



IRAQI
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

Journal of Language Studies

Contents available at: <http://www.iasj.net/iasj/journal/356/about>



A FOUCAULTIAN READING OF RESISTANCE IN CHINUA ACHEBE'S NOVEL "THINGS FALL APART "

Sarab Husian Khalaf *

English Department /College of Education for Education for Women,
Tikrit University
skhalaf@st.tu.edu.iq

&

Asst. Prof Rudaina Abdulrazzaq M. Saeed (Ph.D)

English Department /College of Education for Education for Women,
Tikrit University
rudaina63@tu.edu.iq

Received : 13 / 6 /2023 , Accepted: 25 / 7 /2023, Online Published: 31 / 10 / 2023

©Tikrit University. This is an open Access Article under The Cc by LICENSE
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Abstract

The field of cultural, human and literature has taken the entire study of the concept of resistance, as this concept is linked to the French theorist Michel Foucault. He asserts that power is what caused us to be in the place where we are now. There is no separation between resistance and power, both come through the other.

* Corresponding Author: SARAB HUSIAN, Email: skhalaf@st.tu.edu.iq
Affiliation: TIKRIT University - Iraq

Chinua Achebe is the greatest and most famous writer in African literature. He attempts to find an escape from the colonial turn that invaded African literature, The goal of Achebe's writings is to enable the African people to have pride in their history.

His novel "Things Fall Apart" focused on showing the tragic situation of the people of Africa, the impact of colonialism on Africa, its history and culture, and how the colonialists tried to obliterate the African identity.

The study aims to analyze the novel "Things Fall Apart" in the light of the Foucauldian concept of resistance and how the characters demonstrated the rejection of colonialism and its resistance in the novel.

Key Word: Foucault, Resistance, Chinua, colonialism

قراءة فكرية للمقاومة في رواية تشينوا أتشيبي "الأشياء تتداعى"

سراب حسين خلف

كلية التربية للبنات جامعة تكريت

و

ا.م.د. ردينة عبدالرزاق محمد سعيد

كلية التربية للبنات جامعة تكريت

المستخلص

لقد تناول المجال الثقافي والإنساني والأدبي دراسة مفهوم المقاومة، حيث يرتبط هذا المفهوم بالمنظر الفرنسي ميشيل فوكو. ويؤكد أن القوة هي التي جعلتنا نكون في المكان الذي نحن فيه الآن. لا يوجد فصل بين المقاومة والقوة، فكلاهما يأتي من خلال الآخر.

تشينوا أتشيبي هو أعظم وأشهر كاتب في الأدب الأفريقي. إنه يحاول إيجاد مهرب من التحول الاستعماري الذي غزا الأدب الأفريقي. الهدف من كتابات أتشيبي هو تمكين الشعب الأفريقي من الاعتزاز بتاريخه.

ركزت روايته "الأشياء تتداعى" على إظهار الوضع المأساوي الذي يعيشه شعب أفريقيا، وتأثير الاستعمار على أفريقيا وتاريخها وثقافتها، وكيف حاول المستعمرون طمس الهوية الأفريقية.

تهدف الدراسة إلى تحليل رواية "الأشياء تتداعى" في ضوء المفهوم الفوكوي للمقاومة وكيف أظهرت شخصياتها رفض الاستعمار ومقاومته في الرواية.

Introduction

THE COCEPT OF RESISTANCE

The concept of resistance means a rejection of the authority or a response to it from below, and it is considered a sub-disposition that has the ability to challenge and confront the authority, bargaining with it and its erosion. It is also possible that the resistance is high on the authority and sometimes it fuels or disturbs the authority.(Lilja,209). When discussing about resistance and its definition, there are many definitions of the main resistance and others related to this approach in one way or another, such as "civil resistance", "daily resistance" in addition to the so-called "critical resistance" and this is within other research frameworks and is in an overlapping manner known as partial For example, studies related to the concept of terrorism and studies of social movement, in addition to another type of studies, which is the studies of the followers. It is also possible to talk about other concepts and topics that are similar, such as the concept of resistance, but they have unequal but different connotations.

The resistance was closely associated with the attitudes that were against society and ruin. The resistance had a great influence in changing the course of history and making a major change in all societies. One of the main points of view of the concept of resistance. which is considered primarily to James C. Scott, has been that he had an argument about "class resistance" involving actions by members of a group known as secondary and involving matters either in the form of rejecting matters or claims or in the form of reduction An example of this is the so-called prestige or rents, as well as taxes. And this is in the hands of the upper class, such as the state, or the lower one, authority over others, such as farmers, business owners, craftsmen, as well as owners, or it is in order to demonstrate its claims such as respect and land, in addition to that, associations for charitable work in exchange for the higher classes.(www.reseachgate.net).

The resistance is within specific relationships in a specific time and place, and the interaction involved with various actors and discourses are not similar but characterized by their difference. It is knowing what is behind the intent or the results. This resistance can also be defined as intersecting because it is known as forces that do not share a single relationship of force. It is also not on one level as a result of the change in the situation. In the end, the use of the unstable or interconnected and the sudden use of daily resistance because of its interference with the authority in addition to its unconnected relationship with it, then the description of it is discursive through the actual actors or the desired goals or the observers and that is either resistance or not. In the end a quote can be mentioned Important for the theorist Foucault, who explained that "where there is power, there's resistance."(Vinthagen .et.al, 1).

