Representing Madness: Ambivalence in Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*[1]

Natasha Himmelman

Throughout history, madness has occupied many spaces within vastly different discourses, including colonial discourses and discourses of science. In *Madness and Civilization* (1964), Michel Foucault presents changing perceptions of madness in Europe, specifically its movement from integration within society towards its status as Agamben's *homo sacer*, or inclusion vis-à-vis exclusion.[2] Through this study of madness Foucault is able to examine the construction of discourse(s) and its relationship(s) with power. As Colin Gordon explains in the introduction to *Power/Knowledge*, Foucault's analysis demonstrates "that the invention of madness as a disease is in fact nothing less than a peculiar disease of our civilization."[3] In other words, madness is discursively constructed. Drawing from "[r]ecent psychiatric – or perhaps anti-psychiatric – research," Gordon reinforces Foucault's analysis when he states that "people do not in fact go mad, but are driven mad by others who are driven into the position of driving them mad by a peculiar convergence of social pressures."[4] The authenticity of Foucault's conclusions is also reinforced by the dialog he constructs with "the voice of insane people."[5] But, as Ania Loomba asks in her book *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*: "how might one recover voices that have been deemed not worthy of social circulation?"[6] According to Loomba, "Foucault found that literary texts were one of the rare places where they might be heard."[7] If literary texts enabled Foucault to capture these supposedly mute voices,[8] then I too look to the realm of literary studies – African Literature – in order to interrogate the construction of discursive power in Africa through the lens of madness. Specifically, this paper analyses the discursive significance of representations of madness in Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*.

Achebe's novel represents a primarily black, patriarchal perspective of the colonial encounter in what would become Nigeria. Through the portrayal of madness, *Arrow of God* interrogates discursive truths, exposes their cracks and demonstrates hegemony's seemingly all-pervasive grip. Achebe's protagonist, Ezeulu, experiences madness in response to the discursive shifts occurring within the terrains in which he resides. Ezeulu teeters between traditional Ibo society and the infringing colonial regime, ultimately confronting a new, but incompletely mapped space. However, without a discourse to accommodate newfound knowledges, Ezeulu is abruptly compelled to madness. This paper interrogates the discursive ambivalence(s) that bars these knowledges, and which contribute to Ezeulu's madness.

Ambivalence is central to the discursive setting of *Arrow of God*, for the protagonist exists in an interregnal space in which one discourse is ending and another is still

emerging. The discursive setting is uncertain because of this indeterminacy, which is strongly juxtaposed against colonial discourses, specifically its modernist foundations, which police the ambivalences, or uncertainties, that contribute to discursive discontinuities.[9] Modernity's focus is that of structure and order.[10] Hence, as Zygmunt Bauman stipulates in *Modernity and Ambivalence*, "First and foremost…it [modernity] means purging *ambivalence*."[11] Colonial discourse, birthed from such ideology, also sought out to "purg[e] ambivalence."

Although colonial discourse differs from modernity, it is quite clear that colonialism derives from a mentality of structure and order, whose purpose is to reinforce modernity's overarching objectives. In *Formations of Modernity* (1992), Stuart Hall explains how modernity was translated into colonial discourse:

> Without the Rest…the West would not have been able to recognize and represent itself as the summit of human history. The figure of 'the Other,' banished to the edge of the conceptual world and constructed as the absolute opposite, the negation, of everything which the West stood for, reappeared at the very centre of the discourse of civilization, refinement, modernity and development in the West.[12]

The construction of the Other in colonial discourse was founded upon a Manichean logic in which everything was defined against what it was not. With reference to the Manichaeism in Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*,[13] JanMohamed writes, "[T]he colonial mentality is dominated by a manichean allegory of white and black, good and evil, salvation and damnation, civilisation and savagery, superiority and inferiority, intelligence and emotion, self and other, subject and object."[14] In other words, within this discursive structure, the West could not be "good" without the Other occupying the space of "evil." The West depended upon the Other(s) in order to define itself.

In spite of colonialism's determination to polarise the West's relationship with the 'native,' a series of ambivalences surfaced, which undermined the monolithic identities projected by the West. For instance, colonialism's 'mad natives' created inconsistencies in the West's dichotomous relationship with the Other. However, although the Western *ratio* that governed colonialism required the eradication of ambivalence, the imperial mission depended upon ambivalence in order to achieve its goals. Thus, despite colonialism's determination to pervade *terra incognita* through a more extensive discursive mapping of these previously unknown spaces, colonialism depended upon an order and structure in which 'native' spaces retained a level of both enchanting and fearful mystery. After all, if the 'native' became too structured, the original fear of the unknown would be forfeited. Colonialism thrived on this fear, which evoked strong ambivalences in the West. The 'native' could not lose its mystique through an absolute dichotomy. Rather, he or she must continue to be both noble and savage, so that an Other could be retained through the guise of a

"sympathetic" civilising mission. Western discursive power required that the 'native' be both feared and pitied.

Ethnopsychiatry created a 'mad native,' who reinforced this discursive ambivalence, and which exceeded the ambivalences held toward the Western madman. Like the insane of the West, the 'mad native' needed to be removed from society in order to eliminate the danger she posed to others, as well as to undergo rehabilitation. However, the 'insane native' also resided within a more extensive sphere of the unknown, particularly evident in the temporal space assigned to her. In *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, Johannes Fabian investigates how the "emergent discipline of Anthropology"[15] created spatial distance between Western and non-Western people. He writes, "What makes the savage significant to the evolutionist's Time is that he lives in another Time."[16] In other words, anthropology provided the necessary 'scientific proof' for placing the colonised Other in a static space, a space which – on a Darwinian evolutionary scale – Western civilisation had surpassed many years prior. Placed within the discursive terrain of the civilising mission, ethnopsychiatry is confronted with the task of 'curing' the 'native' mind so that it may become psychologically capable of embracing 'civilisation.' Essentially, the ethnopsychiatrist must discover a means by which the 'native' mind can be evolved to Western standards. Such evolution was unnecessary for Western mental patients because they resided within the spectrum of Western standards. A temporal distance did not exist between a Western patient and his or her doctor, but did exist between the 'native' and the ethnopsychiatrist. This temporal distance preserved the ambivalence of the unknown, and evoked both fear and pity.

