

Rachid HAMADOUCHE
Département de Sociologie
Faculté des Sciences Humaines et Sociales
Université d'ALGER.

*** I have never been a Marxist.***

M. Foucault

Résumé de l'article intitulé:

"I have never been a Marxist." M. Foucault

Dans ce papier, nous avons essayé d'étudier d'une manière succincte la fameuse déclaration de Michel Foucault – philosophe, historien et sociologue français, ou il affirme qu'il ne se considère pas comme étant marxiste.

Avant de répondre à la question que nous nous sommes posées, c'est-à-dire qu'est ce qui lie Foucault au marxisme.

D'autres questions surgissent: qui est Foucault? Quels sont les tenants de ces théories?

Pour cela nous avons esquissé une "visite guidée" à travers les différents travaux de Foucault.

Enfin nous tenterons une comparaison entre les positions de Foucault et celles du marxisme classique, suivi de la relation qu'il entretient avec certains critiques (théoricien) du néo – marxisme.

ملخص:

" لم أكن يوما ماركسيا " م. فوكو.

سنحاول في هذا المقال الأخذ بالدراسة والتحليل لما جاء مع ميشال فوكو، الفيلسوف، المؤرخ وعالم الاجتماع الفرنسي، حين صرح بأنه لم يكن يوما ما بالماركسي، لكن وقبل الإجابة عن التساؤل الذي طارحناه بخصوص علاقة فوكو بالماركسية..

هناك أسئلة واستفسارات أخرى لا تقل أهمية تستدعي الإجابة: من هو فوكو؟ ما هي الأسس والركائز التي تستند عليها نظرياته؟ ولإجابة عن كل هذه التساؤلات، سنقوم بزيارة" عبر أهم ما جاء من دراسات مع فوكو.

كما سنقوم بمقارنة ما جاء من مواقف عنده، وتلك التي جاءت مع الماركسية الكلاسيكية متبوعة بتحليل لتلك العلاقة التي تربطه وبعض المنظرين والنقاد من الماركسيين الجدد.

"I have never been a Marxist." M. Foucault

HAMADOUCHE Rachid *

The French philosopher / historian, Michel Foucault, states that he has never considered himself to be a Marxist. Irrespective of his own categorization, this paper is intended to address the question: is Foucault a Marxist? This initially appears to be a straight forward project. The work of Marx has been endlessly analyzed and interpreted, allowing sociologists the opportunity to place themselves, or be placed, within or without the boundaries of Marxism. Initially however, in attempting to answer this question, other questions become immediately apparent. Most obviously, who is Foucault and what are the main tenants of his theories?

As Karl Marx have two temporally and analytically separable phases of his intellectual career, Foucault's ideas are often distinguished as being pre- and post- May 1968. Also both wrote about diverse subject matter. Therefore, which aspects and eras of the two theories are to be compared? Indeed, should the comparison not to be made with Marx himself but with the neo- Marxists who have extended his ideas within the contemporary context?

The first section of this paper will attempt to answer these questions, for only then is it possible to confront the stated purpose – to ascertain Foucault's real relationship to the Marxist perspective. The second section will examine Foucault's writing specifically concerning power and domination. The comparison will then be made between his position and that of classical Marxism, followed by his relation to some of the critical theorists of modern Marxism.

Michel Foucault is a thinker whose writings cover a diversity of subjects and touch upon most of the social science disciplines. He successfully escapes being pigeon hold into any specific category or labeled with a particular intellectual orthodoxy.

Even referring to him as a philosopher/ historian is to risk criticism. He was born in France in 1926 and studies at the Ecole Normale Supérieure taking his "licence de philosophie" in 1948. He went on to take his "licence de psychologie" in 1950 and a diploma in psychopathology in 1952, explaining his later books on and around the subject of madness. The intellectual climate of the time was dominated by three paradigms:

* Charge de cours department de Sociologie – Alger.

existentialism and Sartre, phenomenology and Merleau- Ponty and Marxism – each attempting to critically address the realities of post – war life. Although these influences are of considerable relevance when trying to understand the conceptual framework from which Foucault began his intellectual development, they are not necessarily the most important. Not only is Marx a readily observable influence on Foucault's work, as will be discussed at length in this paper, there exists most obvious influences from both Freud and Nietzsche.

