Metin BECERMEN

Assoc. Prof. Dr. | Doç. Dr.
Uludag University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Philosophy, Bursa, TR
Uludağ Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Felsefe Bölümü, Bursa, TR
metinbecermen@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-7585-265X

An Inquiry on Relation among Discourse, Truth and Power in Michel Foucault

Abstract

Foucault calls his work "a critical history of the thought." However, the critical history of the thought is the time, when any truth games appear, but not the time, when the truth is obtained or hindered. This history is directly linked to the power and to how the power operates. Foucault, who also deals with the power matter in line with the relation between discourse, truth and power, inquires function of the power in any enclosed institutions formed depending on development conditions of the capitalism such as hospitals, jails, etc. His main problem is to deal with the power by acting with any power relationship and to make a power solution accordingly. In this context, Foucault also adopts the states as a matter depending on analysis of modern institutions. He thinks that there is a resistance opportunity in wherever the power is available. Resistance means in some ways setting forth a different discourse and developing a game other than the power game. Therefore, Foucault, who thinks that, when the power is at stake, one should go out of the existing game and leave the state our of the game, makes a critical room for philosophy at this point.

Keywords

Michel Foucault'da Söylem, Hakikat ve İktidar İlişkisi Üzerine Bir İnceleme

Öz

Foucault, kendi yaptığı işi "düşüncenin eleştirel tarihi" olarak adlandırır. Ancak, düşüncenin eleştirel tarihi, hakikatin elde edilmesinin veya gizlenmesinin tarihi değil, hakikat oyunlarının ortaya çıkışının tarihidir. Bu tarih de, iktidar ve iktidarın işleyişi ile doğrudan bağlantılıdır. Söylem, hakikat ve iktidar arasındaki ilişki çerçevesinde iktidar sorununu ele alan Foucault, kapitalizmin gelişme koşullarına bağlı olarak şekillenen hastane, hapishane gibi kapatılma kurumlarında iktidarın işleyişini araştırır. Temel sorunu iktidarı iktidar ilişkilerinden hareketle ele almak ve buna bağlı olarak bir iktidar çözümlemesi yapmaktır. Foucault, bu bağlamda, modern kurumların analizine bağlı olarak devleti de problem edinir. Ona göre, iktidarın söz konusu olduğu her yerde bir direniş imkanı da vardır. Direnmek, bir bakıma, farklı bir söylem ortaya koymak, iktidar oyununun dışında bir oyunu geliştirmeye çalışmak demektir. Bu nedenle, iktidar söz konusu olduğunda, mevcut iktidar oyununun dışına çıkmak için, devleti oyunun dışında bırakmak gerektiğini düşünen Foucault, bu noktada felsefeye önemli bir yer açar.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Bilgi, Hakikat, İktidar, Panoptikon, Söylem.

I

Foucault says that the power produces knowledge and both the power and the knowledge included in one other. Thus, it is accepted that there shall be no power relationship unless an associated knowledge area is formed, and there shall not be any knowledge and knowledge area that never assume and form any power relationship (Foucault 1992: 33-4). In this context, it is impossible to exercise the power without knowledge and it is impossible for the knowledge to exist without creating a power (Sarup 1995: 93). However, the knowledge comes out of any foundations required for social control and also provides these foundations. Community relies upon and enables each type of knowledge (Walzer 1986: 64). In Foucault's opinion, it is seen that the knowledge matches up with the power. Revealing a new human understanding as disciplinary objects in the relationship between the power means making a new thing with people (Hacking 1986: 33). According to him, discipline is a control principle in production of the discourse and ensures boundaries of the discourse my means of an identity so that the guidelines are updated permanently (Foucault 1993b: 21).

According to Foucault, the power is neither out of the discourse nor root of its source. The power is a thing that runs throughout the discourse, because the discourse is an element of strategic dispositive[1] of any power relation (Foucault 2005a: 182). Thus,

---

[1] According to Bernauer, the dispositive concept, which is the most important next methodological innovation in Foucault's *Knowledge's Archeology*, enables us to see interaction of two planes. The *Dispositive* concept results of a strategic opinion model followed by Foucault's opinion. That is, *dispositive* is an integral structure consisting of

the power is not a meaning of the discourse. Foucault, who says that the discourse includes a series of elements within a general power mechanism, states that the discourse should be accepted as political events, a series of events. With these events, the power is communicated and oriented. In this context, jails that are targets of Foucault's criticisms may be seen as the human's own modern identity. This identity is center of humanism that emphasizes both a special understanding in relation to human reality and technology of human development. This means a truth that comes to a power and a power that markets itself as a truth (Bernauer 2005: 34).

