



Foucault, Fairclough and Post-Development Discourse Analysis

Dana Ibrahim Ahmed

Department of English, College of Basic Education, University of Raparin, Ranya, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

danablb@uor.edu.krd

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 1/9/2021

Accepted: 7/10/2021

Published: Autumn 2021

Keywords:

Post-Development,
Critical Discourse
Analysis, Foucault,
Fairclough

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.6.4.34

ABSTRACT

Post-Development-inspired thinking is rooted in a critical view of modernity from a Post-Modern perspective. This field is strongly influenced by the thoughts and works of Michel Foucault. Studies in this direction have been done to analyze the concept of development to reveal the role and function of power and knowledge in the discourse of development. This article explores the topic of Post-Development, which reveals the concept of Post-Development through a review of Foucault's thought and intellectual framework and some of the initial and incorrect interpretations left out in this regard.

All these analyses are carried out under the three-layered theoretical framework of Fairclough and especially the third layer of this model, which considers explanation as to the ultimate goal of the study of discourse in relation to society in the field of critical speech analysis. Scattered and weak discussions around this axis are due to the misuse of Foucault's thoughts. Therefore, in this article, we seek to expose the post-Development discourse as much as possible by using Foucault's ideas about knowledge and power, which are the source of development.

1. Introduction

Language is the highest tool for representing thought and ideology, which is the by-product of society, discourse and ideology that governs society and requires critical speech analysis. Discourse as a social action shows how social structures determine

discourse, and in this regard, critical analysis of speech has provided researchers with certain ways to study language by appealing it to social contexts. Given how the world around us is represented in linguistic texts based on the inner interests of writers and linguistic actors, critical speech analysis provides an opportunity to carefully examine the interaction of society and language, text and context, language and power (Fairclough: 2001). This field is inspired by thinkers such as Foucault, Gramsci, Althusser, Fairclough, and Laclau & Mouffe, unlike the others who consider all discourse phenomena to be social; they consider discourse to be a part of social action as a linguistic event. According to Fairclough (1995, iv.), apart from the views of critical speech analysis, verbal interactions inspire by society and society cannot be rendered. Factors such as ideological presuppositions, inequality, domination and power can be ignored in discourse. The ultimate goal of critical discourse analysis is to extend the domain of discourse analysis over other social and political spheres and create a suitable platform for criticizing the unequal structures in society.

Thus, the purpose of critical discourse analysis is to analyze the structures of domination in society and influence the direction of the arrow of power among institutions and social relations. A series of pessimism about the theoretical position of this field in linguistic and social studies indicate that critical discourse analysis is about being mature. It is necessary to consider the need for practical theories in this field, i.e., linguistic and sociological dimensions. The general structure of Post-Development refers to the ambiguities in Foucault's works. As Gledhill (2000:150) points out, Foucault sees power as a relative factor present in all social relations that have permeated through all the elements of society. The result is the first resistance to the power of personal strategies that consider certain forms of domination, even partly. The Development Discourse, quoted by Edelman and Hangerud (2005), was co-sponsored by the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 and after the end of World War II by President Harry Truman, in which US technical and scientific superiority promoted the quality of life in developing countries. Another phase of development during the 1970s and the end of Burton Wood's domination of capital movement was that in 1971 the exchange rate of capital-based gold was



converted to dollars, and outside the United States, it was called economic neoliberalism.

During the same period, in the 1970s, the World Bank under McNamara's leadership shifted its macro-policies from economic growth to economic equality and the eradication of poverty. The concept of development means improving health, living standards and opportunities, and historically refers to the stages of industrialization, modernization or globalization. Based on the work of researchers such as Amartya Sen, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) has created indicators for development that combine health indicators, life expectancy, literacy, public education and political participation. During the same period, other scholars were influenced by Foucault's views and denied the necessity of development, calling it a destructive discourse put forward by bureaucrats and aid organizations in order to keep the poor and weak states in poverty. The observer of all social relations knows that he faces individual resistance. In addition, he considers knowledge and its structure in society to be inseparable from the power structure.

