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Abstract

The aim of this research “Characteristics of Michel Foucault Historiography (1926-1984)” is to explore the patterns of Foucault’s system of historiography. The object of this research is to study Foucault’s historical projects in such a way that it helps to make a good understanding of his historical thought. Foucault was one of the most influential figures of the mid-20th century, addressed contemporary western socio-cultural problems in a unique way. Foucault is known as a representative of power/knowledge discourse. His interest was not like a usual of historic topics and assumptions for example his concept of space and time are totally different from the traditional concept of time and space. Michel Foucault wrote “the histories of the present” related it with religious ideas of the society. Foucault’s selection of historical topics are also unique in the field of historiography. Foucault urged the humans to respond the power which every person possess in itself but due to lack of response cant participated in the development of historical process. With respect to working at the intersection and European philosophical traditions, he considered to be a person who inquiring into the grounds and pre-condition for knowledge, truth, beliefs, institutions, practices, authority and power. He is more of historian than a philosopher, though his approach to his material is very different from that of a historian. He has spent a lot of time and energy undermining the preconceptions and methods of ‘history’. He is a breaker of system. In France he is the most influential personality after Nietzsche, in England he also falls on the stoniest of grounds. He is the person who not only introduces the method of historical research to uncover underlying history but also gave some alternate historical paradigm. Foucault challenges traditional assumptions of history such as rationality, linearity, and the moral judgment.
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Introduction

The basic theme which lies in the historical work of Foucault is the relation between power and knowledge. This relation can not considered a simple one. It is very complicated. He also worked on how the power can be used to control the knowledge. The basic objective of Foucault’s work seems that to create a history of the different modes by which humans are made subject in our culture.

**HIS RADICAL APPROACH:**

At first glance, Foucault’s historical work seems a work of complex mind having no clear ideas. His writing shows that Foucault radical thought also influenced his work. The central topic of Foucault was mostly related to the debates about the struggle of many individuals to cope with the existing power in the society. The basic concern in 25-years of Foucault’s historical work was, why all individuals governed with the certain rules of the society which only merged for some specific purposes. We can easily analyze his basic concept from its work related to the role of prisoners and prisons in any society.

**AS POST MODERNISM HISTORIAN:**

Due to historical concepts about the traditional historiography, Foucault’s work consider as postmodernist historians. It was true with respect to its critique on traditional historiography but as many postmodern historian Foucault not used narrative style of writing but also introduces new methodologies for history writings. Foucault’s work also a critique on this view of modernity, “creating more rationality is necessary for creating more order in society”. Foucault critique on this view in more refined form in his many lectures and explained that whenever we tried to create rationality for order then same kind of irrationality also occurs in the form of disorder on the basis of equality. Foucault explain this view in his book, the order of things, in detail.

**TRUTHFUL HISTORY:**

Foucault borrowed many his postmodern ideas from German philosopher Nietzsche. Paralleled to Nietzsche some ideas about self, Foucault also believed that the true self is the most important part of a person’s life. Foucault concern that in humans we can’t find any stable identity, there is no intrinsic nature in humans which can be waited for its realization. He rejected the discourses raped with the moral values, social standards and norms.

**CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL DISCOURSES:**

The dilemma of WW II also had a great impact on thinking of Michel Foucault. He now converted his thoughts towards the construction of social discourses rather to write about the certainties in social values and norms. The early statement about the work of Michel Foucault that it fits for the postmodern writings, growing up and become as complexes as Foucault’s own work.

**REVEAL SECRET KNOWLEDGE:**

Foucault create a world without any imagination and set course. He believed that it is impossible to create a complete order in society. For example he criticized the stability of ideas in the form of social norms by explaining his experience of education in many French educational institutions. He describe that
“French educational system as a form of initiation in which the secret knowledge promised was always postponed to a later date, in primary school he learned that the really important things would be revealed when he went to the lycee but at lycee he informed that he would have to wait until the final year. There he was told that the secret of secrets was indeed to be found in the study of philosophy, but this would only be revealed at the university stage, that the best place to find it was the Sorbonne and that the holy of holies was the Ecole Normale Superior”

The search of Foucault for “that ultimate answer” continued until his death in 1984. The basic reason behind introducing a wide range of topics in his work is also related with his that curiosity. He worked hard in search of “secret Knowledge”. However he revealed the secret of that knowledge but he introduces many new methodologies in the field of historiography. Which open many new doors for research and many thinkers and historians followed his thought.