The thinkers of this concept also worked hard in order to give an explanation of the reason behind the necessity of opposing one group against another, whether this opposition is political or is it moral in social institutions, as the spread ideologies have great control over the discipline of participants and social traditions. However, this concept in theoretical bodies is very far from being opposed to authority only. Resistance has to contribute, in some way, to the cause of gradual change related to the environment by

encouraging the refutation of the reproduction of oppressive social structures and social relations (Abowitz, 878).

Those in charge of the resistance do not consider their resistance in vain, nor do they intend to oppose or deliberately harm the people in power (higher positions). or against their interest. But on the other hand, their action does not correspond to reality in favor of the superiors when carrying out the work of power. After that, it appears as a resistance far from the results that are reached, whether intended or unintended, or leading to problems related to their peers.

This type of resistance, (daily resistance) can be intentional, but it is not literally part of the intentions, ideological politics, or interests known to the hostile class, but the goal of resistance is possible to find solutions to problems or preserve their lives.(Vinthagen, et.al,20)

According to Scott, the success of the daily resistance requires an important matter, which is not to show intentions systematically, or rather, intentions are falsified as sincere and slandered. Apparently, it is not possible to know what the "intention" of the person who is doing the resistance is, but Scott discusses the importance of doing so because the goal is to clarify what is considered to be the work of the resistance. Scott gives an example of how resistance is based on a manifestation of power, in addition to people who believe that real resistance is "organised, principled, and has revolutionary effects. The vital role of power relations in changing forms of resistance." Instead, the daily resistance is "secret" and the goal is to resist the resistance

Scott suggests that the main advantage of daily resistance is the abundance of use of distortion, as what is known as concealment is obtained in two cases, either by concealing the identity of the demonstrators or concealing the act itself. It can be said that the daily resistance is a type of resistance that contains concessions and is known as the infinite complex. It also facilitates giving an idea of the method of polluting the resistance with what is known as force. Scott argues that daily resistance, when carried out by many people, is likely to be an effective type of resistance. Scott's views, they helped in the American Civil War to defeat the southern states from all of the above. It can be said that scattered acts of resistance are likely to bring about great changes in society, when they are spread as serial remnants of mass and are not considered organized. (Lilja,11).

Also among those who argued about daily resistance, Kerkvliet, who is considered one of the pioneers who endeavoured to search for this concept, is that when people wander within a political system and seek attempts to bypass this system, these attempts are in the form of actions that appear as daily resistance. Still, in reality, they are not. Also, "these actions usually convey indifference to production, distribution, and resource use rules and processes. They are usually things people do in their attempts". (Vinthagen,20)

According to Kerkvliet, these people have advantages distinguishing them from everyday resistance. Their resistance is not in vain. Neither intends to oppose or intentionally harm persons in power (higher positions) nor against their interests. However, on the other hand, their work does not correspond to the reality for the benefit of superiors when carrying out the work of power. After that, it appears as a resistance away from the results reached by being intentional or unintended or leading to problems related to their peers.

After this, scholars have opinions about Foucault's work, as they have shown that Foucault's study of power greatly influenced the study of resistance, or rather did not leave

room for it, which focuses on the study of social production in addition to the construction of space. These scholars believe that Foucault shows "how architecture contributes to maintaining the strength of one group over another, on a level that includes the control of movement and the control of the body in space." (Naraghi, 9) They claimed that this thinker and those who follow his approach have not succeeded in addressing the lived experience and the resistance of individuals as well as groups to the so-called process of social control known as spatial. Joining this caravan of scientists is the scientist Driver, who claims that Foucault underestimates the importance of what he called the struggle.

He was influenced by Leonard's words and even quoted from his words about Foucault that the latter, due to his excessive normalization process, left only a small space for revolutions. But on the other hand, he explained the method of resistance, control, knowledge, and winning among power relations. Foucault claimed that in the curriculum of force there is a so-called attempt to escape by other parties to achieve their freedom. It is not possible to imagine the circle of power without stubbornness, pride, and attempts to resist. What we mean by struggle is to follow the methods of resistance against dissimilar forms of power, which is a starting point.

Six characteristics can be illustrated between these conflicts.

- 1- Not just one country.
- 2- The goal of revolutions or so-called struggles is the effectiveness of the force itself.
- 3- The collision of the sources of direct force.
- 4- They do not accept unilateral government.
- 5- They fight with the power of the relationship of knowledge.
- 6- They reject ideas known as abstractions that do not care about the idea of "who we are as individuals." In general, revolutions and resistance (Ibid,10).

By talking about resistance from Foucault's concept, what is known as critical resistance that David Couzens Hoy used in a useful way, or it can be explained more precisely "criticism without resistance is empty and resistance without criticism is blind." It must consider that Foucault is looking at both concepts, power and resistance. The cooperation between the two things, power and criticism, i.e. what we mean by "critical resistance" characterizes the public sphere, which is a thread connecting the dissimilar periods that gives Foucault's thought a distinction and at the same time sets limits to a different framework. On resistance as a basis. If we look at the resistance from the political point of view, the resistance becomes clear within a field of non-acquiescence to control, as a method of rejecting the government (Barnett, 235).