Foucault also admits to being influenced, although perhaps to a lesser degree, by the writings of Dumezil, Carguilhem and Hyppolite (Foucault, 1971).

Further affecting Foucault's thought during the early 1960 s was the gradual shift from the existentialist/

Phenomenological orthodoxy of Husserl, Heidigger, Sartre and Merleau Ponty to the "anti - humanist" structuralism of Levi- Strauss, Barthes, Lacan and Althusser (Smart 1985)

As a writer, Foucault has been primarily, or at least superficially, concerned with such topics as madness, science, punishment and sexuality. Unlike many academics, there is not an obvious thread that runs through each subsequent text, eventually maturing into the finished theory by which the author is normally defined. Foucault makes no attempt to totalize his diverse interests and thereby construct a global theory: rather his books tend to stand in isolation, with each new text examining a new subject.

Also, not only has Foucault been interpreted in several different ways by others, he has constantly reinterpreted his own previous works as his ideas or subject matter changed. The next part of the paper will give a brief summary of some of Foucault's major works.

Foucault's first major work is "madness and civilization: a history of insanity in the age of reason" published in 1961. This deal with the nexus between reason and madness. He asserts that madness has not always been associated with unreason and that the "insane" is a socially constructed population. He illustrates how an ideology justifying the incarceration of the insane developed – linking it closely with notions of moral collapse and public fears of contagion. He also outlines the route by which doctors became responsible for the insane, a thing which is due to their perceived respectability than the possession of any therapeutic knowledge.

His next book "the hirth of the clinic: an archeology of medical perception"(1963) moves away from the hermeneutic approach of "madness and civilization". The work is generally considered to have been written

within the structuralist paradigm, despite Foucault's later insistence that he was never a structuralist. Although seemingly a rather narrow book on certain historical aspects of medical practice and perception, it addresses the changes that resulted in the body being viewed as the center of knowledge. Whereas previously doctors had viewed the body merely as the medium for the disease, the focus shifted from this "medicine of symptoms" to a "medicine of tissues" The individual became constituted as the central object for medical study. The role of death and the use of corpses is stressed by Foucault, when he writes.:

"...from the integration of death into medical thought is born a medicine that is given as a science of the individual."

** Foucault, p197, 1975**

At this point in his career, Foucault was still strongly influenced by the structuralism that dominated intellectual life in France. His next book "the order of things : an archeology of the human sciences" (1966) concentrated methodologically on discursive practices, separated as far as possible from the social context , in an attempt to discover their rules of operation. His subject matter covered the central sciences of man. The study contrasts the forms of thought dominant in three different historical periods: the renaissance, the classical age and the modern age. He calls the forms of thought "the episteme" Specifically, he is referring to the set of relations that unite, at a given period the discursive practices that give rise to science. Foucault argues that history is not the gradual progression to the present as is often suggested, rather he delineates two clear breaks which distinguish one era from the next, that is the end of the renaissance signaling the start of the classical era and the end of the classical era signaling the beginning of the modern era. Each era has been characterized by a specific episteme. In the modern era, man finally occupies the position of both subject and object of knowledge, a position closely linked with the formation of modern science (Smart 1985).

"The archeology of knowledge" (1969) outlines a way of conducting historical research. The book is, in effect, the culmination and clarification of the techniques developed in the previous three books. In reflecting on this new technique, Foucault concludes that he has discovered a vast, uncharted territory which is inaccessible to both hermeneutics and structuralism (although in the book he states that discourse is a rule -governed system, a position compatible with the main tenants of structuralist theory)(Dreyfus & Rabinov,1982). Archeology attempts to describe what Foucault refers to as "the archive" of a particular society. The archive is the" system of the

formation and transformation of statements which exist at a given period within a particular society"

As demonstrated in the "order of things", archeology does not view history as a steady progression, rather it studies discontinuities and emphasizes differences. It can therefore be seen that Foucault's view of history owes a considerable debt to Nietzsche. This will be discussed at greater length later in this paper when comparing Foucault's view of history with that of Marx.