Such ambivalence also needed to be spatially represented. Thus, the colonial state needed to maintain centres of Western civilisation, represented by institutions and urban spaces, and *terra incognita*. As a result, and in communion with civil governance, the mission church, as well as other colonial institutions, mental institutions were constructed in order to carve out Western spaces which served to reinforce the dominance of Western power. As Harry Garuba writes in an essay entitled "Mapping the Land/Body/Subject: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies in African Narrative," "[C]olonialism as a regime of power was largely organized through spatiality and subjectivity: spaces to capture, subjects to control."[17] Once mental institutions captured spaces, the development of ethnopsychiatry provided a means through which subjects could be controlled.

Thus, although colonial discourse built superstructures that ordered society in absolute terms – binary terms – the colonial endeavour itself required a constant ambivalence. The unknown needed to be upheld. The 'native' must be both noble and savage, feared and pitied. Moreover, like 'developed' (Western) peoples, the 'native could experience madness, but only because of his inability to become 'civilised.' Furthermore, spaces needed to be mapped, but also left to their own devices. These necessary ambivalences inevitably created potential emergences in colonial discourse, and opened up spaces for subversion and even resistance.

At times subversion was unintended, and lacked political motivation, but a lack of intention did not eliminate the space itself – a space which inspired questioning, mobility, and action. The colonial paradox of ambivalence prevented the colonial administration from denying the 'native' her humanity. Perhaps within the context of colonial discourse, the 'native' served as a specimen of sub-humanity, but she could not be completely denied of her humanity. The colonising mission was needed in order to legitimise the colonial endeavour: without the premise that the 'native' could be 'civilised' (and therefore, would have to be human), the entire enterprise would be deemed unacceptable to Western citizens. Thus, according to colonial discourse, time (in terms of evolution) was the only object that barred the 'native' from 'developing.' In this way, the civilising mission both asserted and denied the 'native's' humanity.

Madness also reinforced this ambivalent humanity. While colonial discourse asserted that the 'native' suffered from a particular kind of madness, distinct from the mental afflictions experienced by Western people, the discourse also believed that the 'native' could be 'cured.' If both 'native' and colonial could experience madness and be cured of that madness, certainly the two populations shared several similarities. Such shared experiences provoked discursive emergences, which inspired more questions. Moreover, 'native' patients, whose symptoms did not seem to result from colonial civilisation, challenged colonial discourse. Reinforcing patient experience as evidence, Jackson writes that "all represent and destabilise the colonizer's explanatory framework for African madness: colonial civilization."[18] Jackson captures the ambivalence of the 'mad native,' and stipulates that his narrative simultaneously "represent[ed]" and "destabilize[ed]" discursive truths invented by ethnopsychiatry and upheld by the political economy of colonialism. Thus, the same patient narrative could be used to reinforce *and* subvert colonial discourse.

This duality of reinforcement and subversion is also evident in the mapping of colonial spaces. Colonial discourse was founded on modernist hyperstructures that ordered society in an attempt to rid it from ambivalence. However, this same discourse depended on ambivalence. The need to preserve the unknown in order to promote enchantment and fear, fetishism and enslavement, also enabled spaces to remain unmapped for all intensive purposes. The title *terra incognita* remained, but this label did not affect populations as profoundly as urbanisation. In an analysis of colonial mapping, Garuba writes:

> many African villages chose to resist 'visual capture' or 'discovery' by explorers and colonial administrators by retreating further in to the forests, and that constant and continual mobility was one of the strategies of colonial resistance.[19]

These populations resided in *terra incognita*. As a result, they possessed colonial subjectivities distinct from colonial subjects in more urbanised villages.

Achebe's *Arrow of God* represents both colonial and Ibo subjectivities and their subsequent convergence. According to multiple sources,[20] Achebe's *Arrow of God* is based on, or, at the very least, influenced by "the anthropological text of Simon Alagboga Nnolim."[21] "[I]n *The History of Umuchu* […] a priest called Ezeagu rejected a chieftaincy in 1913, was imprisoned and refused to roast the sacred yams for the months missed."[22] This summary of events serves as a working outline of Achebe's novel, but inevitably fails to capture the complexities in character and plot present in *Arrow of God*. Achebe's novel focuses on the story of Ezeulu, the chief priest of Ulu, who must negotiate his authority amidst the present, but not-yet pervasive authority of the "white man." As C. L. Innes states in *Chinua Achebe* (1992), "*Arrow of God* is 'about' the problem of authority and the related questions of whom or what to believe and follow."[23] Although Ezeulu's authority remains unchallenged at the beginning of the novel, the chief priest questions the source and extent of his power, but quickly pushes these thoughts out of his mind. The chief priest of Ulu *must* name the feast of the Pumpkin Leaves and the New Yam Feast, and thereby enable his people to thrive.

As the novel advances, however, Ezeulu's perspective changes. Undoubtedly, this change is influenced by more frequent experiences with colonial authorities. In *The Novels of Chinua Achebe*, G.D. Killam writes, "the forces of colonialism – church, government and trade – precipitate the crisis and tragic resolution in the novel which alters the quality of tribal life."[24] However, despite having witnessed against his peers on a land issue, which gained him the attention of the colonial administration, specifically Captain Winterbottom, who invites Ezeulu to educate his son at the missionary school, Ezeulu's tribal life has remained relatively constant. Nonetheless, problems soon emerge. For instance, although Ezeulu sends his son Oduche to learn how to access the knowledge(s) and skills of the "white man," so that he may reveal them to his father, Oduche is taught to reject Ibo religion and culture as heathen. In spite of these and other negative experiences, it is Ezeulu's invitation to Government Hill that causes the most tangible disruption.

Upon receipt of Winterbottom's "invitation," Ezeulu seeks out the advice of his fellow elders, who tell him to visit Winterbottom. Upon his arrival, Ezeulu is imprisoned and therefore, unable to consume the sacred yams, which must be eaten before the Feast of the Yam can be announced. Killam explains the layers of these circumstances:

> Before going to Government Hill Ezeulu was seen by his enemies at home as being in league with the white man. His enemies had made much of this. His rejection of the offer made by Clarke[25] is at first greeted with suspicion by them…The fact that he remains in jail for so long a time convinces them of his sincerity and his reputation rises.