According to Foucault, the truth must be understood as a total of procedures arranged for production, compilation, distribution and operation of words. On the other hand, the truth is within a circular relationship with any power systems that produce and support such truth and with any power effects that create and spread such truth. Foucault calls this "the truth regime." This regime is not only an ideological or super structural one, but also a condition of formation and development of the capitalism (Foucault 2005a: 52). According to him, the thing that prevents talking about something and allows talking about only a certain something is the power finally. In this context, the truth depends on anybody, who has a power to render the truth right (Jenkins 1997: 43).

Foucault objects a truth opinion that remains completely out of a network of knowledge or power relationship. Therefore, his objection also contains possibility of a critical knowledge to talk about the truth and power that reveal what sovereign is and enables and promotes to resist against sovereign (Rouse 1994: 99). According to Foucault, the truth is a thing belonging to this world and occurs due to a large number of forces. On the other hand, each community has its own truth regime and general truth policy. Therefore, in each community, there are types of discourses that are accepted properly and put properly into operation, a number of mechanisms that are useful to distinguish any correct words from incorrect words; means to confirm correct and incorrect things by authorities; means to confirm any proper and improper things by authorities; any techniques and procedures preferred in achieving the truth; and status of anybody, who is obliged to say anything accepted properly (Foucault 2005a: 50-1). However, he states that the thing he understands from the truth is not such a general norm or a series of assumptions, but a total of procedures that enable to anybody to depict any words to be accepted properly at any time (Foucault 2003: 177).

---

discourses, institutions, architectural arrangements, administrative procedures, etc. Accordingly, even if it is an abstract statement, any concrete relationships exhibited by *dispositive* are seen fist while analyzing jails. This area, criminal area of which consists of highly different elements, includes not only discourses, political revolutionists, psychologists, judges, legislators and physicians, but also daily order and disciplinary systems executed at jails complete with architectural structures of fails. On the other hand, upon of *dispositive*, any previously developed archeological tools should not be removed, because development of new integral rules, which expand their capacities, more important than re-addition of former rules for archeology. As seen above, knowledge and power gather in discourse, and discourse always runs as part of historical deployment. Nevertheless, power of legal and oppressive model on running of the power terminates (Bernauer 2005: 254-6).

II

At the beginning of his book *"Discipline and Punish"*, Foucault talks about enforcement of punishment of a prisoner named "Damiens." The prisoner must confess his crime before everybody (Foucault 1992: 3). While anybody, who watches a torture applied to the prisoner, enjoy to watch this, the prisoner only invokes God. In this event, which becomes a bloody show, the King shows his power to everybody there through violence to be applied on the body of the prisoner. The body that is subject to torture and interrogation is an application point of the crime and also a place, where the truth is obtained (Foucault 1992: 52). According to Foucault, juridical torture should be understood in political and liturgical scope. Torture takes place among ceremonies, where the power shows itself. Keelhauling realizes the justice and activates the power again. In this liturgical practice, the power relation that gives its power to the law appears. According to Foucault, there are two powers in this enforcement implemented before the people: Struggle and victory. In this liturgical practice, a struggle, the result of which is clear previously, occurs between the malefactor and king. The ruler shows his power on people as he incapacitates. He should do this. Otherwise, he cannot sustain his power. Most considerable thing is unbalance between forces. He has an absolute domination and infinite discretion on the body of the person as he supports or never supports. Foucault states that the justice of the king shows him as an armed justice, and says that the sword punishing the guilty person is also a sword destroying enemies (Foucault 1992: 61-62). The justice of the king stated as a sword is also his infinite power. The hangman, who is executioner of the punishment, is not only an executer of the law, but also a person, who indicates the power. He is in position of an actor of the violence applied to the prisoner.