As previously stated, archaeological analysis involves the understanding of, and the comparison between, discursive practices. However, it is also concerned with what Foucault refers to as non-discursive practices, ie. Institutions, social and economic processes etc. Foucault continues by attempting to uncover the nexus between the discursive and the non-discursive. In doing so, he argues that there is no ultimate mechanism of causality, no absolute cultural continuity between the two. Sheridan (1980) states that Foucault's ideas are superior to the arguments offered by the Marxists –that is, non – discursive practices cause discursive practices (economic determinism). Although at no point does Foucault refer to Marx's notion of historical materialism, the comparison can still be made between their ideas. Again, this will be discussed at greater length later in this paper.

The events of May 1968 had a considerable effect on the intellectual development of Foucault. Civil unrest started by students but carried on by professionals, technical workers and younger factory workers for a while threatened to completely restructure French society. After this date, Foucault altered the direction of his new work and reinterpreted his old work. The themes of domination and power became of greatest importance to him, as demonstrated by his final two books " Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison" (1975) and " the history of sexuality, vol. 1: an introduction"(1976). His previous interest in discursive practices became of much lesser importance. It is these two books which gain him the label of Marxist.

Marxism is a rather nebulous concept. Marx wrote about a plethora of subjects over nearly a fifty year period. Therefore, categorizing an individual as a Marxist involves taking into account opinions on many different subjects –a complex proposition for authors with such tenuous links to Marxism as Foucault. If, for example Marxism is generally taken to be a collection of opinions such as the economic base determining the superstructure, stressing the importance of the mode of production and class conflict and the notion of history as progress, then Foucault could not

be considered to be a Marxist. However, in studying power and domination, he is addressing issues central to modern western Marxism. This paper will demonstrate in detail the areas where Foucault disagrees with classical Marxism and will attempt to show that his thought is an extension of the critical theory of modern Marxism.

At this stage, not only does Foucault alter the main focus of his analysis from discourse to power and domination, but also his methodology from "archaeology" to the Nietzschean concept of "genealogy" However, there are sufficient comparisons between the two methodologies not to view this change as a complete break from previous technique. After the events of May 1968, the University of Paris was split into separate campuses. The philosophy department, headed by Foucault, was set up at Vincennes. The lectures he gave were summarized under the title of "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History". It is here that Foucault outlined his new methodological technique. On realizing the importance of power in discourse, Foucault abandoned all the terms he used in "the archaeology of knowledge" in favor of genealogy.

Genealogy very much opposes the traditional historical method. It argues that there are no underlying laws or absolute universal truths in history; rather genealogy highlights the errors, small subtle changes, disparity and complexity behind historical events. Beneath historical interpretation there does not lie truth, only the need for further interpretation. "Discipline and Punish" and the "History of Sexuality" stress the importance of genealogy over the partiality – abandoned archaeology. However, Foucault still preserves the theory of archaeology, but only in a secondary manner – as a compliment to genealogy.

"Discipline and Punish" is in one sense a return to previous subject matter, as confinement was discussed in "Madness and civilization". Smart takes the comparison between the two texts even further:

"Madness and Civilization ... Was concerned with confinement and the birth of the asylum, the division between reason and unreason.

And the constitution of a condition "madness" which became Subject of the discourses of psychopathology, so "discipline and punish" addresses incarceration, the transformation in forms of punishment associated with the birth of the prison, the distinction between criminals and "good boys" and the condition of delinquency which has become an object of the human sciences."