> Now Ezeulu determines to have his revenge on his people for the distrust of him and their failure to heed his counsel…[26]

The chief priest's absence means that the sacred yams have not been eaten. Although he is aware of the danger of hunger and starvation, Ezeulu refuses to announce the Feast of the New Yam. "[T]wo months pass, the ground hardens and the new harvest is lost. Ezeulu, his family and the villagers suffer. Ezeulu does not act out of personal spite or the desire to redress insult to himself."[27] While the community suffers in hunger, Ezeulu's son Obika suddenly dies, sending Ezeulu into the depths of madness – the focal point of this analysis.

Numerous essays and books about *Arrow of God* have been published, but most fail to interrogate the significance of the novel's end.[28] Why does the hero go mad? What is the contextualised significance of his madness? *Arrow of God* was published in 1964, merely four years after Nigeria proclaimed its independence from Great Britain. While the novel does not address this momentous event in Nigerian history, it does mark a significant movement away from colonial mentality. With the dawning of independence, Achebe is able to offer his readers a new knowledge to replace the knowledge(s) upheld by both Ibo and colonial discourses, a perspective Achebe gained through his ambivalent position as a black, mission-educated, Ibo male. In "Novelist as Teacher" Achebe writes:

> I would be quite satisfied if my novels (especially the ones I set in the past) did no more than teach my readers that their past – with all its imperfections – was not one long night of savagery from which the first Europeans acting on God's behalf delivered them.[29]

Although these words also refer to *Things Fall Apart* (1958), this novel continues to be mis-interpreted by critics who regard Achebe's portrayal of Ibo culture as static,[30] and misogynist.[31] While Achebe's female characters remain un- or underdeveloped in *Arrow of God*,[32] Ibo culture has been re-written as dynamic and open to change. As Robert Wren states in *Achebe's World*:

The world of Umuaro is a world long in the process of change. It had been six clans once; the foremost god Idemili had been displaced by Ulu; *ichi* marks were no longer carved on men's faces; once, it was said (perhaps only as a cautionary irony), there had been a fifth title in Umaro – king. These are specific changes. More important is the dynamic sense of the complexity of change. It is this that gives the novel its extraordinary texture.[33] This dynamism reflects Achebe's determination to re-write a Nigerian history that confronts the discursive truths upheld by colonialism, and in this way, *Arrow of God* serves as the author's gesture towards decolonisation.

This gesture is especially significant amidst the violence erupting in Nigeria shortly after independence. As Fanon prophesises in *The Wretched of the Earth*, "The

colonized man will first manifest this aggressiveness which has been deposited in his bones against his own people."[34] Achebe's novel demonstrates how the colonised man (sic) Fanon describes was created, and offers a space in which he or she can confront colonial mythologies. After all, decolonisation requires more than an identification of discursive truths; it necessitates an innovative restructuring of power relations. As Foucault theorises, "It's not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power…but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time."[35] *Arrow of God* interrogates "the psychology of power"[36] ('truth') in colonial Iboland in an effort to address similar questions of discursive truth(s) in post-independence Nigeria. The novel demonstrates how truths are ordained with power and the ways in which these truths are inserted into society through force and happenstance.

Achebe's use of both force and happenstance in *Arrow of God* reinforces the ambivalence experienced during the colonial encounter. While both Ibo and European had heard of one another – the Ibo through prophesy and the European through hearsay – a level of unknown existed, which united and divided the populations through imaginative fantasy and horror. In this unknown, discursive truths failed to produce absolutes. The Ibo and the European needed to see to believe. The colonial encounter transformed seeing into believing, thus disappointing and surpassing imagination and discursive truth. As a result of the encounter, 'truths' began to shift, which had the effect of imposing structure onto previously unknown 'truths.' Although unknowns persisted, colonial experiences, mediated by Ibo or colonial discourses, structured residual unknowns, which were read them through the lens of established 'truths.' Each discourse maintained its own logic of interpretation and thus, at times the same unknowns were read very differently from one discourse to the next.

Rather than one overpowering discourse, colonial Africa was subjected to two distinctly contrasting discursive powers, each upholding their own "truths." In *Imperial Leather*, McClintock reinforces this conflict when he states that, "European imperialism was, from the outset, a violent encounter with preexisting hierarchies of power that took shape not as the unfolding of its own inner destiny but as untidy, opportunistic interference with other regimes of power."[37] A study of madness in colonial Africa exhibits such "opportunistic interference." After all, there is evidence from both European and African regimes of power which prove the untidiness and opportunism to which McClintock refers. Although European power enabled an overarching discourse that subjugated the 'mad native,' mapping his or her body and mind through discursive interpellation, colonial trauma, and human rights abuses, African power was not absent from this violent encounter. Chiefs, elders, and family members brought members of their communities to asylums in order to rid themselves of the inconveniences a mentally unstable person may create. Members of the community, who were believed to have committed a taboo or brought bad luck to the society,[38] were also eliminated from the village and placed

in colonial care. While the degree of opportunism is undeniably unbalanced toward European power, "opportunistic interference[s]" inevitably resulted in the entanglement of African and European powers.

Within the context of *Arrow of God*, colonial (European) power becomes entangled with Ibo power. With reference to traditional Ibo societies, Achebe states, "Our life was never compartmentalized in the way that it has become today. We talk about politics, economics, religion. But in the traditional society all these things were linked together…"[39] This logic is particularly evident in the ways in which varying problems were addressed in Ibo society. If a community member was experiencing personal problems, she would see a healer, or "medicine man".[40] Similarly, if another community member were suffering from mental affliction, he would also seek out the assistance of the healer. Moreover, all problems, personal or health-related, were believed to result from "magic, sorcery, witchcraft, broken taboos or the work of spirits."[41] Thus, unlike Western doctors who treat physical or psychological symptoms, African healers seek out religious causes – the why of illness etiology.[42] It is precisely in this way that "things were linked together"[43] in traditional Ibo societies. This worldview is inclusive of the insane whose presence was integrated into Ibo societies; because in most cases the insane were viewed as victims of outside evil(s).