On the other hand, it is seen that a new organization appears upon an action such as confinement, etc. this organization is a jail. According to Bernauer, the fact that a disciplinary power prevails in a medium, where any punishment theories are discussed, set the stage for development of hospitals (Bernauer 2005: 233). However, jails have developed so quickly as modern confinement organizations in a wide range of models, and confinement has become a quite comprehensive situation. Jails differ highly from cells and confinement places like jails in the middle ages. While a prisoner stays in cells and other confinement places, his/her punishment is enforced or he/she is ransomed, such prisoner is disciplined and improved in modern jails. Foucault states jails reveal at the end of ninth century and in this period, a new type of knowledge and thus a new power style are seen (Foucault 2005b: 225).

Foucault shows Bentham's panopticon as last point, where the modern jail system that undergoes change reaches. According to him, panopticon, which is a dream of Bentham, and in which a person may observe everyone, is essentially a dream or one of dreams of the bourgeoisie. However, this dream has realized even if it is not in an architectural structure suggested by Bentham. Although Bentham's panopticon is in an architectural style, it reveals especially in terms of management style. According to Bentham, panopticon is a practical mode of the force on an "intelligence for intelligence." Foucault supposes that Bentham provides a presentation of practical modes of the force (Foucault 2005b: 135; 2003: 86-7).

Foucault, who states that the perception on panopticon expresses a condition in our age, describes that this may be expressed as a panoptism. According to him, "panoptism" is one of characteristics of the community, in which we live. Here, there is a mode of personal and permanent observation. Applied modes of inspection, punishment, rewarding and improvement are power modes applied as modification and formation of individuals (Foucault 2005b: 237; 2003: 94-8). The, discipline is critical. In this context, Foucault says that discipline develops an individual. Discipline is seen as a specific technique for power, which provides the individuals both as objects and execution means (Foucault 1992: 214). On the other hand, success of a discipline-based power includes a hierarchical viewpoint, a normalizing sanction, a combination of them and activation of this combination. In this context, Foucault says that hierarchical observatories resemble a military camp. A disciplinary tool shall enable to see everything permanently at one look. A central point shall be both a source of lights, which illuminate everything, and a place on which everything needed to be known focuses (Foucault 1992: 218). According to Foucault, it is seen that jails and hospitals reveal under glance of a light regime.

According to Foucault, who states that actual and physical disciplines underlie any formal and legal freedoms, although an agreement was considered an ideal fundamental of the justice and political force, panopticon created technical practice of taking a style under pressure and continued to process legal structures of the community deeply and permanently. In this context, according to Foucault, who emphasizes the relationship between discipline and power, the relationship between desire, power and benefit is much more sophisticated than supposed. The power executors should not be any persons, who have benefit on its execution. In fact, Foucault says that any persons, who have a benefit on execution of the power, never executed the power, and the power desire played a game, which still protect a singularity between the power and benefit (Foucault 2005a: 39). For instance in fascism, although the power executes its force on the people until their damage, death, victimizing and killing, the people desire execution of this power. Foucault alleges that he has never known this game between desire, power and benefit sufficiently yet.

III

Foucault considers a "modern state" not as a developed thing by omitting what are on the individuals and even their availability, on the contrary, considers it as a highly developed structure, provided that the individuals give individualism a new form and are subject to a series of specific patterns. In this respect, it is possible to see the state as a modern individualism ground or a new form of the pastoral power (Foucault 2005c: 66).

According to Foucault, a reform made in penal law is essentially a strategy prepared to make the chastising power more systematic, more effective and more permanent. Since this new power mode is positive, efficient and intends to support life contrary to the former adverse and restrictive power modes, Foucault calls such new power techniques and mechanisms "bio-power." Thus, its practice in last three centuries appears as a domination mode of such disciplinary power, which produces individuals

of the modern age. Therefore, understanding of the modern human concept requires understanding of microphysics of the power. According to Foucault, the being includes a product of functionality of such new power mode upon punishers, inspectors, improvers, madmen, children, patients and workers (Keskin 1996: 119-21). On the other hand, since body of the capitalism should enter production process in a controlled way, and the population is adapted to financial processes, the bio-power is an indispensable fact in development of the capitalism.