CREATIVITY OF IDEAS:
About the origin of ideas Foucault claimed that, we think about all ideas expressed by the people so it must be originated from these people. People are conductors of all ideas through which all ideas only passes. They can’t generate them. These ideas can’t be generated by any single person rather these are fluted freely around all the peoples. So what is important in Foucault’s methodology? Ideas, yes, ideas is important not the persons who explain or conduct these ideas. There is a major difference between traditional methodology and Foucault’s methodology that the traditional methodology considered the persons more important as compare o the ideas. so, this method must be revived.

“The sole purpose of existence is to be your true self. He believed to accomplish this one must constantly struggle against the “disciplines” of society. Critics of Foucault claimed he carried the idea of struggling for an independent self too far. If one is to believe Foucault’s idea, following any rule of society is submitting to the discipline of society”

According to Foucault, “scientific knowledge are really just means of social control. Foucault shows how, for instance, in the eighteenth century ‘madness’ was used to categorize and stigmatise not just the mentally ill but the poor, the sick, the homeless and, indeed, anyone whose expressions of individuality were unwelcome”

INTRODUCING NEW METHODOLOGIES:
The chief innovation of Foucault in historiography is to introduce new methodologies in it, as compare to the conceptual theories of other contemporary historians. Foucault offered two methodologies named “archaeology” and “genealogy”.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND GENEALOGICAL METHOD

Archaeology: “is a synchronic analysis of what Foucault calls the statements or enunciations in any discourse. Every discourse contains rules of formation that limit and shape what may be said. These rules of formation are not at the disposal of the author but come into play as the text is composed, out of phase with the consciousness of the writer. Archaeological analysis may be thought of as an elaboration of the figure of the episteme, which Foucault employed so effectively in The Order of Things. It may also be thought of as a sort of structuralism analysis, one that uncovers complexities
within texts. The archaeological method, after all, was developed before Foucault turned to the problems of practice and power.4

**Genealogy:** “is a diachronic method, one that attempts to reconstruct the origins and development of discourses by showing their rootedness in a field of forces. Genealogy disallows pure beginnings, those historical formations that deny their historicity by naturalizing themselves, absolutizing themselves, grounding themselves in some transcendent principle. From the vantage point of those who hold to absolute principles, genealogy appears as nihilist, relativist, amoral”5.

According to Rabinow & Dreyfus, “together with archaeology, genealogy constitutes ‘an analytic of finitude’ one that undercuts metaphysical pretensions, overblown notions of reason's ability to ground discourse, but not ethical action in the best sense of the term”6.

Foucault method of genealogy, “is a historical technique in which one questions the commonly understood emergence of various philosophical and social beliefs by attempting to account for the scope, breadth or totality of ideology within the time period in question, as opposed to focusing on a singular or dominant ideology”7.

In the Genealogies of Michel Foucault, it is often tried to look ideologies beyond to their questions so that more possibilities may be achieved in the form of other conditions as compare to the existing conditions of any ideology.

After the mid of 20th century Foucault presented his genealogical method in more refined form. He further used this methodology in tracing out the development of societies and people through specific ideologies in historical process.

Like other important historical concepts of Foucault, we can deconstruct truth with the help of genealogical method. To explain it, he demonstrated that “truth is, more often than not, discovered by chance, backed by the operation of power or the consideration of interest. Therefore, all truths are questionable. Pointing out the unreliability of truth, which is accused as having tendency of relativity and nihilism, the theory flatly refuses the uniformity and regularity of history, emphasizing the irregularity and inconstancy of truth and toppling the notion that history progresses in a linear order”8.