This perspective contrasts with the physical and social ostracism experienced by the insane in Western societies. As McCulloch states, "To Western eyes the insane were not innocent."[44] Referring to "the traditional cultures of Botswana," Paul Sidandi and others write:

> [M]entally ill people were cared for by their families and by healers, who treated them for bewitchment. Belief in witchcraft per se was not regarded as an illness since such beliefs were widely held. Patients often believed that nothing happens to people unless something evil has been done to them by their enemies through divine intervention.[45]

The Ibo integrated madness into their discursive norms, creating truths,[46] in which the insane were supposedly blameless. Admittedly, the insane were not completely innocent, for as Achebe demonstrates in his short story "The Madman" (*Girls at War and Other Stories* (1972)), a negative stigma is at times associated with the insane. Achebe writes, "Even so it remains true that madness may indeed sometimes depart but never with all his clamorous train. Some of these always remain – the trailers of madness you might call them – to haunt the doorway of the eyes […] Such a man is marked forever."[47] Indeed, Achebe's story demonstrates the ways in which Ibo society may have reacted to madness, but it is important to note a significant temporal and situational distinction.

Arrow of God was published in 1964 and "The Madman" was published in 1972. While writing *Arrow of God* Achebe was enmeshed in Nigeria's fervent nationalism.

During this time the treatment of the mentally ill was revolutionised by Dr. Adeoye Lambo, who spearheaded the creation of the Aro Hospital village system, which combined Western and African methods of treatment and healing in order to address the needs of the mentally ill.[48] In "Community Development and Public Health," Tolani Asuni commends the village system, and writes, "[T]he villagers […] have developed increased understanding and tolerance of mental illness."[49] This positive attitude suggests a previously negative stigma associated with the mentally ill. Asuni refers to such perceptions in "Aro Hospital in Perspective." With reference to Dr. F. B. Home, he writes, "He was not called a 'psychiatrist' but rather an 'alienist.' This title reflects the climate of opinion toward mentally ill patients who were considered to be alienated from the rest of the community."[50] Seemingly, perceptions of mental illness had transformed with the rise of nationalism in the 1950s, precisely when Lambo's endeavour was conceived and executed.

However, it is also important to note that Asuni's assertion refers to *Nigerians* who did not exist until the emergence of a strong nationalist vision. While Aro and the surrounding areas were sufficiently mixed, in terms of ethnic groups, throughout the 1950s and onwards, in "The Village of Aro," Lambo notes the advantage of being well-versed in Yoruba culture.[51] Aro, and its surrounding areas, were primarily *Yoruba* areas, but the colonial Africa Achebe imagines is *Ibo*. Although similarities between Yoruba and Ibo cultures do exist, it would be unwise to collapse their perspectives on madness because of the ways in which affliction is related to traditional religious beliefs. Nonetheless, we can assert that while writing *Arrow of God* Achebe was undoubtedly affected by a nationalist agenda, which embraced a concern for the mentally ill by including the population in its nationalist vision. By the 1972 publication of "The Madman," the village system and concern for the mentally ill was indeed marginalised by two consecutive military coups that occured in 1966 and the Biafran War (1967-1970). Thus, while *Arrow of God* was written during a climate of Nigerian nationalism, "The Madman" was written during Achebe's involvement in Ibo nationalism. Perhaps we can deduce that within Ibo society, a mentally ill individual was included in society, but the ways in which she was able to be involved in the community was limited by her illness.

The West also maintains varying forms of treatment for the mentally ill. However, within the context of colonial discourse, treatment was relatively homogenous. In developing confinement discourse, the West constructed truths in which madness became a sign for societal transgressions. These required discipline and punishment. Although Africans also adopted forms of discipline and punishment, such methods were viewed as forms of treatment. In other words, the mentally unstable individual would not be beaten, but the spirit or evil which had overtaken his body would be beaten out of him. Therefore, while Ibo societies possessed the power to punish, an economy of this power was virtually absent. Conversely, this "economy of the power to punish"[52] was a central component of colonial discourse(s), especially in relation to the institutionalisation of the mentally ill.

This absence of this "economy" in Ibo societies is further reinforced by the fact that during 'therapy' the insane person would not be removed from society. The integration of the mentally ill into village life, rather than their extrication, was one of Lambo's major contributions to Nigerian psychiatry practices. This view is not extended to colonial discourse, which sought to individualise the patient through institutionalisation.[53]   Foucault's definition of the Other reinforces this intention: "[T]hat which, for a given culture, is at once interior and foreign, therefore to be excluded (so as to exorcise the interior danger) but by being shut away…"[54] Colonial discourse sought to shut away those it labelled as insane, thereby mapping spaces in which these individuals could or could not exist at all. While Ibo societies struggled to help community members who were psychologically disturbed, they did not spatially or discursively exclude them.

This treatment strongly contrasted with Western confinement, which sought "to eliminate from the social order a figure which did not find its place within it."[55] Foucault writes, "Confinement merely manifested what madness, in its essence, was: a manifestation of non-being; and by providing this manifestation, confinement thereby suppressed it, since it restored it to its truth as nothingness."[56] While "manifestation[s] of non-being," in the Western sense, was condemned to "nothingness," such interactions with unreason were viewed as crucial components of African discourse. Carothers, a leader in the colonial discipline of ethnopsychiatry, "believed that traditional societies were [mentally] undemanding and therefore the mentally ill, along with the sub-normal, could more easily pass muster."[57] While Carothers's assertion is obviously stained with the racist logic of his time, his observation is indeed significant. Altered states of consciousness were valued in traditional African societies. Hence, while Western truths may deem an individual mad, that same person may be considered quite sane by African standards, as varied as these may have been across time and space.[58] This question of standards is evident in Carothers' observation, specifically in his usage of the term "sub-normal" in relation to "the mentally ill." McCulloch counters Carothers' colonial belief with a post-Foucauldian stance: "It is also possible to view the role of the patient as an artifact of a mental health system: like any form of behavior, being mentally ill is shaped by social expectations."[59] This assertion reinforces Foucault's findings in *Madness and Civilization*; for as Swartz states, "psychiatric diagnoses can become instruments of social control,"[60] subject to the discursive terrain in which they reside.