The discussion of Modernism emerged as a kind of discourse by Foucault during the late 1980s, through the configuration of vocabulary and the framework of development and the restructuring of knowledge and power. In fact, introducing this ideology was a step towards examining history from part to whole or from the bottom to the top. Post-Development presents a hegemonic picture of the development discourse that instead of solving the problems that causes them, but is accused of diminishing the role of individuals and organizations who are engaged in this process by creating an incomplete analysis. In addition, and directly, Post-Development is the result of Post-Modern tendencies in the social sciences. The fundamental idea beyond the Post-Developmental discourse is to incorporate the development discourse into the fusion of science and knowledge in the first world and the ruling power of the third world (Peet, 1997: 75). Post-Developmentalist thinkers use Foucault's work to examine the role of the mind in modern societies and the relationship between north and south and issues branching out from Post-Colonialism (Brigg: 2002). The pioneers of Post-Development see the Post-

Development discourse and its design as the last chapter in the long history of the spread and expansion of Modernity in a mixed Western context.

In fact, these pioneers have divided the world into two developed and developing poles by using the pronouns "us" and "them" in their discourse (Nustad, 1998: 42). In fact, Post-Development has developed as a turning point in the context of development discourse. The characteristic of Foucault's works is determined by a kind of genius conflict with Marx, which is considered the source of its fertility. Ferguson (1994)'s famous book, *The Anti-Politics Machine*, which is even referred to as the Post-Development Gospel, also laments the purely statistical relationship between development and Post-Development and the absence of an independent Post-Development discourse (Nustad, Ibid: 17). According to Escobar (1995) and Esteva (1992), expansion of Post-Development vocabulary and literature has been due to dissatisfaction with the concept and method of implementing development vocabulary and the lack of a more acceptable alternative. Sometimes the differences between the works of Post-Development are so obvious that it is as if we are facing two different schools of thought (Ziai: 2004).

2. Statement of the problem

Field thinkers such as Lewis (2003: 545) see Post-Development in their argumentative style of "Development" as a system of knowledge, technology, relationships, and the exercise of power to organize development goals. In their view, development is a hegemonic and monolithic discourse that ignores the cultural diversity of the societies it covers. Development, as it is perceived, is a kind of intervention (practical studies, a team of researchers, plans and workshops and policies and policies of the World Bank) that without considering this intervention, the term "Development" does not make sense (Maiava, 2002:1).

Green (2003: 123) argues that experts in the field outside of the institutional structure of "Development" see it as a bureaucratic force or global pro-capitalist rhetoric or a means of perpetuating unequal relations between the West and the rest of the world. Such a representation, from the perspective of Pieters (2000: 175), has led to a Post-Structural denial of development, which is based not only on

the internal results of the provisions of this view, but also on its particular worldview. Post-Development theory is helpful in understanding the formal order of development in the ultra-structures and internal relationships of structures and ideas involved in development. The important question that arises in this regard in relation to the role of discourse in real life is how the formation of individual freedom and its normalization in society is formed. According to the followers of Post-Development, development contains a special discourse that gives an objective form to knowledge in that society through various development institutions.

Sachs (1992: 1) looks at ideology from the perspective of today's marginalized thinkers as a development. On the other hand, he sees Post-Development discourse and ideology wrapped in the Neo-Colonial discourse, which seeks to perpetuate inequality between the North and the South, while the United States, like a beacon, paves the way for other nations. Escobar (1991: 666) transforms development into a field of knowledge by helping to regulate existing dispersions. In this system of knowledge, actors enter the field of development and do so through normalization and rational discourse. In this way, these actors and institutions form the desired discourse.