(Smart, P.43, 1985)

"Discipline and Punish" starts with a comparison. The brutal, yet highly organized torture of Damien's "the regicide" in 1757 is contrasted against a prison time table of only eighty years later, involving such humane aspects as education and recreation. Obviously, in the intervening period, a vast change had occurred in the perception of punishment. That which was once viewed as a just and reasonable outcome with respect to the crime committed, was later seen as barbaric and cruel. By this comparison, Foucault succeeds in demonstrating how other systems of punishment can be seen to be normal within their own context – a technique taken from Nietzsche.

He also discusses the ramifications of "Bentham's panopticon" on the exercise of power within the prison. The panopticon allowed the inmate to be viewed at all times by the wardens. Foucault argues that this had the effect of impersonalizing and homogenizing power relations. He extrapolated the prison situation to the wider "disciplined" society, suggesting a close relationship between the exercise of power and the formation of knowledge. He first noticed the connection between knowledge and power in "Madness and Civilization" and "the birth of the clinic" – in this case, biological knowledge. He refines the theory in "Discipline and Punish" concluding that the combination of power and knowledge, localized on the body itself, is a very important mechanism of power within western society (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). Foucault considers that the panopticon is a perfect example of this theory. It concentrates knowledge, in the form of the prisoner's actions, allowing the exercise of power and therefore the control of the body. This is all conducted within the regulated space of the cell unit. Foucault argues that power is not simply possessed, but that it only has reality when it is exercised. The panopticon is the perfect example of the exercise of power reduced to its ideal form. One of the major components of modern power is its invisibility. The panopticon exercises power without obstruction or resistance.

Foucault's analysis of the prison system presented in "Discipline and Punish" is dissimilar in many respects to Marxism. He presents a very Nietzschean analysis of history, going back through time until the penal system of that era seems strange and irrational when compared to our own. This can be contrasted directly with Marx and his notion of historical materialism. Foucault's Nietzschean approach is of value, as it explains the past without attempting to justify the present, in the manner of liberalism, or predicting a utopian future, as with Marxism (Poster, 1984).

This is not to suggest that Foucault is not aware of the contribution that Marx made to history, indeed, he stated that he wondered if there was any difference between being a historian and being a Marxist (Gordon, 1980). (In retrospect, a curious statement, as if he did not consider himself

to be a Marxist, he could consequently not consider himself to be historian, although his books are historical in nature). However, Foucault contends that Marx did not take his position far enough.

Marxists explain punishment by relating it solely to the means of production. Foucault expands this idea, arriving at what Poster (1984) refers to as the "mode of information". He points out that communication and information systems occupy such a vital position in modern society, that they play a similar role to that originally played by the "means of production of capitalism" referred to by Marx. Not only that, but these systems are directly involved in the production / reproduction of discourse, an area upon which Foucault still places considerable emphasis.

Foucault does not totalize his historical writings into any form of neat, global theory, as Marx does. His presentation remains a series of separate glimpses of diverse subjects. Each of these events is deemed to be the product of many differing factors, not just explained in a simple manner by reference to the economic infra – structure. The "technologies of power" he outlines are far more complex in nature than Marx's "means of production" They consist of knowledge and practice associated with creating domination through social relations. However, Foucault is never very specific when trying to describe exactly what he means and in what context these mechanisms operate.

Foucault's next book "The history of sexuality" also examines power, knowledge and the body – on this occasion in the form of an essay on sexuality, rather than via an examination of the penal system. Foucault challenges almost all previous theories on sexuality by arguing that it must be conceptualized in terms of power and knowledge and not within the paradigm of repression.

He therefore shifts the ground upon which the debate about sexuality is based from within the unconscious. Foucault is not the first author to propose alternatives to the Freudian orthodoxy. Reich attempted to combine the theories of Marx with those of Freud. He linked the onset of capitalism with the increase in the level of sexual repression, suggesting that energy was channeled from the bedroom to the workplace. Marcuse examined why the Victorian Puritanism collapsed into the permissive society and suggested that sexuality had only seemed to have been finally liberated. Rather a new form of repression, repressive desublimation, had replaced the old. Capitalism neutralized the potential of sexual liberation by channeling its energies into acceptable, non – threatening forms. Foucault agrees with Marcuse concerning the falsity of the sexual revolution, but concludes it to be an extension of the profusion of discourse on sexuality