Achebe's *Arrow of God* portrays Ezeulu's madness as a social construct, but places this altered state alongside the protagonist's complex and ever-evolving subjectivity. The novel begins amidst an already changing Ibo society, which has experienced varying methods of colonial governmentality through the re-mapping of their village space(s). Western schools have already been created; new chiefs have been appointed by the colonial government, and through Captain Winterbottom's intervention, the community has experienced the judicial system. Nonetheless, very little has changed for Ezeulu, for "[w]hen we meet him first Ezeulu's power is

supreme."[61] In spite of Winterbottom's intervention, Ezeulu has gained the colonial administrator's attention and respect, which has enabled him to send his son to a mission school. As Chief Priest, Ezeulu's position of privilege and authority has been reinforced by the colonial administration.

With regards to these seemingly innocuous tactics, Foucault's theorisation of governmentality provides an important insight: "[T]he object [is] in the hands of the government, aware, *vis-à-vis* the government, of what it wants, but ignorant of what is being done to it."[62] In other words, the colonial subject does not realise her position of subjectivity. Rather, she focuses on obtaining her needs and wants as dictated by the very discourse that makes her its subject. For instance, Ezeulu believes that he can gain access to 'white' knowledge and skill through his son, Oduche. However, the reality is quite different, for Oduche commits a great taboo when he imprisons the python, an act of betrayal inspired by his missionary education. Thus, Ezeulu is made aware of his desire to gain 'white' knowledge and skill, but fails to realise what the fulfilment of this desire means for his own subjectivity and that of his son.

Moreover, Achebe reinforces this interpellation in his characterisation of colonial administrators who are unconscious of the truths they enforce. As Foucault asserts, "in the art of government the task is to establish continuity, in both an upwards and downwards direction."[63] Therefore, like Ezeulu, the colonial administrators, specifically Captain Winterbottom, are unaware of how their respective subjectivities are being moulded by colonial discourse. For instance, although Captain Winterbottom is against the creation of paramount chiefs,[64] he is enraged when Ezeulu declines his offer to become a paramount chief.[65] Hence, colonial discourse succeeds in creating an overarching continuity that encompasses all subjects.

However, despite the fact that Ezeulu and Winterbottom share a mutual lack of awareness as to how they are being constituted as colonial subjects, the two maintain distinct discursive subjectivities. Both men have access to two different discursive spaces, but while Ezeulu chooses to investigate the "white man's" knowledge through his son and varying interactions with Winterbottom, the Captain only pretends to access Ibo discourse – "Captain Winterbottom enjoyed mystifying other Europeans with words from the Ibo language which he claimed to speak fluently."[66] As a result, Winterbottom is unable to access significant knowledges with which colonial discourse can be interrogated. Ezeulu, on the other hand, struggles to negotiate between two discursive subjectivities – Ibo and colonial. Although this dualistic position has the potential to provide Ezeulu with a more extensive discursive objectivity, his multiple subjectivities also inspire significant ambivalences in the ways he interprets himself and the world around him.

There are numerous scenes and gestures which demonstrate Ezeulu's ambivalence towards his implication in Western discourse. However, the most significant

experience is his "visit" to Government Hill. It is during this experience that Ezeulu begins to question his own discursive space in Umuaro. Upon arrival, Ezeulu is "locked up" in a guardroom refashioned by Tony Clarke's fearful messenger, who sends people "to sweep the guardroom and spread a new mat on it so that it might be taken for a guest-room."[67] This imprisonment signifies change in Ezeulu's life. After all, "it is against custom for the priest of Ulu to travel far from his hut.'"[68] Hence, not only does Ezeulu experience an institutionalised, discursive space away from Umuaro, but also the act of travelling which inevitably presents Ezeulu with new knowledge(s). Achebe is conscious of this experience of the crossroad, which he views as a "zone of power."[69] It is in this space that Ezeulu is confronted with conflicting truths.

Initially, Ezeulu's perspective corresponds with his spatial location. His questions remain the same, but his perspective alters. For instance, when Ezeulu is in Umuaro he wonders about his power as Chief Priest, but concludes, "No Chief Priest had ever refused [to name feast of the Pumpkin Leaves and the New Yam Feast]. So it could not be done. He would not dare."[70] Within the context of traditional society, Ezeulu cannot refuse his duties as Chief Priest. However, this perspective changes when he is imprisoned, for as Achebe writes, "It gave him a feeling of loss which was both painful and pleasant. He had temporarily lost his status as Chief Priest which was painful; but after eighteen years it was a relief to be without it for a while."[71] Through residing within a different discursive space, such thoughts are made possible because the network of power is different. Upon his return to Umuaro, Ezeulu says:

> When I was in Okperi I saw a young white man who was able to write his book with the left hand. From his actions I could see he had very little sense. But he had power; he could shout in my face; he could do what he liked. Why? Because he could write with his left hand.[72]

Ezeulu perceives a new regime of power and seeks to access that power in the same manner he earned Winterbottom's respect at the beginning of the novel. However, not only does Ezeulu mis-recognise the incoming written society with the "young white man['s]" ability to write with his left hand, he also fails to identify that power is networked differently in Umuaro, an oral society. As Odege reinforces, "It is […] a story […] of the conquest of an oral society by the written word."[73] Nonetheless, if Ezeulu can neither recognise the supremacy of "the written word" in colonial discourse, nor identify where Umuaro discourse spatially begins and ends, how can he access any discursive power?

Ezeulu's inability to locate discursive power is evident in the title of Achebe's novel; Ezeulu is merely an "arrow of god." Referencing Akuebue, Killam confirms this point:

> [T]his evaluation is confirmed by Akuebue, 'the only man in Umuaro who knew that Ezeulu was not deliberately punishing the six villages as some people thought. He knew that the Chief Priest was helpless: that a greater thing than *nté* was caught in *nté's* trap' (p. 275). He sees, as does Ezeulu, that the priest is no more than an 'arrow in the bow of his god.'[74]

However, is Ezeulu "helpless"? Ogede offers further insight:

> If *Arrow of God* gives as close a view as a novel can capture of the total chemistry of colonialism, it is not only because it proves the duplicity of colonialism's claims to order, but also because it reveals with resounding success the Igbos as playthings in the hands of their gods.[75]

Arrow of God creates a space in which Ezeulu's accountability remains simultaneously significant and insignificant in determining the future of Umuaro, because the novel takes place in several discursive spaces. What is significant to colonial discourse is, at times, insignificant to Ibo discourse. Achebe plays upon this duality and creates a unique perspective which is enmeshed in ambivalence. After all, is Ezeulu's downfall the result of Ulu's intervention, or his own selfish pride?