In Foucault's opinion, most acts of resistance, in all its forms, are linked by the fact that they deal with the same relations of force. The study cannot mean that the specificity of these struggles, and struggles of behavior remained independent and separated from each other with their bodies and partners in addition to their own unique goal. They can be considered committed to conflicts and other problems. For this reason, behavioral inversions are specific in function and form, but regardless of the distinguishing feature of their specificity, but they are absolutely different.

Resistance in all its forms has not been resolved, regardless of its specificity. This can be reflected in the Palestinian revolutions and resistance that took the field of development within a specific region with its power relations described as historically established. The Palestinians are integrating into a variety of designs and methods in opposition to the ongoing colonization. What is known as open and strong resistance coexists with the steadfastness of the Palestinians, and this contains a large set of measures whose main goals are to maintain the Palestinian presence on the ground. It is possible that the forms of the Palestinian resistance and its various types are determined in the goals and the forms as well, but we can say that this resistance is not independent at all despite its awareness of its peculiarities (Lilja, 12).

From a different side, resistance is a great contribution to building the environment in a new form, by tempting to refute the "reproduction of oppressive social structures and social relations." They are recognized against the authority imposed by the schools, whose work is often against their interests (Abowitz, 878).

In talking about the views of Dennis wrang, he gave an important statement about the importance of resistance and the purpose of that is to understand strength. He gave his saying that the idea of control and dealing in the mechanisms of resistance is included within the idea that strength is professional or possibility. Weber defined power as the ability to be one of the actors in the relationship described as social in a condition that makes him able to carry out his goals and wills despite resistance. Evidently, the definition of power given by Weber shows that struggle is necessary within relations of power. On the other hand, Anthony Giddens attempts to defend Weber against this statement.

Giddens has no objection to the idea that the interrelationship between strength and resistance amounts to conflict, but quite the contrary, he believes in the intimate connection between strength and resistance. Giddens' important view is not to accept the notion that power exists only if resistance is defeated in Weber's definition, which states that it is an opportunity for a person or group to understand and know their will and interests within the social workspace even against the resistance that arises from other people within it. (Barbalet, 533)

Foucault insisted and emphasized the concepts of freedom and resistance in both his writings and interviews. Foucault is considered a modernizer who immersed himself in politics throughout his life. He translates his works as an explanation of the way individuals are made, as well as how these individuals prove their existence and themselves in matters of a fresh face. He considers resistance as a tool used for self-change, by minimizing the cases of control. There is also another explanation for this concept. It is not necessary to say that resistance is a confrontational reaction to force. Rather, it may take other forms and methods, such as not confronting or moving, escaping or just saying no or not uttering a word at all. All this can be described as resistance or action. Nevertheless, we can say that it falls within the power relations.

Foucault insists that the concept of resistance is rooted in what is known as the dynamic quality of the relationship of actors. Resisting is not the end of action for Foucault, but rather it is through the capacity of resistance that an understanding of action can be reached. Based on this, resistance is an initial requirement for power relations, an explicit response to continuous power relations. In the same field, the existence of the possibility of resistance does not exist in the human concepts or some of them about the "free individual". For this resistance, depending on Foucault, gives the manifestation to the individual. Resistance does not passively create power, but it has the ability to create itself within its ability to resist within power relations. After the publication of the book

"Discipline and Punish" with a short period and in two debates, Foucault forcefully clarified this interpretation: It is not right to imagine the individual as a form of a primary nucleus, or a basic, elementary, multiple, and rigid atom. A substance that communicates with force that can strike and thus break individuals and make them subject to it. In other words, not in exchange for power.

From his basic points, the individual is the effectiveness of power is a tool for its expression. The study can prove our existence through resistance. But there are certainly institutional and personal obstacles, in addition to social obstacles to this matter. Foucault never suggests that the disintegration of fashion takes place from a whole piece of cloth. But despite this, the possibility at hand to resist, is an early requirement for your presence as a proxy actor and what sets the individual as an actor. We can give an explanation of Foucault's main point, which is based on the fact that power relations are systematic about the amount of potential resistance, by knowing that the incoherent experiences of power relations that you can consider exist in a spectrum, in one aspect of which there is complete control as the result in existence is the lack of opportunities for resistance..

Foucault clarifies the importance of resistance within power relations, and the goal is self-making. He gives great emphasis to this issue. In his vision, power is not a line of resistance to self-realization, but rather a network through which self-creation and development can be achieved (www.academia.edu, 169).

From here, an important question can be asked, which is the role of individuals in this. Our view begins by talking about resistance and fighting with the individuals' promise of liberation. Here comes another question: What happened to this promise? Here is the case from which you can get a major basic criticism of Foucault. As one gave us Mark Bevir where he explains that "Foucault certainly did not reintroduce the self as an agent of change." Relying on it, he considers the self as a function of the determination of force and he goes on to speak, showing that history can be considered an independent drama of overconstructiveness in which force holds the object as a body in time. The same person who invents the subject as a set of wishes and faith and then suppresses them again. In most cases, it becomes clear to us that Foucault and those who follow him invite us to a kind of resistance that is a little ambiguous, because in their belief they believe that some forms of resistance are nothing but an insincere freedom that has a connection with "pastoral power." One of the things that we also address is that disbelief Efficiency has an additional consequence. As Bevir argued, he demonstrated the illusory freedom of individuals "in that we do not really make ourselves through our creative activity but build ourselves up to a way described to us through the techniques of the self sanctioned by the modern system of power." (Rezvani, 12).