For Genealogical method we can say that “from the empirical observability for us of an ensemble to its historical acceptability, to the very period of time in which it is actually observable, the analysis goes by way of the knowledge-power nexus, supporting it, recouping it at the point where it is accepted, moving toward what makes it acceptable, of course, not in general, but only where it is accepted”9.

To find out the truth related knowledge –power relations, genealogical method used as procedure, it is a procedure which excluded the fundamental laws and the method which legitimized these methods in historical process. These fundamental laws runs by a cyclic system of positivity. Foucault invited the historians to re-analyse that cyclic system for making a better understanding of knowledge –power relations. We can say that it is an early stage of genealogical analysis of truth related to the fundamental law which worked behind the existing ideologies of societies or ideas.
Some analysts considered that Foucault’s archaeological methodology are actually concern with the social scientist that how can they make the meaning of any social practices. But in real genealogical method has concerned with the relationship of any discourse in society with its practice which mostly transformed through history itself.

Foucault’s genealogical method started from where his archaeological method ended. So when any analyst tried to find out that how a social discourse professionally got their meaning in the form of fundamental laws. Then they used the genealogical method to find out the process in which these social discourses become the part of history.

This genealogical methodology invites traditional historians to rethink about the historical record and stories used for the historical development of these discourses. It was not a professional historical position of analysis but an anti-traditional historical position of analysis. Rabinow & dryfus stated that, “The genealogist is a diagnostician who concentrates on the relations of power, knowledge, and the body in modern society”.

Many scholars argue that his methodologies tear apart the professional methodologies of historiography in order to elaborate that how a body can make the tool or a kind of enforcing element which used in different strategies of knowledge as well as power in the modern society. Foucault’s “research question” about “how did the body come to be so significant in the way that modern societies distribute and activate their power relations?” it is an important work of Foucault that he arose these questions about the formation of self as an subject of knowledge and power. But the whole writing of Foucault’s can’t give the answer of that formation.

Foucault’s archaeologic-genealogical methodology is basically designed to find out a logical relation among practice and discourse. The strategies which mostly used for interpretations in this method are not fully textual but it is semiotic in its nature. It has some resemblance with the method of interpretation used by Deconstructionist. In this way the work of Foucault become a difficult task for new readers or whom which can’t read the deconstructionism theory of interpretations. They interpret the text comfortably without the representation of any specific contextual frame work. But Foucault’s methodology rejected the presence of any text either it existing with or without any contextual frame work. That was a major difference between the two methodologies. Foucault considered it great problems which need to be resolved. It is a mistake of historical representation of self in history.

Foucault can’t consider the language as a neutral tool for searching of truth and reality, which can’t involve any external element in that process mean the process of finding truth about anything. The main issue is that in which way many disciplines in social science interpret the formation of those rules which regulated all social discourses. We can’t say that Foucault was the only person among his contemporaries who raise questions about the interpretation of these formations but the way in which he tried to resolve that problem is new for the intellectual word of European society.

**Foucault’s methodology VS traditional methodology of history writings:**
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Foucault’s methodology is different from the traditional methodology of history writings. We can employed his methodology to differentiate his method of historical writings from hermeneutics, mean, traditional method of interpretation with cause and connection.

Traditional historians continued their historical approach under the umbrella of traditional model of analysis which were mostly the notions of modernity. It create an exaggeration among many postmodern historians. These post-modern historians not only opposed these notions of modernity but they also rejected the traditional methods of analysis on the basis of cause and connection. Foucault due to his historical approach which reflected some postmodern ideas, considered a post-modernist. He used his ideas for analysing the discontinuity in the connection of discourses and their practices. Foucault claim that the formation of any social discourse have no logical connection between any other discourses of any episteme. These discourses have no logical or causational linkage with each other. Foucault’s Methodology was also distinguished from the complexed and indescribable methodologies of historians of ideas. Fouco rejected the humanistic and idealistic approach of writing history, used for tracing out a long evolutionary process, related to the emergence of historical thought as well as the development in human intellect.