A cursory review of literary criticism reflects a similar ambivalence. For instance, although Killam acknowledges Ezeulu's helplessness in the face of Ulu's plans, he also faults the chief priest, stating that Ezeulu is a man "with a tragic flaw, arrogance and pride, which causes him to commit an error in judgment when he lets his personal feelings interfere with his usually keen assessment of circumstances."[76] Can Ezeulu be held accountable, or is he merely an "arrow of god"? As Achebe demonstrates in his novel, the answer to such questions depends upon the discursive space in which one resides. Ogede reinforces this point when she writes that "imperialist interests defied native logic."[77] This discursive ambivalence is the greatest ambivalence of all. It, above all other things, results in Ezeulu's demise.

At the conclusion of *Arrow of God* Ezeulu loses his mind. Achebe describes Ezeulu's mental demise following the death of his son, Obika:

> At any other time Ezeulu would have been more than a match to his grief…But why, he asked himself again and again, had Ulu chosen to deal thus with him, to strike him down and then cover him with mud? What was his offense?…Perhaps it was the constant, futile throbbing of these thoughts that finally left a crack in Ezeulu's mind.78

It is Ezeulu's lack of understanding that ultimately leads to his insanity. No matter where he stands, he simply cannot gain a satisfactory explanation for the present circumstances. Colonial and Ibo discourses ultimately retain a level of autonomy that bars other discursive perspectives from their respectively individual logic. Both discursive fields fail him because they cannot be reconciled with one another. Thus,

without a sustainable discourse, Ezeulu is *forced* into insanity. Although colonial and Ibo discourses possess very culture-specific perspectives on madness, in both contexts madness is considered as a state of lack – a lack of mental capacity, luck, health, and so on. At the conclusion of *Arrow of God* Ezeulu's madness represents such a lack – an absence of a discursive space in which he can successfully exist.

As a madman, Ezeulu represents an embodied absence that must be filled through the creation of new discursive spaces. A new regime of truth must emerge in order to seal the discursive cracks that Ezeulu embodies. However, this new regime of truth also signals the demise of previous truths, and it is in this way that Ezeulu's madness represents an end. This end is reinforced by the community's eventual religious conversion: "[The Christians] were offering sanctuary to those who wished to escape the vengeance of Ulu."[79] Eventually, "many a man sent his son with a yam or two to offer to the new religion and to bring back the promised immunity."[80] Regarding the inevitable colonisation of Umuaro, Achebe states: "These were the sacrifices which Africa was called upon to make, not in the sense of throwing out an excess baggage. In fact the sacrifices may have been the best things in the tradition, and yet Africa was called upon to make them."[81] Ezeulu's madness does represent an end to a certain kind of lifestyle, one that Achebe's protagonist is unable to concede. In "Colonial Governmentality" David Scott states:

> [I]t is important to speak of the modern as forming a *break* with what went before, a break beyond which there is no return, and in which what comes after can only be read in, a break beyond which read through, and read against the categories of the modern."[82]

This "break beyond which there is no return" is expressed at the conclusion of *Arrow of God*: "But for Ezeulu there was no next time."[83] Obika's death forces Ezeulu to recognise his ambivalent position between two discursive terrains – a position that does not possess a space in traditional or colonial discourses. Without a space, Ezeulu descends into madness.

Once again, we must ask what this madness signifies within the context of the colonial encounter and as a conclusion to the novel. Achebe explains that "the end of a story is only an end in one sense. It is a beginning in another sense because it is an open-ended kind of end. At the end of a page, another page is projected, like an echo or the pebbles you throw in a pond, and it goes on and on."[84] Ezeulu's madness is the result of these questions and his inability to comprehend any logical explanations to his questions. Thus, the protagonist's madness represents a continuing need to question and seek out answers to those questions, but also a need to recognise the contingency of the answers we seek.

Arrow of God's conclusion is indeed open-ended in spite of its protagonist's mental demise. The novel concludes when Achebe writes, "Thereafter any yam harvested in his fields was harvested in the name of the son."[85] These words mark "a new

dispensation in which youth and inexperience earn a new legitimacy."[86] Hence, while the protagonist's madness represents a lack, the youth will build a space in which Ezeulu could have existed, a space where multiple discourses overlap with one another. Therefore, "*Arrow of God* is a novel of African Being and of African Becoming as well. There is no dichotomy in this, but rather a unitive principle of viewing two as one, many as one, instead of one as two, or one as many."[87] Indeed, Ezeulu's madness signifies a discursive break, but this break represents change. A new discourse needs to be constructed – one that is hospitable to multiple discourses. Ezeulu's madness prefaces this hybrid space.

Arrow of God interrogates "the psychology of power" in order to decolonise the African mind. Achebe's novel demonstrates how the colonised was created, offering a space in which he can confront colonial mythologies. Moreover, Ezeulu inevitably fails to discover a discursive terrain within the context of their respective interregnal spaces. Without a discursive space in which to exist, Ezeulu descends into madness. Rather than representing an end, madness represents the unknown that is yet to come. Thus, *Arrow of God* remains open-ended, and anticipates the emergence of a discursive space hospitable to Ezeulu's newfound knowledges. Nonetheless, Ezeulu's mental demise is foreclosed, because we know that colonialism ultimately pervades Ibo society.

Achebe invokes and creates madness in order to (re)imagine impossibilities, but also to critique the limitations that Discourse imposes on its subjects. *Arrow of God* interrogates the Manichean relationship between madness and reason. Achebe's novel demonstrates how colonial discourse lacks spaces that include Ezeulu's reality, compelling him to descend into madness. Thus, madness is used to signal mobility because of the ways in which madness contests Reason.

Madness proves to be a particularly poignant discursive space because of its presence (or absence) in the Western *ratio*. As discussed, madness was used to define the 'native's' inferiority, a discursive tactic employed to reinforce Western superiority. However, the emergence of the 'mad native' challenged this 'truth' that linked "primitives and neurotics,"[88] for if the 'native' was already mad, then we must ask what constituted a 'mad native'? In spite of these glaring discrepancies, new 'truths' were formulated, which renewed discursive continuity. Nonetheless, such discontinuities reveal the power of the discursively oppressed. After all, "for power to be deployed with all this cunning…which falsify and distort this universe, then it is highly likely that at the very heart of this space there is a threatening power to be mastered or defeated."[89] Throughout histories, madness has garnered the power to reveal discursive cracks and discontinuities. Within the context of Western colonial and post-colonial histories, madness inhabits a particular space, one that is antagonistic to the centre of Western hegemony, namely, Reason.