Similarly, Ferguson (1994) calls the reproduction hypothesis this way as development is continuously reproduced with the help of development agents and strengthens the existing discourse, so other forms of knowledge, despite the common discourse, are challenging to come up with. In support of this point, Orlandini (2003: 20) explains that the discourse of development means the hypothetical representation of the developing world and the continuous representation of development factors such as economists, statisticians, and even nutritionists. In such a case, the discourse of development, by reproducing itself, helps dominate the power structure and its acceptance by the agents of power in that society, which it does by downplaying rival discourses and, in a way, recalls Van Dijk's ideological square. In line with the above discourse, Mosse (2004: 644) calls Post-Development discourse an ethnographic impasse that replaces only the logical efficiency of politics with the automatic operation of the machine, resulting in a pragmatic sociology. The inflexible views of the organization of power by experts

such as Ferguson (1994) neglect the role and authority of the human factor in this field, so that they are referred to as involuntary agents.

3. Theoretical framework

Fairclough (1996: 25) offers a three-tier interpretation of critical discourse analysis that lies in the innermost or most tangible layer of the text, then discourse action, and finally social action also referred to as context. In the first layer, the expressive values of the text, i.e. words, grammar and different grammatical structures, as well as the relationship of these structures with each other are considered, which have an indirect relationship. In the second layer, the interpreter renders the text using his background knowledge and the text's clues. At the highest level, the interpreter explains, that is, considers the relationship between interaction and social context, or, more explicitly, explores the role of community in the production and interpretation of discourse. In fact, the possibility of producing such discourse among the existing and acceptable discourses in that language is determined based on sociological, historical, ideological and cultural factors. So from his point of view, there are different ways to look at a discourse.

3.1 Discourse and power

Critics such as (Escobar: 1995, and Sachs: 1992) find this objection to Post-Development discourse in its specific sense that by homogenizing the development discourse, it blows the theories of modernity of the 1950s and 1960s into the body of development discourse and its useless expansion. In addition, they refer to the beneficiaries of economic benefits and aid in the context of Post-Colonialism as others and have brought a kind of dispersion among Post-Development experts. In fact, in the meantime, too much emphasis has been placed on the spirit of discourse and the subject and title of discourse have been diminished. This is why Kiely (1999) refers to development as a particular discourse that constructs rather than reflects reality. Following Foucault, Kiely considers discourse to be the producer of science, not an individual subject, which means that the subject is the product of discourse. Due to the close relationship between knowledge and power, each society has its system and body of knowledge.



Critics such as Oksala (2005) consider the lack of agency in argumentative discussions one of Foucault's weaknesses. According to Foucault (1980: 156) and especially Post-Developmental thinkers, power does not act in favor of or against individual subjects, but is a machine surrounded by everyone. Of course, Foucault (1994) in his later works, analyzes the three aspects of power. It means domination, strategy and sovereignty. Dominance represents the subject of who rules over whom, or more simply, superior power. Of course, due to the relative nature of power, Foucault emphasizes in this regard the ability of subjects to resist, because no power can find meaning without the presence of an opposing force. The strategy of the game is between the rivals present on the scene, and finally, domination is an aspect of flexible power and the executive arm in society. Post-Development discourse generally deals only with the first aspect of power, namely domination, because it cannot reach all aspects of power simultaneously.

The neglect of Post-Developmental discourse in various aspects of power and the neglect of individuals are to some extent in line with Foucault's anti-humanist framework (Rapport & Overing: 2000) and his Post-humanist framework (Fraser: 1989). Based on the anti-humanist view of Foucault, Rapport & Overing critique Foucault's view of discourse as destabilizing because it obscures social interactions and the role of individuals in creating social relations. The authors consider the separate application of discourse as a motivating factor in creating a social framework. Fraser (1989: 56) criticizes Foucault's Post-humanist view by rejecting metaphysical subjects, and concludes that, in Foucault's view, the subject is the only by-product of a series of specific historical language-based interactions that exert power relations on human beings.

Basically, Foucault claims that power is current in the body and not in our minds, and even the producers of a discourse cannot decipher it because power can exist anywhere and even within anyone. Giving too much power to discourse leads to a shortening of the individual and cultural diversity role, which is one of the weaknesses of Foucault's inspired analysis. Post-Modernism is interested in creating divergence and differentiation in its view of the theory of Modernism, which is itself depicted as a domineering discourse and monotony. This leads to a critical reaction

to Post-Developmental discourse, which, in Peet's view (1997: 77), bears the blame for prioritizing the power of discourse over-emphasis on the agency. The human factor and the diversity of discourses have been ignored, and the actors in the field of discourse have only the role of a tool in the body of discourse, and perhaps the reason for this is Post-Development experts who equate discourse and reasoning methods with the totality of social life and the multiplicity of this process.