(Poster, 1984). It is this dialogue on sexuality which is the central focus of "The history of sexuality"

Foucault charts the progress of sexual discourse from the confessional of the 17th century to the science laboratory of the modern era. Firstly, he illustrates the nature of discourse

on sexual matters in the 17th century as being primarily concerned with the actions of the individual, with the reformation, this alters to incorporate intentions as well as actions. That is, the dialogue emphasizes the mind as well as the body – paralleling a similar shift of emphasis in the nature of punishment, as outlined in "discipline and punish" He then turns his attention to the modern era and the scientization of the discourse on sex.

He illustrated the pre- occupation that exists with this discourse and compares the confessional with its modern counterpart – psychoanalysis.

The main argument behind "The history of sexuality" is that sexuality is a product of history. He disagrees with the dominant ideology that there exists a sexuality which is absolute and trans – historical.:

"We have had sexuality since the eighteenth Century, and sex since the nineteenth. What We had before been was no doubt the flesh."

(Foucault, p.211, 1980)

Foucault argues that before the 19th century, sex was an integrated part of life, not requiring or receiving special attention. However, the 19th century saw sexuality being separated from normal functioning and reified – in much the same way that leisure became artificially separate from work with the onset of capitalism. Sexuality became examined and discussed and, with this increase in discourse, developed a new sexuality, defined in new way. Foucault does not treat sexuality within the framework of various forms of repression. Instead, he examines discourse on sexuality as a mechanism of power. Discourses on sexuality affect individuals within society and actively reconstructs that sexuality. This replaces simply being seen as reflecting sexuality and class position. He therefore argues that discourse and practice (ideas/ actions) are inexorably intertwined.

So far, this paper has outlined the contents of Foucault's early texts and studied in more depth his final two books. It has also described the two methodological techniques of archaeology and genealogy and placed them in relation to his theories of power and knowledge. At various points, comparisons have been made between his theories and those of Marx. It

would now be advisable to collate these comparisons in order to ascertain Foucault's relationship to the Marxist perspective.

The factors listed do not stand in isolation, as presented here, but are interrelated. They are only separated for the general purposes of clarification and simplification.

1- Marx viewed history as progress. His notion of historical materialism charted the development of human society. Mankind developed the material goods necessary to exert power over nature and developed production forces that progressed through primitive, slave and feudal, to capitalist society. He predicted the final utopian stage of socialism.

Foucault employs a Nietzschean view of history. He argues that society has not progressed; rather it merely substitutes one form of domination for another. History is viewed as being complex and fragmented and the modern era as just another instant in history, not any form of continuous product.

2- Marx constructed a single basic theory which explained the structure of the social world. The theory encompassed all epochs and covered all aspects of the capitalist system of his time.

Foucault wrote books on a series of subjects. There is no attempt made to weave these diverse topics into any form of totalized, global theory that can explain all possible social and historical events under its umbrella.

3- Marx argued that economic production is the central aspect of any society. The economic base is deemed to determine all other social systems present in the super – structure. These systems include educational, political, ideological etc. Culture itself is therefore an economic product.

Foucault considers this to be an oversimplification. He proposes that there is no single determining factor, but that there are always multiple social causes of any social effect. This is exemplified by his assertion that the relationship between discursive and non – discursive practices, which he outlined in the "The archaeology of knowledge", is far more complex than the simple economic determinism proposed by Marx.

4- Marx proposed the theory of the "mode of production". In the early capitalism of Marx's time, this primarily involved man working on machinery, therefore, his social class was defined by his relation to that machine, ie. Owner/ worker. Marx considered the whole of history to be the history of the various modes of production.

Foucault proposed the theory of the "mode of production" has lost much of its relevance in the modern advanced capitalist society. He

replaces this with an emphasis on the "mode of information" (a term not used by Foucault, but coined by Poster, (1984).)

