrialism which allowed capitalism to spread its wings unchecked when this was coupled with old labour laws and was typical of the socio-economic class which was getting richer day by day, it wrecked havoc on the lives of common masses and compelled them to suffer a lot. At this juncture Dickens wrote Hard Times, a scathing social satire, with his focus on industrial utilitarianism and its ruinous impact on society. Dickens chooses Thomas Gradgrind as the premier character to be the mouthpiece or the spokesperson of industrialism to convey the ideals, evils and eventual outcomes of growing utilitarianism. The Foucauldian theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse is applied to this celebrated fiction where we find a big gap between the powerful industrialists and powerless workers. Gradgrind's inflexible obsession with facts indicates his philosophy as a reflection of the mentality of factory owners who look at factory workers as means of net profit in terms of money. He judges the worth of children in a classroom by their ability to accurately define terms or give the factual details. The educational theory which is founded on pure facts and statistics is harshly condemned and criticised by Dickens in Hard Times, the relation between labour and capital is severely attacked, aggressiveness of trade unions and stubbornness of factory owners is also deplored. The resistance shown by Stephen Blackpool and Sissy against the prevalent
hierarchical power structure in the nineteenth century Victorian England mirrors the Foucauldian hypothesis of power. George Gissing rightly comments, "The book is a crude attack on materialism, a theme which might, of course, have entered very well into a study of the combatant working-class" (Gissing 106).

Chapter III entitled: "Untouchable: The Dialectics of Power in Caste, Class and Religion" takes up for critical discussion and interpretation Mulk Raj Anand's Untouchable. The novel demonstrates the Foucauldian interpretation of Power/Knowledge Discourse as it accentuates the social marginalisation of the untouchables including women and subalters. Ultimately they are bound to agonize under the established class and caste structure, growing on rich-poor divide because in Indian social set up, caste becomes a leading factor of a person’s identity in the power scale. The novel is a heartbreaking and poignant cry of the writer against the animality and coldness of the upper class people towards the have-nots and destitutes. It symbolises the Foucauldian investigation of power as the capacity of powerful agents to impose their will over the powerless, and the web of power is omnipresent in a society in which all are engulfed and no one is outside these power relations. In this context Foucault proclaims, "Power is co-extensive with the social body; there are no spaces of primal liberty between the meshes of its network and the relations of power are interwoven with other kinds of relations" (Foucault, Power/Knowledge 142). Anand has graphically and distinctly illustrated the mental agony and distress of Bakha, the central character of the novel. A close examination of the text makes us aware of the numerous problems of the untouchables who are mistreated, oppressed and abused by the upper strata of Brahminical society. With Bakha, there are some other characters who also suffer because of their low caste and marginalized status and they suffer and suffer only as they are helpless enough to challenge or voice their emotions. Bakha is a universal figure who represents the brutality, harshness, injustice, domination and humiliation which has been the destiny of the whole community of untouchables. His hardships and misfortunes are not only his own, but represent the sufferings of all under privileged, expatriates and the subalters. In other words, the novel exposes the deep-rooted contemptuousness, ruthlessness and viciousness which men inflict on human beings who are still meager and trivial in the eyes of the society. The Foucauldian analysis is an appropriate approach to explore this colonial text as Anand’s presentation of untouchability examines those facets of human life which are closely linked to Foucauldian theorization of power and resistance. Caste and national barriers have no significance for the
novelist and he regards all mankind as one, and his purpose is to focus attention on the miserable condition of the have-nots, awaken sympathy and compassion for them, and thus make a start for their welfare and upgrading. The novel arouses in the mind of the objective reader the terrifying social disorder that prevailed in the colonial days because the established power structure of the society was suppressive, domineering, tyrannical and coercive.

