

Compared to the detailed theoretical analysis of colonial power and discourse, the conception of anti-colonial resistance has been generally underdeveloped and undertheorised. This inadequate, theoretical concern with resistance to colonialism has led to the current conception of colonial power and discourse in postcolonial theory. This argument is illustrated on the analysis of the approaches to resistance in the works of Foucault and Bhabha, who have paid the major attention to the issues of power, knowledge and colonialism. They are countered by the work of Edward Said who brings resistance to the focal point of the post- and anti-colonial discourse.

Foucault argues that resistance is neither defined by terms of its object, nor is it the result of intentionality on the part of the subject, whether this subject is collective or individual. He thinks of power as an intentional question without a subject, as if he were talking about purposefulness without purpose or action without agency. Yet, Foucault's theory of resistance remains inadequately explored. For Foucault, resistance is not integral but rather a necessary condition for the operation of power. Power itself is viewed as an undifferentiated conception: he tends to think of power from the standpoint of its actual realisation, not the opposition to it. Foucault implicitly claims that power disguises itself by producing a discourse that is only seemingly opposed to or critical of it. Such an oppositional discourse, according to Foucault, can be no more than a ruse within a more efficient reconfiguration.