According to Foucault, another effect of the development of the bio-power is importance gained by a normative game to the detriment of the legal legislation system. Accordingly, the legislation never remains without guns and its most suitable gun is death. The ones, who object to the legislation, are responded with this absolute jeopardy at least at the final stage. The legislation is considered permanently with holy justice. However, a power, which assumes life responsibility, shall always require any regulatory and corrective mechanisms. Here, it is possible to give life in worth and capability field, but not to put the death forth in sovereign field. Foucault says that the legislation runs more increasingly in a normative way and functionality of the legal authority becomes integrated more increasingly with a universe of tools especially such as medical, administrative, etc. Accordingly, a normalizing community is a historical end of a power technology that focuses on the life (Foucault 1993a: 147-8).

Since power relationship, first, the state is deprive of a power to be able to occupy all field of power relationship despite absolute power owned by the state's own units, and second, the state may run in foundation of any other existing power relationship, this exceeds the limits of the state. The state is in a superstructure position against a series of power networks, where th) body of the state involves sexuality, family, knowledge, technology, etc. and these power networks takes place in the conditioning-conditioned relationship with a "meta-power" structured essentially around a certain prohibition functionality. However, this meta-power, which brings prohibitions, may take place and find a stable base only to extent that it takes root in a wide range of uncertain power relationship, which ensures fundamental of major negative power modes (Foucault 2005a: 73).

According to Foucault, state occurs upon coding of a large number of power relationships, which enable their own functionality. Revolution is seen as a different coding of same relationships. This means that there are types of revolutions as much as number of re-coding of the power relationships and revolutions that leave the power relationships, which constitute the ground of functionality of the state, essentially as is may also be considered. Foucault states that regular and legal power modes should not be analyzed in terms of things that may have general mechanisms or total effects, but on the contrary, the power should be dominated at its extremes. In other words, this means domination of the power at extremes that become less legal gradually. However, it is necessary not to see the power as a mass and homogenous domination phenomenon and domination of an individual, group or class upon others (Foucault 2005a: 105-6).

On the other hand, the power relationships include ones executed not only by the public units upon individuals, but also by a husband upon his wife and children. Furthermore, they also include a power executed by a physician, a power executed by

gentry people and a power executed by a plant boss upon his workers at his plant. Therefore, the power relationships that enable domination of a social class upon other one completely and domination of a group upon other one engage each other (Foucault 2003: 162).

Foucault states that impact of modern state on individuals is amazing contrary to common belief. Here, a number of techniques are placed and developed so that they prevent individuals from avoiding the power, surveillance, inspection, and becoming compliance, rehabilitation and settling down. All major disciplinary units –barracks, schools, shops and jails– include units that enable to know how to encompass individuals, who they are, what they do, what it may be done with them and where they should be placed. Human sciences also include any information that enables to know who individuals are, who is normal and abnormal, who is in his/her right mind or not, who has skills and which skills they have, what they may do, what anticipated attitudes of individuals are and which attitudes should be eliminated (Foucault 2005a: 213-4).

Foucault depicts that the prevailing "truth regime" always constitutes a knowledge area of the power relationships bounded cyclically by the truth and such knowledge enables the power to run, and traces basic relationship between knowledge and power. According to him, a power having a plenty of power relationships is produced and is available everywhere. Foucault emphasizes that public units, legislation or other hegemonic means consist of modes any strategies identifying the power are crystallized and formed. In this context, since the power exists only when it runs, it is necessary to analysis its functionality and to determine any circumstances, under which it introduces domination mode (Foucault 2004: 10-11). In this context, Foucault talks about a disciplinary community, where any inspection powers reproduce and hide (Blanchot 2005: 85). According to him, political domination of the body and solution of microphysics of the power require waiving violence-ideology conflict, knowledge model and object priority (Foucault 1992: 34).

Foucault talks about any struggle for a power that is available in the West from the Middle Age and is neither political, legal and financial power nor an ethnical domination power completely, but however, has major effects on structure of our communities. Here, the power is a religious power, which desires to assume existence of people comprehensively and in developments from births and deaths and to force them to act in a certain way and to pray (Foucault 2005a: 211). He calls this "pastoral power." The pastoral power is a power executed by a sheepman on his fold. This type of power reveals in Christianity. In Christianity, any belief containing a hierarchic organization based on establishment and ground foundation of a church, and after death, sins, salvation and merit regime, and the belief that the Christians are a rabble according to definition of a priest reveal. Particular people, who make use of a particular status, have a right and duty to exercise any pastoral obligations on this rabble.