3.2 Discourse and Freedom

Now it is time to turn to whether agency and discourse are related to each other or not, and how important is this connection in social analysis? The answers to these questions depend on dichotomies such as structure and factor, transcendence, collectivism and individualism, and the concept of individual freedom. The result is deliberate underlining of the concept of freedom and the absence of domineering policies. Fairclough sees ideology as closely related to power because the nature of ideological assumptions is subject to criteria whose nature depends on power relations, and because they attempt to legalize existing social relations, they take these power relations for granted. On the other hand, ideology is closely related to language because one of the most common social actions is language. Contrary to its everyday use of language, ideology is less involved in discussing the relationship between language and power, which is a sign of its limitation.

Fairclough (1989: 3) considers the exercise and use of power in modern societies through the ideological function of language. Some followers of Post-Modernism have spoken of the prominent role of linguistics in sociological theories and have even referred to it as Post-Linguistics, which has gained this position due to its complexity and relevance to today's complex and modern society. Recognition of the importance of language indicates its ideological nature, which is one of the main themes of modern social sciences. Discourses do not reveal transcendental concepts, despite the provision of tools for expressing ideology. It is the actors within the discourses who derive their desired meaning from the discourse.

Boden (1990: 189) calls discourse actor's wise agents rather than puppets of culture, and considers macro-structural methods to be consistent with micro-studies, and sees these actors as the source of inspiration and reinterpretation of discourses.

Boden (ibid: 192) states that the agent must turn to social studies to counter reductionism in macro-analysis and show the flexibility of potential actors in larger structures. Foucault defines his work as the genealogy of the modern subject, and his archaeological method is an objective revelation of the transformation of human beings into subjects.

Oksala (2005) distinguishes three periods in Foucault's works: the first period, which focuses on the archaeological method according to which language consists of a major empirical field, and the second period, which focuses on genealogy and the systematic power of discourse. And finally, the third period, which focused on the axis of morality and the subjects' relations with it, which was also called sovereignty. According to Oksala, Foucault was in a secondary position to discourse, but in the latter period, he raises how individuals present themselves in relation to discourse as a subject. Oksala (ibid: 5) sees the subject as inspired by networks of power and knowledge and as having the capacity for moral review and resistance to standard ideas.

Freedom in relation to discourse is an imaginary rift engraved on the walls of the world around us that opens to seeing what could have been. Individual freedom in discourse is assumed to be an intuitive question because it helps us avoid accepting uncertain issues. Honneth (1991) considers Foucault's theory of discourse to be an anti-subjective hypothesis. It is not considered for the individual whether this action is related to internal or external practical discourse. According to Hunt, after developing his theory of power and discourse, Foucault forgets that his method is based on objective inter-subjective analysis of social discourses, which in itself leads to the formation of a kind of resistance. Instead, Foucault sees power in the sense of repeated use of force. According to Honneth (1991: 112), as a result of Foucault's literary-theoretical interpretation of social life, man is no longer the center and focus of the experience of the actions he sees or ignores but is part of a network of influences produced by the rules of language. He does not understand that this interpretation of Foucault's works means eliminating the human subject and resorting to empiricism. While Foucault's theory of power is closely related to tangible and empirical studies, his idea of resistance is only theoretically formed on

paper. Brenner (1994) questions the reason for Foucault's insistence on the principle of insistence on power without a practical examination of it when formulating the theory of discourse and power.