Foucault radically altered how can understand power and, thus, how resistance is viewed as well. Resistance takes on new forms if power is not only a sovereign center that forbids (and punishes) but also a generative network of power tactics that operate independently of a central hub. There are repercussions for any resistance research if the decentred powers develop regimes of power/knowledge, specialized institutions of discipline, and ultimately the very subject that makes resistance. Although Foucault produced a fundamental shift in how we view power and resistance, he is not particularly useful in doing so. Foucault did investigate power, and he did it from the perspective of power (its archives and methods, always in brackets). (Vinthagen,2)

However, the literature on resistance frequently contains elements like aims, purposes, intent, or some sort of (class) interest. Resistance can be understood, according to the specialized pedagogical theory of resistance, as "the counter-hegemonic social

attitudes, behaviors, and actions that aim to weaken the classification among social categories and that are directed against the dominant power(s) and against those who exercise it(them), having as their goal its (their) redistribution in a more equitable way."(6) The development of such "counter-hegemonic curricula, teaching materials, and pedagogical practices" that can undercut the cultural reproduction of dominant forms of class, race, ethnicity, and gender relations in schools is at issue here.

By "any action imbued with intent that attempts to challenge, change or retain specific circumstances relating to societal relations, processes, and/or institutions," Routledge defines resistance. which cannot be divorced from practices of domination and imply some sort of contestation.

Others choose a definition that considers both the impression of the person being resisted and the goal of the resister. Moore describes how a popular definition of resistance includes "any activity designed to thwart German plans, or perceived by the occupiers as working against their interests" in his study of resistance in Western Europe against fascism and Nazism. Therefore, any behavior by the subordinate that the power holders perceive as problematic or posing a danger to their position of authority could be considered.

Pile and Keith's investigation into the "geographies of power" serves as an example of a concept that is more problematic. They go on to claim that "resistance is the people fighting back in defense of freedom, democracy, and humanity" after declaring that it "stands in uncompromising opposition to "power." In this case, resistance is defined. Using the two basic types of resistance—the open and the covert—Scott has created a classification. He creates six different sorts of resistance by dividing it into two categories (public and covert), which correspond to three different types of dominance (material, status, and intellectual).

Publicly stated forms of resistance, such as open uprisings, petitions, land invasions, etc., against material dominance, are also possible. Other public forms of resistance include declarations of value or degradation of status symbols, assertions of worth against status dominance, and counter-ideologies against ideological dominance. And resistance can take the covert form (low profile, unnoticed, or infra-politics), manifesting as everyday resistance (such as poaching, squatting, desertion, evasion, or foot-dragging) or direct resistance by masked resisters against material domination, masked transcripts of rage against status domination, or masked discourses of dignity against ideological domination.

However, the listing does not include every variety that does occur. Resistance will differ depending on the kind of societal structure it opposes, such as state institutions and laws, businesses and market regulations, cultural institutions, traditional norms, or discursive rules, as well as the type of power relationship involved (such as disciplinary, hegemonic, or suppressive power). Depending on the social context, it may take place in a formal and established public forum, in an unofficial and developing political space (such as a neighborhood), or in a private or apolitical space to become a site of political contestation. Additionally, resistance will differ depending on the sectarian category being resisted or opposed, the relative size and strength of opposing groups, the historical setting in which it takes place (for example, a totalitarian European state in the 17th century or a liberal democracy with a welfare system like Sweden today), and the values or ideologies that serve as its compass.

Other aspects will also be important, such as whether the resistance is a planned move or an unplanned response. Accordingly, depending on all of these variables, resistance will also have a variety of effects (resulting in democratization, equality, anarchy, or harsher repression, etc.).

It is possible to see how distinct resistance is if a few straightforward categories are used, such as who is resisting, where it is occurring, how it is organized, and towards what it is focused. Non-institutional resistance varies greatly along various dimensions, for instance;

Who performs? Differences between the individual and the group, the minority and the majority, and the kinds of social groups or ideological groupings that engage in resistance can all be found in the "who"(8) dimension. Individual acts of resistance, such as "whistleblowers" or "men and women of courage" or "proletarian shopping" (the "theft" of supermarkets by activists opposing capitalism and private property), mobilizing the majority, like in the case of the Indian resistance to colonialism. It might involve the mobilization of particular social groups based on factors like gender, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or particular ideological groups, for instance. Liberals in a fascist regime or fascists in a liberal democracy.

Resistance must therefore emerge from within the framework of power relations. However, this is where we can distinguish between Foucault's reactive and active notions of resistance (using terminology from Deleuze's interpretation of Nietzsche).