Chapter IV entitled: "The Discourse of Power/Knowledge and The Colonized Other: Reading V.S. Naipaul's A House for Mr. Biswas" takes account of another splendid colonial text from Foucauldian perspective. A House for Mr. Biswas delineates the colonial situation in Trinidad during the stormy period of World War II. Mr. Biswas, the protagonist, has been set against the orthodox and traditional Hindu dogmas, customs, traditions and ideology. Naipaul sketches Hanuman House as a symbol of traditionalism, rigidity, cultural infallibility, ritual duty, hierarchical and closed communal life. It runs on the lines of a slave society where Mrs. Tulsi and her brother-in-law Seth were at the top in the scale of power structure and they needed docile and adaptable workers to follow their every order meekly and obediently. They exploit the homelessness and impoverishment of men like Biswas and others by exerting their power on them which reflects that power functions from top to down in a hierarchical fashion. The fundamental power of these narrow ideas of the Hindu community has been contributory for instigating the spirit of defiance and disobedience in Mr. Biswas, the man who stands alone against the authoritative forces of discrimination, fanaticism and injustice; subsequently his resistance to the tyrannical Tulsidom is quite significant and relevant in the novel. His insubordination and non-conformity assumes significance as he wants to unhook himself from the power structure of brutal, conventional ideas and rituals of the so-called Brahminical society and tries to establish his own identity and existence in the fast changing multiethnic Caribbean society. A close reading of the novel reflects that Hanuman House resembles the architectural pattern of Panopticon from where Mrs. Tulsi can keep an eye on the inmates of the Tulsi household and assert her power in order to maintain control and discipline. Constant supervision and management of the inmates in Hanuman House is executed through the panoptic schema of disciplinary power by Mrs. Tulsi to make every member of the family governable, manageable and subservient. In this context the Foucauldian statement becomes relevant wherein he proclaims, “Panopticon may even provide an apparatus for supervising its own mechanisms. In the central tower, the director may spy on all the employees that he has under his orders … he
will be able to judge them continuously, alter their behaviour, impose upon them the methods he thinks best” (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 204). Though he is a member of Tulsi family as he is married to one of the daughters of Mrs. Tulsi, yet he remains a stranger and thus becomes a poor and helpless victim of power relations. In reality, Biswas belongs to a labourers' class which is powerless enough to give expression to any form of resistance or defiance against the power structure of Tulsi family. His suffering is that of a destitute individual struggling to acquire a minimum basic requirement - the claim to a house or a place of his own.

Chapter V entitled: "Confronting the Web of Power Politics: An Interpretation of Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*" is a critical analysis of a Syrian family living in Kottayam District of Kerala. This postcolonial novel is justifiably applicable to Foucault's theory of power/knowledge as it is a controversial write up about characters who are subjected to the discourse of gender, ethics, truth and religion of their community. They cross the limits set up by their society and refuse to stick to their individuality and show the courage to violate the norms set by their community. The novel shows how the ideology of disciplinary power is suppressed and resisted at the individual level by the protagonist Ammu and she faces suffering, torture, humiliation and ultimately death because she is a victim of power relations which determine her fate. The resistance at the individual level is ruthlessly crushed by the age old patriarchical system of society which has class, caste and gender differences. Ammu is not given protection even in her parents' house because of the orthodoxy in the family and society. It is her misfortune that her parents and her brother Chacko treat her cruelly and torture her physically, emotionally and mentally without having any regrets for this behaviour. Leading a life of a divorced woman, separated forcibly from her children, has no share in parental property as her brother thinks that even the share of his sister Ammu's property is also his property. It is manifestly emphasised that power relations are interwoven with other relations as power is everywhere and it comes from everywhere, it is produced from one moment to the next and from one point to the other and thus in every relation, there is a display of power. Ammu belongs to a high caste, and Velutha has illicit sex relation with the low caste Velutha. On social level it is an immoral relation, that is to say she outpaces her limits and resists the laws of Keralite society and its moral standards. Her act of resistance is according to Foucault's theory of the co-existence of power relations which means that power and resistance go side by side. In this context, Foucault appropriately remarks, "There are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective
because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised" (Foucault, *Power/ Knowledge* 142). The love of Ammu and Velutha is a resistance of moral norms of the society but their resistance is brutally and callously crushed by the male dominated upper class patriarchal society which takes pride in its high caste. The author has closely observed the widening distance of the powerful and the powerless in India as well as in other parts of the world. So this award winning novel of Arundhati Roy justifies Foucault's notion of power and resistance.