Foucault (1994: 680) does not have a comprehensive answer to this question, but states that the solution for Foucault is a role-playing analysis of power relations that limits the grammar of this resistance to non-role-playing. A third perspective seeks to integrate the subject and intuitive analysis with a focus on actor interaction and structure. This method, called the expansion of social theory, ignores social relations and interactive structures by re-reading society as the starting point of social theory (Haugh: 2001). According to Kapferer (2004: 151), a social theory requires including the intrinsic complexities of dynamics, their processing, and the extent to which they affect human beings. It does not state how the society was formed. In this regard, Haugh (2001: 65) recommends using several methods and paradigms that are in line with Denzin's (1989) theory of triangle, which believes in combining several strategies for an event.

The only magic of this triangle is to make the researcher aware that different methods present different images of empirical facts. This makes the anthropological view that there is no place from which an event can be observed in its entirety (Nustad, 2003: 127). Honneth (1991), on the other hand, sees Foucault as role-oriented because of his overemphasis on the structural anthropology of Strauss, who set the rules for determining human actions and questioning the unequivocal trust in human science. Foucault's Post-Structuralism redefines the distinction between the symbolic level of reasoning and the level of construction of reality and behavior in society, while Levi Straus-inspired structuralism reduces the dialectic between worlds and non-worlds. Such a distinction is also drawn in Foucault's works between reasoning and practical features.

Long (2004) confronts the development sector in the discussion of knowledge and examines the origin and method of transmitting knowledge from the point of view of social constructivism and theoretical perspective to the method of producing discourse by the language user, transmitting the content of speech and finally understanding it by the audience. The focus on discourse shows that ideas are not

separate from the interests of language users in the form of tangible and objective events but are intertwined in different contexts of time and space and create forms of power that can express characteristics. They have a certain culture potentially. Therefore, Long (ibid: 28) does not consider discourse as a phenomenon separate from social actions and sees the term "argumentative expression" in Foucault's writings in the same direction. He sees discourse as a system of knowledge of the same quality as other systems of knowledge and analyzes the interaction of these systems as a critical point of contact between different social systems that the cohesion of social systems is sometimes distorted due to conflict in their value criteria. Interference indicates a change from different discourses and systems of knowledge to the various situations faced and contain a full-fledged discourse that deserves to be studied and emphasized. The incoherence of social life involves values, knowledge, and power because interference generally occurs at a point where different areas of social and individual life meet (Long, 2004: 35).

Conclusions

Foucault has two genealogical and paleontological approaches to discourse. In Foucault's "paleontological" works, he focuses on the types of discourse as rules that govern the realms of knowledge. Discourse structures for Foucault refer to systems of ideas, points of view, concepts, ways of thinking and behaving in a particular social context. Foucault's works reveal a completely non-turbulent and uneven application of the basic concept of the proposition and the meaning of "discourse". From a holistic point of view, it can be said that discourse in the context of Foucault's paleontological works implies "analysis of propositions". Discourse analysis here is not the same as linguistic analysis, just as discourse is not language. Discourse analysis does not worry about which proposition can be embodied, but rather focuses on identifying and assigning diverse "discourse organizations" from a socio-historical perspective.

Fairclough, on the other hand, recognizes the need for change in the type of attitude and methodology of language in the form of two main goals that the critical linguistic approach pursues: helping compensate for this widespread disregard for



the importance of language in producing, maintaining, and changing the social relations of power, and informing people about how language plays a role in governing some over others, because awareness and knowledge is the first step towards liberation. to the vast majority of experts, the discourse of Development and Post-Development has been formed around social issues such as power, knowledge, equality, and inequality. In discourse analysis, the foundation operating method shows that each analytical method has its perspective that examines different systems of knowledge regardless of the power attributed to them. In the above empirical way, not only does Foucault tries to decipher the black box of discourse by addressing politics and its implementation, but he also challenges the Post-Structuralist school and the Post-Development discourse to which he owes it. Relying on Post-Developmental perspectives, the Foundation's operating method makes it possible to understand how development-related meanings and concepts are produced, criticized, and implemented in practice, and the importance that the term places on the actors. Echoing in the field of Development. Despite revealing the argumentative context of Development, Post-Development discourse has the ability and potential to play a role in understanding Post-Developmental understanding by emphasizing the factor in the context of discourse and without undermining the role of agency.