The industry of knowledge and information has progressed to a point that the industry production is becoming of minor importance as a mechanism of social domination. This is not imply that Foucault considers the "mode of information" to be the single determining factor, in the way that the "mode of production" was the signal feature in the theories of Marx. Rather, he views it as one of many factors involved in the relationship between powers, knowledge and domination.

5- Marx attempted to construct bodies of knowledge about the social world in a systematic and structured way.

Foucault takes subject matter within existing ideologies which he then debunks to create his own theories. The knowledge he uncovers was previously hidden from general view.

6- Marx argued that reason is a product of class relations, therefore truth, a product of reason, was also intimately associated with social class. He asserted that the proletariats were in the privileged position that could enable them to see the truth.

Foucault argues that there is no truth, only an infinite number of truths. This relativist position perhaps explains Foucault's reluctance to totalize his theories from the specific subjects he analyses, as each represents its own reality.

All the points of comparison outlined all demonstrate the dissimilarity between the theories of Marx and Foucault. In most cases, they address a similar subject matter, but either arrives at different conclusions, or use disparate methodological techniques. Therefore, in addressing the original purpose of this essay, to ascertain Foucault's relationship to the Marxist perspective the conclusion reached by this essay is that the theories of Foucault bear very little resemblance to classical Marxism.

In reality however, Marxism no longer simply refers to the theories of Karl Marx himself. A great number of contemporary thinkers have extended and refined his works and are labeled as Marxists accordingly. Errors in Marx's original writings are corrected and his theories are manipulated to suit the modern context. The critical theory of western Marxism was one of the central orthodoxies throughout Foucault's intellectual development. It is only reasonable to assume that traces of this tradition will be discernable in Foucault's work, or rather that he will have been aware of the Marxist alternative to his own position and could therefore be located in relation to it.

The neo- Marxists attempted initially to address the failure of traditional Marxism to explain events from the First World War onwards. Marx's predictions had not, and did not look like coming true. Many writers took up the challenge of revitalizing Marx and combining his economic theories with more modern intellectual traditions, such as phenomenology, existentialism and psychoanalysis. Most important of the neo- Marxists are arguably those who belong to the Frankfurt school.

However, Foucault states that he was completely unaware of the Frankfurt school until fairly late in his career. Therefore, the Marxists with whom Foucault should be compared are those of whom he was aware and in whose intellectual company he constructed his own theories – such as Sartre and Althusser. What follows is a rather simplified outline of Foucault's relationship to some of the more important modern Marxists.

Sartre is an intellectual who became highly influential in post – war France. He is often referred to as an existential Marxist. Foucault's relationship to him is a complex one, also one which changed after the events of may 1968. Sartre defends Marx's tantalizations of power and domination, but tries to put it into a non – reductionist framework. As previously stated, Foucault rejects any form of tantalization.

Both Foucault and Sartre appreciated that knowledge is specific to the social and historical biography of the individual. Also, Foucault originally rejected the notion of the subject as the center of knowledge, a position close to that held by Sartre; he also modified this view after 1968 whereon he came to realize the importance of Sartre's work.

Several attempts have been made to combine Marxism with Freudian psychoanalytical theory – most notably by Reich, but also by members of the Frankfurt school, such as Marcus (1955) and Habermas (1971). The primary benefit of this synthesis is that it attempts to explain the nature of the nexus between society and the individual. Each writer employs Freud in a different manner; however, in all cases they actually use his theories as part of their own

As previously mentioned, Foucault regards Freud as another chapter in the history of discourse on sexuality and that discourse itself has created the sexual practice. Therefore he rejects the ground upon which the Freud/ Marx theories are based.

The ideas of Marx were also investigated and updated in the field of semiotics by such writers as Barthes and Baudrillard. Barthes, in his book "mythologies"(1973), analyses a variety of topics within modern society and

illustrates that in the process of producing meaning from events, individuals are subjected to domination.