Resistance would seem to be described as a reaction or a response to a specific exercise of power, which seems to be implied by the phrase itself. Everyone is familiar with the classic example: the student in elementary school who immediately responds to instructions to sit down and stand up, form a straight line, stop talking in class, and raise your hand when you need to use the restroom. Such a person constantly pushes the boundaries of power, resisting it everywhere and at all times. And on a bigger stage, both politically and socially, this conception is replicated. The "knots of power" readily reform around resistance, however, when it is only an act of defiance against authority. What is an active idea of resistance, or to put it another way, how is resistance primary in relation to power, became Foucault's next inquiry.

In his final writings, Foucault provided the answer to this query: when power is used against itself rather than another exercise of power, it becomes active. Resistance manifests in one's relationship to oneself, in each person's capacity to influence oneself, and in the self's independent influence. It is evident from reading Foucault's biographies and his final interviews that his experiences in California, where he went to teach at Berkeley, contributed to or at least reaffirmed his active understanding of resistance.

He found a gay community in San Francisco that was unlike any he had seen in Paris; it had grown gradually, as individuals exerted power over themselves, affected themselves, identified as gay, and then linked up slowly but steadily to form a community that, by the time Foucault arrived, had a sizable political presence and political power. In this way, Foucault's philosophy summarized Kant's three philosophical questions: What am I able to know? What am I able to perceive and explain within a specific historical episteme? What can I do? (What authority may I assert, and what obstacles may I overcome?); and, most crucially, (3) What am I? How can I make myself available as a subject? How am I any different? Why would I believe otherwise? The latter question's response is somewhat determined by a force's or power's ability to influence itself. (Smith, 268)

Even in prison, which is the poster child for disciplinary control, there is resistance. According to Foucault, the goal of the modern jail is to teach inmates how to respect the law, but this endeavor is unsuccessful because of how prison life is structured, which leads to unexpected outcomes. Prisoners become resentful of the government, its legal system, and even society as a whole after experiencing punishment. When prisoners are released from jail only to discover that their criminal background prevents them from obtaining good employment or full citizenship, resentment grows. This is an illustration of how the use of power can result in a backlash of unhappiness, which raises the risk that the use of power may unintentionally spark oppositional actions. Foucault continues to contend that jails actually encourage convicts to form groups in order to protect themselves from their harsh surroundings. When they are released, they can continue their crimes with the help of networks of reliable allies. To put it another way, the detainees have more influence thanks to associational ties and a common sense of animosity stemming from the judicial system's use of restraint. It might not appear to be a very encouraging example of significant acts of resistance when prisoners are given more freedom to commit more crimes. However, Foucault's analysis of the unintended effects of power play at least provides a case study of how people who appear to be the most restrained and repressed may nonetheless be capable of acting in ways that undermine the status quo. (David, 61)

People's potential to challenge authority or employ it creatively has been investigated by commentators working to construct Foucauldian theories of resistance. Hoy contends that individuals might engage in "critical resistance" by "destabilizing and subverting domination by using the very mechanisms of power." Since the body is the main focus of disciplinary authority, this type of resistance strongly focuses on genealogy critique to expose discourses of power and is primarily focused on liberating the body. Pickett contends that, while departing from conventional models of resistance, Foucault has a well-developed theory of resistance. According to Pickett (1996), Foucault favors a persistent fight against all discourses that restrict the range of personal freedom. Therefore, resistance must be a dynamic struggle against hierarchy, inequality, and normalcy. Despite the fact that such an endless fight must reject all types of restraint, Pickett claims that it does provide a mechanism to undermine even the most prevalent forms of power.

Mari Ruti presents a positive interpretation of Foucault's philosophy of self-creation that transforms resistance into a self-directed endeavor. Power, according to Foucault, is actively generative rather than merely prohibitory, limiting, or negating, opening the way for the articulation of meanings even as it limits the range of discursive possibility, according to Ruti. By critically evaluating their own lives and purposefully creating identities that may defy normalizing discourses, people have the ability to fight power. According to Ruti (2006: 64), Foucault "presents a subject that is not only passively molded by power but who is capable of dynamically participating in the fashioning of its own subjectivity. She believes that Foucault's idea of the self' enables people to transcend the disciplinary framework. Although they are challenging to maintain, the positive readings of Foucault's theory of power present intriguing alternatives to the pessimistic readings. These ideas rely on people acting as imaginative forces of resistance, yet as the preceding paragraph shows, Foucault views people as being so overpowered by various expressions of authority that they have limited potential for independent thought and action. People frequently appear to be overly determined by the many forms of disciplinary power at work in their lives. Their subjectivity is created by myths that normalize the world. They are restricted by regimes of knowledge, constantly monitored by authorities, and subject to tests and judgments to make sure they are not deviant. Those who attempt to glean theories of resistance from Foucault provide compelling justifications for how common people can mobilize power,

but they provide insufficient justifications for how people can ever hope to transcend the various forms of power acting upon them to the point that they can engage in acts of resistance. A more significant issue arises when a notion of resistance is derived from work of Foucault. As Ruti, Hoy, Pickett, and others note, one of the most significant issues with the crucial resistance is that purposeful resistance typically rely on people being able to use power willfully.