References

1. Boden, Deirdre (1990). "The World as It Happens: Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis". *Ritzer*: 185–213.
2. Brenner, Neil (1994). "Foucault's New Functionalism". *Theory and Society* 23, no. 5: 679–709.
3. Brigg, Morgan (2002). "Post-Development, Foucault and the Colonialisation Metaphor". *Third World Quarterly* 23, no. 3: 421–436.
4. Denzin, Norman (1989). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5. Edelman, Mark and Angelique Hangerud (2005). *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization*, Black Well publication.
6. Escobar, Arturo (1991). "Anthropology and the Development Encounter: The Making and Marketing of Development Anthropology". *American Ethnologist: A Journal of the American Anthropological Association* 18, no. 4: 658–682.

7. Escobar, Arturo (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
8. ESTEVA, G. (1992). Development. In: W. SACHS (Ed.). *The Development Dictionary: A guide to Knowledge as Power*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press. pp. 1-23.
9. Fairclough, Norman (2001). *Language and Power*, second edition, Longman, New York.
10. Fairclough, Norman (1996). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Conversation with Norman Fairclough*. Deakin Centre for Education and Change, Faculty of Education, Deakin University.
11. Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*. Longman, London.
12. Fairclough, Norman (1989). *Language and Power*, first edition, Longman, New York.
13. Ferguson, James (1994). *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
14. Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Brighton, UK: Harvester Press.
15. Foucault, Michel (1994). "L'éthique du souci de soicommepratique de la liberté". *Ditsetécrits 1954–1988, Paris: Gallimard*, pp. 708–729.
16. Fraser, Nancy (1989). *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
17. Gledhill, John (2000). *Power and its Disguises. Anthropological Perspectives on Politics*. 2nd ed. London: Pluto Press.
18. Green, Maia (2003). "Globalizing Development in Tanzania: Policy Franchising through Participatory Project Management." *Critique of Anthropology 23, no. 2*: 123–143.
19. Honneth, Axel (1991). *The Critique of Power: Reflective Stages in a Critical Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
20. Kapferer, Bruce (2004). "Introduction: The Social Construction of Reductionist Thought and Practice." *Social Analysis 48, no. 3*: 151–161.
21. Kiely, Ray. (1999). "The Last Refuge of the Noble Savage? A Critical Assessment of Post-Development Theory." *European Journal of Development Research 11, no. 1*: 30–55.
22. Lewis, David, et al. (2003). "Practice, Power and Meaning: Framework for Studying Organizational Culture in Multi-Agency Rural Development Projects." *Journal of International Development 15, no. 5*: 541–557.
23. Long, Norman. (2004). "Contesting Policy Ideas from Below." *Bøås and McNeill*: 24–40.
24. Maiava, S. (2002). *When Development is not 'Development'? Recognizing unofficial development or practicing post-development?* Massey University.
25. Mosse, David. (2004). "Is Good Policy Unimplementable? Reflections on the Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice." *Development and Change 35*: 639–671.
26. Nustad, Knut G. (2003). "Considering Global/Local Relations: Beyond Dualism.", *Globalisation, ed. Thomas Hylland Eriksen*. London: Pluto Press: 122–137

27. Nustad, Knut G. (1998). *Community Leadership and Development Administration in a Durban Squatter Settlement*. PhD diss., University of Cambridge.
28. Oksala, Johanna (2005). *Foucault on Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Orlandini, Barbara (2003). "Consuming 'Good Governance' in Thailand." *European Journal of Development Research* 15, no. 2: 16–43.
30. Peet, Richard (1997). "Social Theory, Postmodernism, and the Critique of Development." Pp: 72–87 *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*, (ed.) George Benko and Ulf Strohmayer. Oxford: Blackwell.
31. Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (2000). "After Post-Development." *Third World Quarterly* 21, no. 2: 175–191.
32. Rapport, Nigel, and Joanna Overing (2000). *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge.
33. Sachs, Wolfgang, ed. (1992). *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books.
34. Ziai, A. (2004). 'The Ambivalence of Post-development: Between Reactionary Populism and Radical Democracy'. *Third World Quarterly* 25(6): 1045-1060.