Basic function of the pastoral power is to do its enemies favor, but not to harm. The pastoral power, which differs principally from traditional power that is characterized with its victory upon ones the power succumbs is a power that ensures livelihood of both individuals and their respective group. It is a helpful power, but not victorious power (Foucault 2005a: 226-7). Consequently, it may be said that the pastoral

power is an individualistic power. Contrary to political power, such power mode is for salvation. Contrary to the empery principle, it is self-dedicated. Contrary to le legal power, it is individuative, bears sustainability with life and is associated with that an individual produces a truth on himself/herself (Foucault 2005c: 65-6).

Foucault states that the thing that gives the power a right to approach until the body is to assume responsibility of the life rather than to threaten with death. He alleges that it is necessary to talk about any event, which puts any lives and living mechanisms under open accounts and changes the knowledge-power to a fact of conversion of the human life as a bio-policy, when any pressures applied to correlate historical processes to living actions is called "bio-history" (Foucault 1993a: 146-7).

On the other hand, Foucault considers the normative community as a community type, where the legal power never regresses, but expands rather to a general power. This community requires a more different monitoring and inspection system. There are inexhaustible visibility, permanent classification of individuals, hierarchy, qualification, determination of limitations and diagnosis. Norm becomes a criterion of dividing individuals into groups (Foucault 2003: 77-8). Thus, when the power matter is discussed only by means of the term "legislative" or "constitution" or the terms "state" and "public authorities," such matter losses its importance. He alleges that the power is complex, dense and common unlike total of laws or a public unit (Foucault 2003: 98). According to him, the power mechanisms are applied highly larger than a simple legal unit and the power is executed by means of a highly large number of domination procedures.

However, the state has a structure that encompasses and orientates all power relations. In this context, Foucault does not desire to render the political power principally subject to the power relationships and also objects to render the power relationships subject to the political power. Foucault says that, when the power matter is discussed by means of the works "power relationships", and availability of "administrative" relationships is accepted between individuals, in a crowd and in a highly complex network of relationship, major types of power –political power, ideological power, etc.– take place necessarily in these types of relationship, that is, in management and orientation relations between people. According to Foucault, if there are not such types of relationship, there are not other types of political structures as well (Foucault 2005a: 324).

According to Foucault, the power is not a function of any organization. On the contrary, such organization is a function or an effect of the power. In this context, the power arises from an organization and flows via such organization. The organization is seen only as a combination of a variety of power relationships. Since the power relationships are unstable and turn easily toward the organization, which control them, the organization is unstable as well. However, when the power relationships change to the domination relationships, power flows may be hindered and solidified. Such domination relationship is the ground of any organizations like government (Newman 2006: 133). According to Foucault, rights and worthies are indefinite. They are not essentially on the side of the power or on the side of resistance. Since rights include

guns to be used in a struggle, interpretation of these rights is on individuals' opinion (Newman 2006: 150).

At this point, Foucault states that today the roles of an intellectual person are not to enact any laws, to suggest any solutions and to predict anything. When he/she do so, he/she contributes only to functionality of a particular power situation (Foucault 2004: 162). Foucault criticizes this situation and states that his purpose in not to come up with a statement based on the power instead of a statement based on economy. He says that he tries to arrange and systematize any different analyzes and approaches configured around the power matter. Foucault, who states that he never understands any claims that he cannot explain the power, says on this matter that: "They say that I cannot explain it. Besides, nobody says that I explain it!" (Foucault 2004: 157).

IV

Foucault, who alleges that the power is everywhere, states that this results from that the power come from every place, but not from that the power covers every place. In this context, the power is not an organization, a structure or a particular power owned by some ones, but is a named given to a sophisticated situation in a community. On the other hand, the power is any obtained or lost thing, but is a structure that exits from an unlimited number of points and runs among unequal and movable connections. These connections are not in position of a superstructure having a simple punishment or maintenance role. They play a productive role directly, where they exist (Foucault 1993a: 99-100). According to Foucault, the thing constituting generality of a struggle is not a power system, but all running and execution mode of the power. According to him, the power comes from lower levels. This means that there in no conflict between ones, on whom the power principle prevails, and ones, who bind to the principle, that show its effect on groups restricted more gradually downwards and to depths of the social body (Foucault 1993a: 100).