Traditional historical method which related to the Hegelian idealistic approach for writing history with cause and confection. Here the formation of subject in history may be started which can be traces back from the age of brightness. It was the basic point of Foucault work that he introduced a new methods to traced the origin of formation of these subject and from where the self-become the object of knowledge.

Against the traditional approach of historical writings, Foucault’s methodology tried to introduce some new conditions, under which, it can be possible to achieve many new kinds of knowledge. It also used to identify the rules of formation worked behind the logical operation of intentions.

It is these rules of formation, which were never formulated in their own right, but are to be found only in widely differing theories, concepts, and objects of study, that I have tried to reveal, by isolating, as their specific locus, a level that called ... archaeological.

Unlike structuralism, to which his early analyses bear some resemblances, these rules are not universal and immutable in character, or grounded in the structure of the mind, but are historically changing and specific to given discursive domains. Such rules constitute the “‘historical a priori’ of all knowledge, perception, and truth”. These rules are “the fundamental codes of a culture” which construct the ‘episteme’, which highlight a particular historical era to determine some specific social practices in empirical orders.

In his first major work, Madness and civilization, Foucault tried to write “archaeology of that silence” which constituted madness historically as an object of reason. He argued in the whole book that discontinuity can be traces by the event of great confinement started in 1665, where the notions of modernism in the form of reason attempt to save the danger of unreason. So discontinuity works here as opposite discourse formed in society in different episteme.

Foucault continued his ideas in the development of new methodology with different references as he showed in his other famous book, “The Birth of the Clinic , subtitled ‘An Archaeology of Medical
Perception”, He basically analyse the changes in approaches deal different social issues. Now the pre modern style of speculative approach converted into modern empirical approach of thinking ,but the question was not related with the changes of ideas or approaches it is related to the formation of scientific object.

He rejected a history full with the consciousness of great men or speculative thinkers. He Pursued a structure based studies to determine the conditions of possibilities.

In “ The Order of Things, subtitled as ,An Archaeology of the Human Sciences”, he not only examine the emergence of the human sciences but also gives his most detailed analysis of the underlying rules, assumptions and ordering procedures of, the Renaissance, classical, and modern eras, focusing on the shifts in the sciences of life, labour, and language.

“In this analysis, Foucault uncovers the birth of ‘man’ as a discursive construct. ‘Man’, the object of philosophy as the human sciences emerges when the classical field of representation dissolves and the human being for the first time becomes not only an aloof representing subject, but also the object of modern scientific investigation, a finite and historically determined being to be studied in its living, labouring, and speaking capacities. Embedded in a new field of temporality and finitude, the status of the subject as master of knowledge becomes threatened, but its sovereignty is maintained in its reconstitution in transcendental form”

Foucault further describes that, “how modern philosophy constructs ‘Man’ - both object and subject of knowledge - within a series of unstable ‘doublets’: the unsought doublet whereby Man is determined by external forces yet aware of this determination and able to free himself from it; the retreat-and-return-of-the-origin doublet whereby history precedes Man but he is the phenomenological source from which history unfolds; and the transcendental/empirical doublet whereby Man both constitutes and is constituted by the external world, finding secure foundations for knowledge through a priori categories or through procedures of ‘reduction’ which allow consciousness to purify itself from the empirical world”

Foucault critique on the social sciences methodologies and idea related to their field ,of all social scientist of philosophy ,history ,sociology and psychology.

He says that these social scientists tried to impose some thoughts and ideas which belongs to the opposite poles and they tried to construct of any subject that irreconcilable poles of thought. Foucault used his genealogical method to clear that concept in which he clearly assumed the importance of political system that that used humans as a subject of their object.

He used his methodology to find out the rules and groundings which shaped the epistemological basis for any society which constructed for a defined structure.

The order of thing basically summarized the whole debate related to the representation of man in the society in a suitable form.

Foucault used that piece of work to explain the end of man as compare to the birth of man in the modern theory of progress. Foucault’s archaeological methodology had a visible structure in this book. This work is a continuous process to construct a new methodology and it also provided some basic
rules to the genealogical discerption for the formation of any thought in the past or in any historical era.