People's potential to challenge authority or employ it creatively has been investigated by commentators working to construct Foucauldian theories of resistance. Hoy contends that individuals might engage in "critical resistance" by "destabilizing and subverting domination by using the very mechanisms of power." Since the body is the main focus of disciplinary authority, this type of resistance strongly focuses on genealogy critique to expose discourses of power and is primarily focused on liberating the body. Pickett contends that, while departing from conventional models of resistance, Foucault has a well-developed theory of resistance. According to Pickett (1996), Foucault favors a persistent fight against all discourses that restrict the range of personal freedom. Therefore, resistance must be a dynamic struggle against hierarchy, inequality, and normalcy. Despite the fact that such an endless fight must reject all types of restraint, Pickett claims that it does provide a mechanism to undermine even the most prevalent forms of power.

Mari Ruti presents a positive interpretation of Foucault's philosophy of self-creation that transforms resistance into a self-directed endeavor. Power, according to Foucault, is actively generative rather than merely prohibitory, limiting, or negating, opening the way for the articulation of meanings even as it limits the range of discursive possibility, according to Ruti. By critically evaluating their own lives and purposefully creating identities that may defy normalizing discourses, people have the ability to fight power. According to Ruti (2006: 64), Foucault "presents a subject that is not only passively molded by power but who is capable of dynamically participating in the fashioning of its own subjectivity. She believes that Foucault's idea of the self' enables people to transcend the disciplinary framework. Although they are challenging to maintain, the positive readings of Foucault's theory of power present intriguing alternatives to the pessimistic readings. These ideas rely on people acting as imaginative forces of resistance, yet as the preceding paragraph shows, Foucault views people as being so overpowered by various expressions of authority that they have limited potential for independent thought and action. People frequently appear to be overly determined by the many forms of disciplinary power at work in their lives. Their subjectivity is created by myths that normalize the world. They are restricted by regimes of knowledge, constantly monitored by authorities, and subject to tests and judgments to make sure they are not deviant. Those who attempt to glean theories of resistance from Foucault provide compelling justifications for how common people can mobilize power, but they provide insufficient justifications for how people can ever hope to transcend the various forms of power acting upon them to the point that they can engage in acts of resistance. A more significant issue arises when a notion of resistance is derived from work of Foucault. As Ruti, Hoy, Pickett, and others note, one of the most significant issues with the crucial resistance is that purposeful resistance typically rely on people being able to use power willfully. (62)

According to Foucault, power is uncontrollable by an individual. According to Foucault, the challenges of resistance are not limited to that power. It is widespread, but it cannot be controlled or used by one person alone.

Power, according to Foucault, is not something that is consciously chosen; rather, it is formed by social practices and is independent of the decision of the individual. There is a

chance to restore Foucault's philosophy of resistance, but attempts to do so frequently fall short of explaining how resistance may be compatible with his forceful assertions of authority. Understanding the boundaries of personal power and conceiving of other agents of resistance is the key to solving this problem. Individuals must be able to create alliances that go beyond the limitations that people face since they are mostly at the whim of various sources of power. Additionally, these collectives must be able to challenge authority in ways that do not assume a deliberate understanding of power. Resistance can be supported by Gramsci's idea of hegemonic resistance.(63)

Explaining how any agent might become aware of disciplinary control and start formulating strategies to oppose that control while still being subject to it is the key to identifying an agent of resistance. According to Foucault, in order to practice resistance, one must be able to identify sudden relations of power, critically evaluate the rules of truth that establish these relations of power, and question the boundaries set by prevailing institutions and values. This is a difficult assignment for one person to complete. People might want to resist some of the more overt types of investigation, normalizing narratives, and monitoring that govern their lives, but according to Foucault, power is so ubiquitous that most people lack the capacity to identify all of its sources.(67)

Resistance changes somewhat in Foucault's later writings. Foucault defined resistance as tactical reversal in the Method section of Volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality* (1976), which means that resistance can be located when local conflicts are assimilated or re-inscribed into the existing order. This re-appropriation involves mutual conditioning that strategically modifies both active and reactive forces. In other words, although power carries the inherent risk of dominance, the risk is mitigated by the inherent possibility of reversal, or the ability to overthrow oppressive relations of force. Although reversal offers this opportunity, it limits resistance to a reactive posture that only allows it to respond to restrictive governmental rules, institutionalized normalizations, and societal intolerance. A notable illustration of this kind of resistance is provided by Judith Butler's concept of "gender performativity," (Hofmeyr, 108) which she first described in her 1990 book *Gender Trouble*. She disputes the distinction between sex and gender (in nature and society) and asserts that sex is always already gendered. A masculinist economy that normalizes heterosexuality unites reproductive processes, desire, pleasure, and other concepts under the umbrella of "sex." Gender is not an inherent trait or feature, in Butler's own words, but rather a question of doing and results. If gender is indeed performative, one could be able to "perform" their gender in a new way and challenge heteronormativity. The realm of gender norms might then become more democratic as a result of this upheaval. The question is, do effeminate men's overly feminized gestures successfully defy the sex-gender equation, or do they only reinforce it by mimicking conventional feminine mannerisms? The obvious question that emerges in this context is: if resistance is a mere reaction or negation, what is inherently creative about it?