Domination is therefore presented by Barthes as being far more covert and pervasive than Marx's theories, based upon economic domination. Baudrillard (1972) presents a similar argument to Barthes. He examines the manner in which commodities are sold within the modern capitalist society and asserts that meanings are given to objects, beyond their specific function. In this way, banal commodities, such as washing powder and razor blades, can signify a host of desirable personal attributes, from happiness to sexual desirability.

Baudrillard argues that this mechanism is now of central importance to the understanding of domination within society.

Foucault is in some agreement with the neo – Marxists who place emphasis on the importance of language. As previously discussed, Foucault wrote several books which contained material relevant to semiotics. However, the historically specific natures of his writings have made comparison with these positions difficult. The relative proximity of Foucault's theories to those of Baudrillard was insufficient to produce any form of dialogue between the two writers.

Althusser provides a good comparison for Foucault within the tradition of western Marxism. Althusser reformulated Marxism within a structuralism framework, a popular paradigm at the time in France. They agree with each other in several aspects of social theory. Neither Foucault nor Althusser artificially separate discourse from practice. Both recognize that discursive practices are important mechanisms in the exercise of power and, both are primarily concerned with domination. However, Foucault looks at a variety of subjects whereas Althusser is only concerned with the working class. The difference is an important one, as it has wider ramifications. Poster illustrates this point:

"As a Marxist, Althusser theories the totality through the category of the mode of production. Foucault rejects the category of the totality in general and the Marxist version of it in particular ..."

(Poster, p.39 1984)

As "the spirit" of Marxism is primarily concerned with the concept of domination, not just with economic and political theories, it can be said that Foucault presents a far wider arena for study than does Althusser with his concern for ideology and the mode of production. Poster continues by analyzing Foucault's position in relation to modern Marxism in general:

"The conclusion is inescapable that Foucault is continuing the work of the western Marxist by other means. Rejecting almost the entire edifice of critical theory, Foucault Nevertheless remains within its problematic."

(Foucault, p.40 1984)

In conclusion, the theories of Michel Foucault are very complex. Not only does he deal with a variety of subjects, within different disciplines, utilizing different methodologies, he writes in a manner that does not always assist comprehension. He has constantly reinterpreted his own work, altering emphases and proposing different explanations. The often implicate nature of his theories made that, he has been interpreted in several different ways by a considerable number of authors, due to the often implicit nature of his theories.

Irrespective of these difficulties, it has been possible to assertion Foucault's relationship to the Marxist perspective.

The conclusion reached by this paper are that his theories bear little resemblance to classical Marxism and only limited resemblance to the modern western Marxist tradition. He can, however, be compared with both these paradigms as, in the final analysis, they are all concerned with aspects of domination.

References

- Barthes R. Mythologies* 1973 *Paladin books* – London
- Baudrillard J. For a critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* 1972
Telos Press – St. Louis
Dreyfus H. and Rabinow P. Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics 1982 *Harvester Press* – Brighton
- Foucault M.*
- "Orders of Discourse." *Social Science Information* 1971 10: p. 27 - 30
- Madness and Civilization: A history of insanity in an age of reason* 1977
Tavistock . London
- The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* 1975
Vintage books . New York
- The order of things : An archaeology of the human sciences* 1973 *Vintage books . New York*
- The Archaeology of knowledge* 1977 *Tavistock . London*
- Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* 1977 *Allen Lane. Penguin press. London*
- The history of Sexuality. Vol.1 An Introduction* 1979 *Allen Lane. Penguin press. London*
- Gordon C. (ed.) Power /Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings* 1972–1977 by *Michel Foucault*. 1980 *Harvester Press. Brighton*
- Habermas J. Knowledge and human interest* 1971 *Routledge and Kegan Paul. London*
- Marcuse H. Eros and Civilization* 1955 *Johnson. London*
- Poster M. Foucault, Marxism and history: mode of production versus mode of information* 1984 *Polity Press. Oxford*
- Sheridan A. Michel Foucault: The Will to truth* 1980 *Tavistock. London*
- Smart B. Michel Foucault* 1985 *Ellis horwood. Tavistock. London*