Foucault critique on the notion that, only subject separately used as core element during the interpretations of desire, language and unconsciousness.

At the end, not a least work done by Michel Foucault in Archaeology of knowledge, using his methodology, Foucault used a theoretical approach to clarify his mistake done in the past. He further claims that a new kind of history now automatically tried to create its own theory.

It is a new concepts in history about, totality, teleology, subject and continuity are all re-constructed. As discontinuity can be seen as a critique on modern historiography due to its attack on the use of different principles and narration in history. But Foucault used that above notion of discontinuity as a positive working concepts. Foucault critique on concept of general history presented by many post-modern historians but he not supported the concept of total history which was a popular notion of idealism and materialism. He concluded the differences between these two concepts in these lines , “A total description draws all phenomena around a single centre - a principle, a meaning, a spirit, a world-view, an overall shape; a general history, on the contrary, would deploy the space of a dispersion”.

Foucault not fully opposed the concept of totality at all but he rejected only anthropological, horizontal and vertical totalities which mostly found in the humanist conception of centre based object, society, civilization, and epoch.

Foucault considered that, traditional historiography attained its totalization and narrations through an illegitimate way because these narrations and totalization are constructed by some obscure abstraction which mistakenly thin to be revealed. He more suggested that if we closely analysed these abstractions then we can found many complex interrelations, series of discourses which are not relate to each other but they are individual in their nature and can’t be reduced from each other to formulate a vertical arrangements of tantalizations. Or a single law model and unity.

So he tried to break these unities and then analyse that did these elements can be legitimately united or suitable for a new form of totality. In other words Foucault supported a detotalization in which an entire field is set free, these fields are related to the complex systems of dispersion and many discursive formation founded in any episteme.

Foucault’s methodology of writing history is also different from post-modern methodology of writing history. His methodology has a diversifying effect as compare to a unifying one. His method gave an opportunity to the historians for the multiple discovery of discourses in all field of knowledge.

Methodology of Foucault is also different from other theorists like Derrida and Lyotard, with two basic references. First he does not tried to dissolve the coherence and form of structure, which seems intelligible, and converted them into a significance flux with endlessness. Rather he attempt to know that which regulated form of structure, relations, totalities and coherences really exist in the all fields of knowledge.
His methodology want, “to attain a plurality of histories juxtaposed and independent of one another, but also ‘to determine what form of relation may be legitimately described between ----different series of things”14.

Second, unlike Baudrillard’s confused statements to understand that post-modernism is a complete breakup of reasons with some references and political economy.

“Foucault employs a cautious and qualified use of the discourse of discontinuity. While he appropriates this discourse to attack the traditional interpretation of history as the steady accumulation of knowledge or the gradual progress of truth or reason, and to show that sudden and abrupt changes occur in configurations of knowledge, he rejects the interpretation of his work as simply a ‘philosophy of discontinuity. Instead, he claims that he sometimes exaggerated the degree of historical breaks ‘for pedagogical purposes’, that is, to counter the hegemony of the traditional theories of historical progress and continuity”15.

Foucault refers discontinuity as “a fact that in a transition from one historical era to another ‘things are no longer perceived, described, expressed, characterized, classified, and known in the same way.

“In the shift from the Renaissance to the classical episteme. Foucault take rupture not as a some absolute change, but a ‘redistribution of the prior episteme, a reconfiguration of its elements, where, although there are new rules of a discursive formation redefining the boundaries and nature of knowledge and truth, there are significant continuities as well”. Here he invited a dialectical process of discontinuity and continuity, and showed some historical breaks in which he included some voices of mistress from new and old ideas.

In his famous book, The Order of Things, for example, “he emphasizes the continuities between the modern and the emerging postmodern episteme, such as the continued importance of the problematic of representation in the space of the counter-science. Similarly, in his works on sexuality, he describes a continuity between medieval Christianity and modernity in terms of the constitution of the individual whose deep truth is its sexuality”16.