How can the power of resistance be viewed as a constructive activity taken on its own terms? In an effort to explain what transpired between the 1976 publication of Volume 1 and the succeeding second and third volumes of Foucault's *Histoire* in 1984, several explanations have been proposed by Foucault academics. If not a fundamental rethinking of the concept of power and knowledge, there is evidence of a shift in emphasis regarding power and resistance. One of the most important interpretations of this dry spell in Foucault's usually active career may be found in James Miller's acclaimed, if rather sensationalistic, biography. Miller contends that Foucault's shift towards governmentality and the technologies of the self can be interpreted as an implicit admission that his portrayal of power and resistance in Volume I was overly restrictive. During this time,

Foucault's thinking about power and resistance underwent a clear change that culminated in his article from 1982. The power and subject. The self is now thought of as the active agent of its own construction rather than the passive byproduct of an external system of constraint and prescription, as it was in the first volume of his *History of Sexuality* and the second and third volumes that followed. As a result, Foucault develops a more constructive kind of resistance, namely, resistance as autonomy through heteronomy. The gap between the publishing of the first and second volumes should not, however, be interpreted as a sharp division, as if the concepts of resistance in the first and second volumes were incomparable. In fact, in an interview from 1984 titled "The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom," (109) It soon becomes clear that resistance as a proactive force cannot eliminate the need for resistance as a defensive force. In this passage, Foucault introduces the self in the manner of the Greeks, i.e., as a unique agent distinguished by autarky and auto-affection. All of the material, historical, economic, discursive, and linguistic structures, practices, and forces that subject the subject while also forming it through subjectivization are put in opposition to it. Not that the topic is actually ever "outside of power." Foucault claims that the subject's embeddedness in power specifically does not necessitate the acceptance of an unavoidable type of dominance. Instead, it achieves autonomy both in spite of and in conjunction with heteronomous power relations. The forces that disable it and that it resists are also the forces that enable self-creation. Since the freedom of the arts of the self, according to Greenblatt (1980), does not exist in the act of self-creation but rather in the experience of self-formation in the face of all the other factors that shape us,

Discussion

Resistance: Demolishing and Productive Resistance

The discussion of the power-knowledge relationship includes the concept of resistance, which is seen as a form of social and political production exerted by developing and conflicting power relations. This view is evidenced in Foucault's (1976) statements that "where there is power, there is resistance," and this "resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (95). In another words, every exercise of power will be accompanied by new classes of knowledge, which will give the way to new trends of ideas and "forms of behavior". Thus, these dominating forces and relational powers bring out counter forces and discourses, which ultimately culminating in struggles and resistance (Mills, 33).

In the open sense of the term, multiple words and meanings fall under the umbrella of resistance. Fundamentally, it refers to the opposition against oppressive political systems, social obstacles that are perceived as taboos. Also, it implies the concept of freedom, liberation, not to mention it is a tool for enormous personal and social change. In all these suggestions, resistance is confrontational reaction to force. Like power, this reaction also has its own mechanism and manners.

The investigation of resistance in *Things Fall Apart* addresses not only indigenous villagers' resistance to British colonialism, but also another act of resistance that emerges from Igbo society itself. Rather, this study is not confined to interpret the text in colonial terms and so blaming only the colonizers, but it also underlines the faults of all participants including the colonized. As it mentioned earlier, this analytic approach is justified by Foucault's point of view, which is always opposed to monolithic interpretations of history.

In addition to Chinua Achebe's viewpoint, who is critical of his own people so dedicates his writings to uplifting African culture by underpinning their defaults.

The first part of examining resistance is concerned with the colonized resistance of the Igbo society embodied by Okonkwo against the British colonizers. The author painstakingly details Okonkwo's conscious and indignant observation of the increasing British influence that paved the way for their colonial rule over Nigeria. At the start of the story, the fervent tribe man Okonkwo shows intolerance and hostility towards the British persistent efforts to diminish the villagers' religion and/ or their "heathen belief" (Achebe, 145). He tries to unite the people of Umuofia in one front against the colonizers, resulting in the burning of the white man's church. In fact, this action has had the opposite effect on the villagers, particularly Okonkwo and his comrades.

The British retaliates harshly by humiliating and imprisoning him along with five of his tribe men. This oppressive act agitates fierce and counter opposition and struggle (verbal and physical) implemented in Okonkwo's determination to use physical force against them by killing one of the British messengers (185). As previously stated, one of the elements of fruitful resistance is collective will or consent as well as organization among its participants. Thus, the lack of organization fails Umuofia's struggle against the colonizers and leads Okonkwo to end his life tragically. He desperately calls his people to band together and drive the stranger out of Umuofia. Yet, the final section of the text reveals Okonkwo's disappointment with his people, who increasingly appeal towards the British side while ignoring their dignity and indigenous heritage. He reckons mournfully that Umuofians "choose to be coward" and, "worthy men are no more" (180), thus in inconsiderate impulsiveness, he resolves to "avenge himself" on his own (180). Upon this account, it might be argued that the collectively well-planned resistance fosters a well-established competing power that grant its participants their rights and deserved position.

From another perspective, resistance can be examined within the Igbo community, namely Okonkwo's household. The Umuofian society is ruled by an unquestionable authority that is armed with strict religious and tribal ideology, most importantly a patriarchal and masculine hegemony. The dominant hegemony marginalizes and silences some groups and individuals, such as women, young members, and the less fortunate. This fact can be tested by comparing the central male voice in the novel to the much fainter voice of women and children, such as Okonkwo's wives.