شیکردنه وه ی وتاری فیرکلۆ له زه مه نی دواى پيشکه ووتن

پوخته:

له راستیدا بیرکردنه وه ی هانده رانه و سه رکه وتوو له زه مه نی دواى پيشکه ووتن بنچينه به کی هه یه له تیروانینی سه رده میانه به تایبه ت پاش مودیرنیزم. نه م بواره تا راده یه کی زور کاریگه ر بووه به بیرۆکه و کاره کانی میشیل فۆکۆ. تووژینه وه ی زور به م ناراسته یه کراوه بۆ لیکۆلینه وه و شیکردنه وه ی چه مکی پيشکه ووتن بۆ دیارخستن و نیشاناندانی رۆل و نه رکی هیز و مه عریفه ت له وتاری سه رده می پيشکه ووتن. نه م تووژینه وه یه هه و لیکه بۆ گه ران و لیکۆلینه وه له وتار له سه رده می دواى پيشکه ووتن، که ده ریده خات که چۆن زاراوه ی دواى پيشکه ووتن له رپگه ی پیداجونه وه به بیرۆکه ی فۆکۆ و وه له چوارچیه ی تیروانین له بۆچونه کانی فۆکۆ وه هه روه ها له هه ندیک له و بۆ چوونه هه له سه ره تایانه ی هه نه بۆ نه م بواره.

نه م تووژینه وه به تایبه ت ده ریده خات که هه موو شیکردنه وه کان له ژیر رۆشایى سن چینی له چوارچیه ی تیوری فرکلاف وه به تایبه تیش چینی سیه می نه م مۆدیله که گرنگی ده دات به روونکردنه وه وه ک کۆتا ئامانجی لیکۆلینه وه ی وتاره (discourse) له په یوه ندی به کۆمه لگاوه به

تاییه تی له بواری شیکردنه وه ی قسه ی یاخود وتاری ره خنه گرانه. ده توانی بوتری که گفتوگویی پچر پچر و لاواز له م پوانگه وه ده گه ریته وه بو خراب به کارهینانی بیروکه کانی فوکو. به م شیوه یه نه م توژیینه وه یه هه ولیکه بو لیکۆلینه وه و نیشانسانی وتار له دواي زه مه نی پیشکه ووتن وه به کارهینانی بیروکه ی فوکو له دیدگای هیزو مه عریفه ت که نه مانه ش سه رچاوه ی پیشکه ووتن له بواری لیکۆلینه وه ی وتار (Post-Development discourse) .

تحليل خطاب فيركلو وما بعد التنمية

المخلص:

إن التفكير المستوحى من مرحلة ما بعد التنمية متجذر في وجهة نظر نقدية للحدثة من منظور ما بعد الحدثة. يتأثر هذا المجال بشدة بأفكار وأعمال ميشيل فوكو. وقد أجريت دراسات في هذا الاتجاه لتحليل مفهوم التنمية للكشف عن دور ووظيفة السلطة والمعرفة في خطاب التنمية. هذا المقال هو استكشاف لموضوع ما بعد التنمية ، والذي يكشف عن مفهوم ما بعد التنمية من خلال مراجعة فكر فوكو وإطاره الفكري وبعض التفسيرات الأولية وغير الصحيحة التي تم التخلي عنها في هذا الصدد. تتم جميع هذه التحليلات في إطار الإطار النظري ثلاثي الطبقات لـ Fairclough وخاصة الطبقة الثالثة من هذا النموذج ، والتي بدورها تعتبر التفسير الهدف النهائي لدراسة الخطاب فيما يتعلق بالمجتمع في مجال تحليل الكلام النقدي. ترجع النقاشات المتفرقة والضعيفة حول هذا المحور إلى سوء استخدام أفكار فوكو. لذلك ، في هذه المقالة ، نسعى لفضح خطاب ما بعد التنمية قدر الإمكان باستخدام أفكار فوكو حول المعرفة والقوة ، والتي هي مصدر التنمية.