In his last work on sexuality he seems to know the continued thread of historic-critical condition which existing in European societies from the age of Enlighten.

“The Archaeology of Knowledge” known as Foucault’s last work which was done under his archaeological methodology, as he used this method to explore rules of discourses work at unconscious and many shifts considering historical are occur within each discursive field. Habermas understand its methodology wrongly as he considered it autonomous from social practices and institutions that was not true assessment at all. There is no doubt to say that Foucault’s early methodology open some new ways of analysis in social institutions about the basic elements of knowledge and theory.

While “Foucault’s limited focus had a legitimate philosophical justification, recasting traditional views of history and seeking an immanent clarification of the intelligibility of discourse in terms of linguistic rules unperceived by human actors, a more adequate analysis would ultimately have to focus more directly on practices and institutions to situate discourse within its full social and political context”.
After presenting its first methodology, he now introduced a new shift in his thought in the form of new method, genealogy in 1970. That method is more adequate in theorizing methods of power and social institutions.

In his famous essay, ‘The Discourse of Language’, “he speaks of employing a new genealogical analysis of ‘the effective formation of discourse, whether within the limits of control, or outside them”17. During his many lectures he delivered in college de France From 1970 to 1971, he often summarized that his earliest methodology should now conducted in sorting out the relation among the need of knowledge and power which created by many means of knowing something.

In his famous next easy “Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History”, in that easy he analysed many themes of Nietzsche to build his new methodology’ genealogy’. Foucault explain his new methodology in very refined form in his next famous books “Discipline and Punish” and three Volume of “History and sexuality”18.

Although his genealogical methodology signals a tuned in his theoretical mode, but it does not mean that it is a change in the focus of his analytical thought rather it is a sign in widening the scope of Foucault thought .It is a new mode of Foucault’s historical writings. In the terminologies of Michel Foucault, a genealogist is known as a historian.

It seems that Foucault’s Both methodologies attempt “to re-examine the social field from a micro logical standpoint that enables one to identify discursive discontinuity and dispersion instead of continuity and identity, and to grasp historical events in their real complexity, Both methodologies, attempt to undo great chains of historical continuity and their teleological destinations and to historicize what is thought to be immutable”.

His methodologies urged the humans for the pluralizing different fields of discourses and analyse the notions of modernism, as reason, through the history of the human sciences and built their assumptions about historical knowledge with the exclusion of man as a subject of historical process

As compare to his archaeological method in which he emphasized upon then on materialistic conditions of discourses ,in his genealogical method he more focusing on the materialistic conditions of discourses, which he further define in term of political practices, economical theories and institutions.

He consequently wants to thematising power as basic operational tool produce subjectivity and knowledge. But it does not mean that due to this transition of concepts we can differentiate between an materialistic approach of Foucault in his genealogical method and an idealistic approach in hi archaeological method, rather it is a refined form to understand his basic theme which he employs in his all work to analyse a relation between formation of social practices and their used as a functional tool in the form of power. He also used that concept in finding a relation between power and knowledge.

Archaeology and genealogy now easily combined in the form of theory and practice where theory is immediately practical in character, Michel Foucault stated that archaeology would be the appropriate methodology of the analysis of social discourses and genealogy would be a technique
which provided some basis for the descriptions of these social discourses by whom knowledge was subjected can be released from that subjection historical process would be freely played its role. Both methodologies seeks that the construction of subject is fictitious and only used to draw some political consequences.

“Where archaeology criticized the human sciences as being grounded in humanist assumptions genealogy links these theories to the operations of power and tries to put historical knowledge to work in local struggles, And where archaeology theorized the birth of the human sciences in the context of the modern episteme and the figure ‘Man’, genealogy highlights the power and effects relations they produced”^{19}.

In his book ‘Discipline and Punish’ he described about the historical formation of the soul, body, and subject within various disciplinary matrices of power that operate in institutions such as prisons, schools, hospitals, and workshops.