On the other hand, there is resistance wherever the power exists. Therefore, resistance is never in an external position in comparison to the power. However, the power relationships may exist in comparison to a majority of resistance points. These points play a progress role for competitor, support and struggle in the power relationships. These resistance points are available on one side of the power network (Foucault 1993a: 101). These resistances are indestructible contrasts in the power relationships.[2] Just like a thick tissue formation that enters units and organizations partially at the end of the power relationships, migration of the resistance points pass through social separations and personal unions. As such, if the state is based on institutional integration of the power relationships, the thing enabling this revolution is that these resistance points are coded strategically (Foucault 1993a: 102).

---

[2] For example, life is a target of the power. Life is also an invisible face of the power. It exhibits its boundaries and resists against the power. According to Foucault, life is a boundary of the power. When people are ready to die to resist, and "life never exchanges itself," the power reached its boundary. Maybe, this boundary is in the meaning of pure clarity and possibility (Newman 2006: 153).

Therefore, the power mechanisms must be in an area of these power balances. Thus, it may be possible to throw off a Legislation-Ruler system that is attractive for a long-term political opinion.

Foucault alleges that primary duty of any political opinion and political struggle is strategic for discovering weakest aspect and most effective aspect of the power in respect to struggle (Bernauer 274). In this context, according to Foucault, it is better to know anything to jeopardize us and how we shall defend ourselves (Foucault 2005a: 102). Foucault states that the power relationships cause an inevitable resistance, make a resistance call at any time, enable to resistance and may resist highly more against the power that executes domination for a real resistance. In this context, Foucault says that anything he tries to reveal is a permanent and comprehensive struggle rather than a stable domination of a standardizing unit (Foucault 2003: 176-7).

Foucault never believes that individualization stands against the power, on the contrary, believes that our individuality is an effect and a tool of power of compulsory identity of each one of us. Anything the power is afraid of mostly is force and violence of groups (Foucault 2005b: 282) In this context, Young says that ones, who allege that Foucault eliminates resistance possibility, miss essence of the matter and anything Foucault reduce its importance is a resistance theory focused on an individual object as a prevailing subject. According to Young, a claim of a type of contrast resistance assumes that the subjects mar resist in a position out of procedures of the power according to prevailing internal and external models of the traditional policy (Young 2000: 144).

On the other hand, Foucault states that it is necessary not to intend to eliminate the power relationships completely. According to him, the power relationships are also played. They are power plants needed to be reviewed by the term "tactic and strategy", "rule and incidence", and "hands and target." Foucault states that these power games may be dealt with in many respects. Foucault prefers to be interested in power games having a noble status that are highly more modest, highly more limited and known to experience any major problems philosophically instead of reviewing major game of the state with citizens and other countries. They include insanity, medicine, diseases or sick body, criminal procedures and power games around jails. Foucault says that it is not possible to be a party of these power games basically for purposes of respecting their freedom and rights,, and they are games not required clearly yet. According to him, it is possible to reject the game and resistance to the game, but not intra-game conflicts (Foucault 2005a: 204-6). However, upon this rejection, existence of a "real" freedom is possible. Even if this is a quite difficult thing, Foucault shows that this is not possible.

The power that is Foucault's sympathizer never obtains any associated truth and freedom, but obtains condition of the truth and freedom and a standard relationship between them (Taylor 1986: 93). On the other hand, Megill, who talks about the difference between rejection of the system by Foucault and rejection of the system by anarchists, underlines that there is no natural order and probable adaptation (Megill 1998: 376).

Foucault states that today's political, ethic, social and philosophical matter is to relieve us of the state and its associated individualization, but not to relieve a person of

the state and its public authorities (Foucault 2005c: 68). Accordingly, it is to develop any life and action style other than any discourse and practice developed and to be developed around the state. However, any game other existing games may be exhibited. Area, where these games shall be implemented, is more ethical than policy. With regards to ethics, it may be possible to exhibit "a power, which does not come to power" game other than a power game. Since a game other that comes to power game is exhibited in an ethical area, this is a game, which does not come to power. However, since people never abstract them from political area, it is not possible to relieve them from existing power relationships. This never means that it does not occurs. However, resistance is also part of a power game. Power must be available for resistance to occur.