Western modernity, as we have come to know it, is centred on reason, logic, and rationality. It has thus been defined against madness; it positions the two spaces in a

binary opposition. As a result of this Manichean relationship, madness comes to include virtually everything that is excluded from Reason. The 'native' comes to inhabit this space because she is supposedly incapable of what Freud termed "objectivity." Rather, the 'native' lives within the confines of unreason and illogic. Even after the 'native' achieved independence from his colonial 'masters,' he remained locked into this binary, a positionality which barred him from Reason. African nationalisms, Négritude, in particular, attempted to appropriate and redefine this space of what the West defined as unreason and illogic in order to celebrate an African authenticity that could interact dialectically with Western Reason. Today, in our neo-colonial, post-modern, globalising reality, this legacy persists, for Africa and all that it represents continues to be defined in opposition to the Western *ratio* – First World vs. Third World, Western vs. non-Western, and developed vs. developing. This antagonistic relationship is dismissive of any African *ratios* that may exist. Is Africa really 'mad' once again?

By re-writing the colonial encounter, Achebe complicates colonial discourse by centring his novel on Ezeulu in such a way that it becomes impossible to deny his agency. Additionally, Achebe creates a poignant narrative that refuses to be complicit in inscribing Ezeulu as a 'mad native.' The protagonist does not descend into madness because of some innate inferiority, which resulted from his 'native-ness.' Moreover, Ezeulu's madness does not seal the fate of the future, but serves to advocate constant discursive change. As Garuba suggests, "many African villages chose to resist 'visual capture' or 'discovery' by explorers and colonial administrators by further retreating in to the forests."[90] Such movements enabled the 'native' to avoid "surfacing," to use Jackson's term. Thus, it is through constant movement that individuals were able to resist discursive mapping and interpellation. However, within the context of *Arrow of God*, Ezeulu does become a subject of colonial governmentality. As an Ibo chief priest and a colonial subject, who lacks a discursive space in which these two subjectivities can be reconciled, Ezeulu's mobility is impeded. Discourse, or the lack thereof, prevents mobility, and imprisons Ezeulu within the confines of his own mind.

What is believed to be impossible is that which is unknown or unreasonable within a particular discursive context. Within the context of the Manichean absolutes of madness and reason, that which is impossible resides within the jurisdiction of Madness. Achebe, uses madness in order to challenge, contest, and deny the Western *ratio* as Reality *par excellence*. *Arrow of God* contests and denies the absence of Africa in discursive practices that uphold Reason. Achebe's narrative demonstrates the incompleteness of available discourses, as well as their static, hyper-structured order of things. Like the madman or madwoman, Africa cannot be erased and will not disappear simply by being written out of discursive norms. Ezeulu must be accounted for through the acknowledgement and subsequent production of multiple, rhizomatic discourses, subjectivities, and *ratios*. In addition, Achebe invokes and creates a madness that reveals discursive discontinuities. He uses the silent, hidden, dismissed, and marginalised space that madness has come to

inhabit in order to undermine discursive continuity. Furthermore, madness serves as a means through which forms of mobility are creatively presented. In order to imagine a new *ratio*, we must think creatively around forms of change. *Arrow of God* crafts a madness that offers new ways of conceptualising discursive change.

Notes

[1] This essay is a revised portion of my MPhil mini-dissertation, which was supervised by Professor Brenda Cooper of the Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town. I would like to extend my gratitude to Professor Cooper, as well as the anonymous reviewers of this essay, from whose intellectual support and comments I have greatly benefited. I would also like to thank and acknowledge the support of the A.W. Mellon Foundation.

[2] This date refers to the English translation published in 1964 by Union générale d'éditions. *Folie et déraison: Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique* was first published by Librairie Plon in 1961.

[3] M. Foucault (edited by C. Gordon), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (Pantheon Books: New York, 1980), viii.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] A. Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (Routlege: New York, 2001), p. 38.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] This is not to say that literature is the only source, but one of many useful sources. Foucualt also uses a range of other sources and locations in his work.

[9] See, for instance, B. Latour and C. Porter, *We Have Never Been Modern* (Harvard University Press: Boston, 2008).

[10] For the purposes of this essay, "modernity" is used to signify a certain hegemonic ideology of rationality and systematicity that characterises particular modernising projects.

[11] Z. Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Polity Press: Cambridge, 1993), p. 24 (original emphasis).

[12] S. Hall and B. Gieben, *Formations of Modernity* (Polity Press: Cambridge, 1992), p. 314.

[13] F. Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (Grove Press: New York, 1963), p. 93.

[14] A. R. JanMohamed, *Manichean Aesthetics: The Politics of Literature in Colonial Africa* (The University of Massachusetts Press: Amherst, 1983), p. 4.

[15] J. Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1983), p. 27.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] H. Garuba, "Mapping the Land/Body/Subject: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies in African Narrative," in *AlterNation* 9 (1) 2002, p. 87.

[18] L. A. Jackson, *Surfacing Up: Psychiatry and Social Order in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1908-1968* (Cornell University Press: Ithaca, 2005), p. 73.

[19] Garuba,."Mapping the Land/Body/Subject," pp. 92-93.

[20] See C. E. Nnolim, "Trends in the Nigerian Novel," in *Calabar Studies in African Literature 4: Literature and National Consciousness* (Heinemann Educational Books: Ibadan, 1989), pp. 53-65. See also Innes, *Chinua Achebe*, and O. Ogede, *Achebe and the Politics of Representation* (Africa World Press, Inc.: Trenton, 2000).

[21] Ogede, *Achebe and the Politics of Representation*, p. 35.

[22] Innes, *Chinua Achebe*, p. 68.

[23] *Ibid.,* p. 73.

[24] G. D. Killam, *The Novels of Chinua Achebe* (Africana Publishing Corporation: New York, 1969), p. 59.