“Disciplinary techniques include timetables for constant imposition and regulation of activity, surveillance measures to monitor performance, examinations such as written reports and files to reward conformity and penalize resistance, and ‘normalizing judgement’ to impose and enforce moral values such as the work ethic, The life of the student, soldier and prisoner are equally regulated and monitored, The individual now is interpreted not only as a discursive construct, but as an effect of political technologies through which its very identity, desires, body, and ‘soul’ are shaped and constituted. ‘Discipline “makes” individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise”^{20}.

In his last work he tried to write the history of discursive formations that emerged since the end of the sixteenth century in which rigorously inscribed the body within discourses of sexuality governed by a scientific will to knowledge.

“Power operates not through repression of sex, but through the discursive production of sexuality and subjects who have a sexual nature, penetrating bodies in an increasingly detailed way, and in controlling populations in an increasingly comprehensive way sexual body allows it to be inscribed within a network of normalizing powers where a whole regime of knowledge-pleasure is defined and controlled”^{21}.

In order to theorize the birth of modern disciplinary and normalizing practices, genealogy politicizes all facets of culture and everyday life.

Genealogies are therefore ‘anti-sciences’, not because they seek to ‘vindicate a lyrical right to ignorance or non-knowledge’ and attack the concepts and methods of science per se, but rather because they contest ‘the coercive effects of the centralizing powers which are linked to the institution and functioning of an organized scientific discourse.

Instead of the Marxist binary model of class struggle between antagonistic classes, Foucault calls for a plurality of autonomous struggles waged throughout the micro levels of society, in the prisons, asylums, hospitals, and schools. For a modern concept of macro politics where clashing forces struggle for control over a centralized source of power rooted in the economy and state. Foucault substitutes a
postmodern concept of micro politics where numerous local groups contest diffuse and centred forms of power spreading throughout society.

The unspecific intellectual who represents, that is, to speaks on behalf of all oppressed groups is denoted to the specific intellectual who assumes a modest advisory role within a particular group and form of struggle. Foucault in that sense rejected the main concept of Marxism and rejected its some terminologies as well.

“Consequently, ‘they can be unmade, as long as we know how it was they were made. Foucault’s genealogy of sexuality was written with such purposes in mind. He attempted to problematize contemporary notions of sexual liberation by demonstrating that the concepts of sexual nature or sexuality originated in early Christian culture and in modernity became articulated with disciplinary and therapeutic techniques that work to imprison individuals in normalizing discourses and identities. In the later Foucault, emphasis on technologies of the self-decentres the prior emphasis on power and domination. Yet, it would be a mistake to think that domination disappears altogether in this stage of his work”22.

“First, one finds an emphasis on gaining power and domination over oneself, of subduing and mastering one’s desires and body in a self-relation of ‘domination-submission’ and ‘command-obedience’ (Here the conflict between power and the autonomy of the self is overcome as freedom is defined as mastery of and power over oneself. Second, in his history of ethics, Foucault foregrounds the domination of men over women”23.

CONCLUSION

We have known this feet very clearly that is important in foci’s historiography. before we focus upon his historiography we should analyse the task by which he was analysed, there is no any educational deportment which could not have presented Foko as the positive or negative thinks or did not discuss him but there are some possible points which are many important to be elaborated. my research was started with the statement of “Arthur Marvik “on the behalf Foko was considered as the writer of Hegel’s and marks lend after this he was considered in the list of modern historians it is not over intention that we declare Foko as a new kind of historian but we want to examine the points on the behalf he was considered as a modern writer and questions. Before we stand this discussion if is very good that we must elaborate about the physical and metaphysical school of thoughts.

Postmodern it is an intellectual movements arising after the 1950’s the rejection of foundationalism include the ideas (epistemological ontological, ethical, & philosophical) which have underwritten and authorized the kind of knowledge produced by historical research since the middle of 19th century. Today’s in this modern time no one can complete oriental learning. First of all Foko used this term in 1940 according to which ancient learning is actually the materialism arrears of part, but Foko’s thoughts were different. In contrary to it he says that oriental learning in a knowledge through which we can get the idea of particular path that shown that how a human being reached at this stage where that particular human being is encoding now.
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