Nwoye, in stark contrast to his father Okonkwo, battles the pressures of Umuofia's traditional discourse. He conveys a nonconformist spirit to his society and his father, who constantly refers to him as weak, "degenerate, and effeminate" (55). As a result, he chooses to articulate his new voice and his own path in life, even if it means being disowned by his father. The truth is when Nwoye converts to Christianity, he enters into a new power dynamic. Reasonably, he recognizes the significance of the white man's force, which endows him with power and self-worth that corresponds to his natural self rather than the undesirable one imposed on him by his community. Thus, following the missionary enables him to break the family commitments and social taboos, and even he plans to "return later to his mother, and his brother and sister and convert them to the new faith" (141).

In reality, Nwoye's resistance emanates from the newly acquired knowledge and skills that, with time, proves to be more successful and bearable. As a result, he frequently visits the missionary and educational institutions established by the British in the village. At this point of analysis, Nwoye represents the new African generation seeking alternative ways of life away from the oppressive religious and kinship authority. In contrast to his

father's violent struggle, Nwoye and others consciously choose peaceful and non-offensive methods of resistance that are more logical and effective in practice. Also, his resistance indicates the productive and rebuilding kind of resistance.

Overall, the study interrogates Foucault's insightful approaches to understand power, knowledge, and resistance. The Foucauldian reading of *Things Fall Apart* deconstructs Umuofia's contesting hegemonies and power structures. Further, it unfolds the mechanisms of these interplaying powers. It lay bears the British mechanisms of power as the study has proved that British exercise power on different levels: the political, social, and physical level in the form of sovereignty, disciplinary, and pastor power.

To maintain their hold on the natives, the British colonizers disseminate their influence in a variety of spheres, including education, spirituality, the legal system, and administration. Their success is attributed to their superior knowledge, which is a critical component of power. The study also relies on Foucault's central theory that every power invites another power to demonstrate how colonial oppressive force incites indigenous resistance, which is viewed as a new form of power in itself. However, by detailing Okonkwo's tragic fall, it has been critically explained that successful resistance is based on well-planned and collective resistance.

The Foucauldian investigation extends to map the indigenous Nwoye's attempt to forge his own kind of existence, identity, and power in opposition to the dominant patriarchal hegemony and tribal and religious ideologies that govern his village. It has been elaborated the power and the logic of modernist and enlightenment discourse attracts

Nwoye and guides him to reject masculinity and heathen discourse and adopt the discourse of the white man or colonizer.

Conclusion

Theorist Michel Foucault is considered one of the pioneers of thought and philosophy in the second half of the twentieth century. He had different opinions on the concepts of power, knowledge and resistance. According to his ideas and beliefs, resistance is not an opposition force, but rather a reaction to a force that seeks to change it.

Through the discussion about the struggle of the characters in the selected novel (*Things Fall Apart*), we realize that the resistance succeeds when it is organized and has goals, and also coupled with the knowledge that the indigenous people gained from knowing the British, as it became a source of strength for them and they left their clan. Nwoye got the power from the knowledge he gained from the colonialists, when he was under the shadow of his parents he was limited in power but he got the power from the British and the relationship with them, that power is not linked to the military side, the authoritarian and material side.

References

- Abowitz, Kathleen Knight. "A pragmatist revisioning of resistance theory." *American educational research journal* 37.4 (2000): 877-907.
- Barbalet, Jack M. "Power and resistance." *British Journal of Sociology* (1985): 531-548.
- Barnett, Derek C. *The Primacy of resistance: Anarchism, Foucault, and the art of not being governed*. Diss. The University of Western Ontario (Canada), 2016.

Lilja, Mona, Mikael Baaz, and Stellan Vinthagen. Exploring irrational resistance".*Journal of Political Power* 6.2 (2013): 201-217.

Lilja, Mona. "The definition of resistance." *Journal of Political Power* 15.2 (2022): 202-220.

Mills, Sara. "Routledge Critical Thinkers: Michel Foucault." London: Routledge (2003).

Parker, Patricia S. "Control, resistance, and empowerment in raced, gendered, and classed work contexts: The case of African American women." *Annals of the International Communication Association* 27.1. (2003): 257-291

Rezvani, Ashkan, "Foucault's Conception of power and Resistance " , (2012)

Smith, Daniel. "Two concepts of Resistance Foucault and Deleuze" London: Bloomsbury. (2017). P. 268.

Vinthagen, Stellan, and Anna Johansson. "Everyday resistance: Exploration of a concept and its theories." *Resistance studies magazine* 1.1 (2013): 1-46.

Vinthagen, Stellan. "Understanding "Resistance": Exploring definitions, perspectives. Forms and implications"

Presented at Resistance Studies Network , Gothenburg University.2007. P. 2.6.8

Kreps, David. "Gramsci and Foucault: A Reassessment".University of Salford, UK. 2015 . P. 61.62.63.67

Hofmeyr, Benda. "The Contemporary Pertinence of the Later Foucault. Have his Strategies of Resistance Stood the Test of Time?". University of Pretoria, Pretoria .South Africa. 2008. P. 108.109