[25] Clarke is a colonial servant who works under Captain Winterbottom.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[28] See Killam, *The Novels of Chinua Achebe*; R. M. Wren, *Achebe's World: The Historical and Cultural Context of the Novels of Chinua Achebe* (Longman: Essex, 1980); S. Gikandi, "Nation Formation and the Novel," in *Reading Chinua Achebe* (James Currey: London, 1991), pp.1-23; Innes, *Chinua Achebe*; A. Gagiano, *Achebe, Head, Marechera: On Power and Change in Africa* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.: Boulder:, 2000); Ogede, *Achebe and the Politics of Representation*.

[29] C. Achebe, *Hopes and Impediments* (Doubleday: New York, 1989), p. 45.

[30] See Wren, *Achebe's World*, p. 75.

[31] Many critiques problematise these interpretations. For instance, see K. Osei-Nyame, "Chinua Achebe Writing Culture: Representations of Gender and Tradition in *Things Fall Apart*," in *Research in African Literatures* 30 (2) 1999, pp. 148-164; and L. A. Podis and Y Saaka, (eds.), *Challenging Hierarchies: Issues and Themes in Colonial and Postcolonial African Literature* (Peter Lang: New York, 1998), pp. 109-160.

[32] Achebe addresses his problematic portrayal, or lack thereof, in his short story collections and, most prominently, in his novel *Anthills of the Savannah* (1987).

[33] Wren, *Achebe's World*, p. 75.

[34] Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 52.

[35] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, p. 133.

[36] See D. Carroll, *Chinua Achebe* Second Edition (St. Martin's Press: New York, 1980), p. 5; and Ogede *Achebe and the Politics of Representation*, p. 42.

[37] A. McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (Routledge: New York,1995), p. 6.

[38] Such treatment is particularly evident in the case of epileptics. See S. Swartz, *Culture and Mental Health: A Southern African View* (Oxford University Press: Cape Town, 1998), p. 17.

[39] B. Lindfors, *Conversations with China Achebe* (University Press of Missisippi: Jackson, 1997), p. 79.

[40] See J. S. Mbiti, *Introduction to African Religion* Second Edition (Heinemann Educational Publishers: Johannesburg, 1991), p. 77, 170-173.

[41] *Ibid*, p. 155.

[42] *Ibid*.

[43] Lindfors, *Conversations with China Achebe*, p. 79.

[44] McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, p. 125.

[45] P. Sidandi, C. Mambwe, Z. Zoric, S. Vanvaria, N. Vanvaria, and E. Laryea, "Psychiatric Rehabilitation: The Perspective from Botswana," in *International Journal of Mental Health* (28) 3 1999, p. 32.

[46] That is, insanity results from "the transgression of a taboo or from the casting of a spell." See J. McCulloch, *Colonial Psychiatry and 'the African Mind'* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1995), p. 31.

[47] C. Achebe, "The Madman," in *Girls at War and Other Stories* (Anchor Books: New York, 1991), p. 11.

[48] See A. Lambo, "The Village of Aro," in *The Lancet* (2) 1964, p. 513; and T. Asuni, "Aro Hospital in Perspective," in *American Journal of Psychiatry* 124 (6) 1967, p. 72.

[49] T. Asuni, "Community Development and Public Health By-product of Social Psychiatry in Nigeria," in *West African Medical Journal* 13 (4) 1964, p. 151.

[50] Tolani, "Aro Hospital in Perspective," p. 71.

[51] Lambo, "The Village of Aro," p. 513.

[52] M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* Trans. Alan Sheridan (Routledge: New York, 1995), p. 80.

[53] *Ibid*., 236.

[54] M. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (Routledge Classics: London, 2004), xxvi.

[55] M. Foucault (translated by R. Howard), *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (Routledge Classics: London, 2004), p.109.

[56] *Ibid*.

[57] J. McCulloch, *Colonial Psychiatry and 'the African Mind'* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1995), p. 106.

[58] "What is true…is that some experiences, which Western psychiatrists have, in the past, incorrectly labeled as mental illness, are acceptable forms of experience in those cultures." See Swartz, *Culture and Mental Health*, p. 64.

[59] McCulloch, *Colonial Psychiatry,* p. 106.

[60] Swartz, *Culture and Mental Health*, p. 55.

[61] G. D. Killam, *The Novels of Chinua Achebe* (Africana Publishing Corporation: New York, 1969), p. 69

[62] M. Foucault, "Governmentality," in G. Burchell, C. Gordron, and P. Miller, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1991), p. 100.

[63] *Ibid*., p. 91.

[64] C. Achebe, *Arrow of God* (Heinemann: Johannesburg, 1986), p. 36.

[65] *Ibid*., p. 149.

[66] *Ibid*.

[67] *Ibid*., p. 156.

[68] *Ibid*., p. 144.

[69] Lindfors, *Conversations with Chinua Achebe*, p. 81.

[70] Achebe, *Arrow of God*, p. 3.

[71] *Ibid*., p. 160.

[72] *Ibid*., p. 189.

[73] Ogede, *Achebe and the Politics of Representation*, p. 35.

[74] Killam, *The Novels of Chinua Achebe*, p. 78.

[75] Ogede, *Achebe and the Politics of Representation*, p. 47.

[76] Killam, *The Novels of Chinua Achebe*, p. 82.

[77] Ogede, *Achebe and the Politics of Representation*, p. 39.

[78] Achebe, *Arrow of God*, p. 229.

[79] *Ibid*., p. 220.

[80] *Ibid*., p. 230.

[81] Lindfors, *Conversations with China Achebe*, p. 138.

[82] D. Scott, "Colonial Governmentality," in *Social Text* 0 (43) 1995, p. 200 (original emphasis).

[83] Achebe, *Arrow of God*, p. 228.

[84] Lindfors, *Conversations with China Achebe*, p. 50.

[85] Achebe, *Arrow of God*, p. 230.

[86] Lindfors, *Conversations with China Achebe*, p. 50.

[87] *Ibid*., p. 90.

[88] McCulloch, *Colonial Psychiatry and 'the African Mind'*, p. 11.

[89] M. Foucault (edited by J. Lagrange), *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the College de France, 1973-74* (Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 2006), p. 6.

[90] Garuba, "Mapping the Land/Body/Subject," p. 93.