Chapter VI entitled: "Apartheid, Oppression and Counter-Violence: A Foucauldian Reading of J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*" is an analysis of violence and turmoil in the post-apartheid period as the novel is a grim portrayal of racial status of whites and blacks in the apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa. The unpleasant questions about the relationship between the coloured and the white races are posed, as well as deplorable account of the white community which is on the point of extinction in the post-apartheid period is graphically drawn. The power has changed hands from the white people and it has gone to the black ones who are in large number and the whites were in minority. South Africa was a British colony where the whites ruled and treated the black people with cruelty, hatred, violence and treachery but with the changed power equations the ruling class is the Black people now and they do not leave a single chance to take revenge on the whites. With the shift of power to the natives, a great change came in their behaviour, thinking, attitudes and life style. They used to be the silent sufferers in the apartheid era but in the post-apartheid times, they refuse to tolerate the pain in silence, rather they have become a part of the machine of which everyone is a part. Foucault has justly said that power is not a system of dominance in which dominated ones are always powerless people holding secondary position in the life. The people who wield power once can be ruled over by others because power goes on changing hands and heads also as it brings a change in their thinking, though this mental change is a comparatively slow process. Professor Lurie, the central character of the novel could not change mentally as easily as Petrus, who at once follows the mode of dressing, walking, talking and living like white people. The shift in power affects the issues of identity, race, gender and dignity, and the operation of power leads them to very complex dimensions in the new South Africa. Lurie learns to accept the change after losing his university job, position, respect and dignity. He even loses his daughter who even after her rape by the three black men does not agree to report the matter to the police and in the end of the
novel, he reaches the state of total resignation and renunciation. From the University Professor to a caretaker in the dog farm and vegetable grower and seller in the remote east Cape Town shows his acceptance of the changed power situations in the country. Foucault's contention that power excludes and represses individuals and distorts their personality is true in the case of Lurie, so the dynamics of power visibly operate throughout the novel, making the individual’s experience universal.

The main intention of this research project is to reach certain conclusions so that the relevance of Foucauldian Power/Knowledge Discourse can be traced in literary texts as well. My thesis is not on literary texts alone; the first chapter is related with Foucault's theory of power/knowledge discourse where I have extensively talked about sovereign power, disciplinary power, bio-power, governmentality, discourse and resistance etc. and rest of the chapters are on selected literary texts on which I have tried to apply this theory.

Foucault builds his arguments around several of these constructions. In *Hard Times*, utilitarianism and capitalism are not so much concerned with literary imagination but Dickens takes up these issues being a staunch social critic. Similarly, Arundhati Roy takes up the issue of caste, sexual oppression and gender oppression. It is very difficult to say whether V. S. Naipaul and Coetzee are aware of what Foucault has said and literary texts are independent of all these things. So indirect reflection is ostensibly there and that is the part of research i.e. to find out how these theories have or can be related to the texts in a better way. Otherwise, we can read a literary text as a story. For instance, we can read Mohun Biswas's life as the story of an individual but it will be an ordinary reading of the text if we do not talk about colonialism, indenture system, slavery, uprooting and oppression of different types which form the backdrop of the narrative strategy. If we understand these issues, we can understand the background of the text in a better way.

Basically, each writer has taken up a specific situation or confronted a problem in these texts. For example, Coetzee's novel is very difficult, it is about apartheid and post-apartheid. Now 'apartheid' has been exercised indirectly in a number of ways in other countries, in other societies. It has been carried out in India, Africa and many other countries. So in every text, there is a lack of privilege which make people become subalterns, victimized and oppressed. Foucault was quite aware that the world is very uneven and human beings are subject to many forms of oppression exercised by diverse forms of authority. In all these literary texts that I have taken
up, there is a form of resistance. To repeat, Foucault also said that where there is power, there is bound to be resistance. In all these texts, there is resistance; even the element of protest is very much there. Importantly, all these texts are from decolonized nations and there is direct or indirect oppression reflected in these texts. Basically these are cultural texts, about diverse cultures and communities reflecting the problem of identity, problem of finding dignity and respect. They are illustrative of these issues and Foucault's theory is one of the possible ways of understanding the larger dimensions of these texts. Although I believe that purely shoehorning of Foucauldian theory of Power/Knowledge Discourse to any literary text may not be appropriate, but literary texts like other texts can be fruitfully understood in the light of Foucauldian theorization. Finally, what makes the present research project viable and rewarding as I have experienced in the last few years of study, is that both literary texts and theory can be fruitfully co-related, for reflecting what is most valuable, rather than keeping them in confrontation and isolation. In sum, theories like those spearheaded by Foucault emerge from real problems of civilizations, societies and nations for exposing the negative and violative tendencies affecting human beings, irrespective of class and gender.
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