At this point, Foucault, who thinks philosophy shall play a critical role in this game, talks about situation of philosophy[3] against power that: "It may be thought that there may still be a certain possibility for philosophy to play a role other than to be a founder or driver of the power against the power. Maybe, philosophy may still play a role near counter power as long as philosophy never praises its law against the power; philosophy stops to see itself as a prophet; and philosophy stops to see itself as pedagogy or law and undertakes to analyze, explain, display and expand any struggles occurred around the power, any strategies, tactics and resistance focus of rivals in the power relations as a duty. Briefly, the condition is that philosophy discusses the power matter by means of existence terms, but not the term 'good' or 'bad'" (Foucault 2005a: 202-3).

This shall prevent philosophy from coming to power as well as it shall provide philosophy with an independent area against the power. If philosophy assumes a duty to destruct icons instead of a commander duty like Nietzsche's "hammer" metaphor, the underlined word is better omitted the criticism may find its response. The "hammer" metaphor may depict a call toward power against each attempt to come to power. Foucault shows us that philosophy has a possibility to implement this to resist against the power and implement existence.

Conclusion

We see that Foucault deals with the power matter in terms of the relationship he established between discourse and truth. Foucault, who studies how the power runs in different institutions depending to confinement while he discusses this relationship, analyzes the power matter based on the power relationships. At this point, he focuses on the capitalism and individual, that is, subject, which appears depending institutional structure of the capitalism. According to him, a modern institution structure produces a modern subject. Therefore, according to Foucault, the power is a producer. That is, the power needs an individual and subject produced by the power. The power creates itself over these individuals and subjects. This shows that the power expands horizontally and

---

[3] According to Deleuze, Foucault is a philosopher, maybe a unique philosopher of twentieth century. Thus, he is talked well about. In this context, Foucault puts his life in his opinion. The relationship Foucault founded with the power and himself includes a new life, death, insanity or mental problem (Deleuze 2006: 120).

deeply, but not vertically and penetrates into each point. The power reveals itself differently in a family, factory, school, jail, hospital, barracks, etc. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the power in each relationship. However, there may also be a resistance possibility wherever the power is available. The more the power area expands, the more the resistance area expands. It is possible to resist against power wherever it is present. Resistance means displaying a game other than the power game and playing "a game, which never comes to power." This game never depends on a truth discourse, but is a game that is far away from scientific frame and realizes on a being ground. That is, it is necessary to play a game, where the capitalism never prevails and accordingly to develop institutions incur to "deconstruction". For this, it is necessary to go out of the existing power game and leave the state out of the game, because the power institutionalizes in a places that the state is available in the game and penetrates into each area of daily life. At this point, Foucault considers philosophy as a major place. According to him, when philosophy never alleges that it obtains he truth; never assumes to encompass; never dominates; never sees itself as a prophet; and most importantly, never desires to be a founder and a driver of the power, it may play a role as a counter power against the power. This means that philosophy is critical and has a critical place in life.

REFERENCES

Bernauer, J. W. (2005). *Foucault'nun Ozgurluk Seruveni*, Trans. Ismail Turkmen, Istanbul: Ayrinti Yayinlari.

Blanchot M. (2005). "Hayalimdeki Michel Foucault", Trans. Ayse Meral, *Dısarının Dusuncesi Michel Foucault-Hayalimdeki Michel Foucault Maurice Blanchot*, Istanbul: Kabalci Yayinevi, ss. 59-104.

Foucault, M. (1992). *Hapishanenin Doguşu*, Trans. Mehmet Ali Kılıcbay, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayinlari.

Foucault, M. (1993a). *Cinselligin Tarihi I*, Trans. Hulya Tufan, Istanbul: Afa Yayinlari.

Foucault M. (1993b). *Ders Ozetleri*, Trans. Selahattin Hilav, İstanbul: YKY.

Foucault M. (2003). *Iktidarın Gozu Secme Eserler 4*, Trans. Isık Erguden, Istanbul: Ayrinti Yayinlari.

Foucault M. (2004). *Marx'tan Sonra*, Trans. Gokhan Aksay, Civiyazilari Istanbul: Yayinevi.

Foucault M. (2005a). *Entelektuelin Siyasi Islevi Secme Eserler 1*, Trans. Isık Erguden-Osman Akinhay-Ferda Keskin, Istanbul: Ayrinti Yayinlari.

Foucault M. (2005b). *Büyük Kapatilma Secme Eserler 3*, Trans. Isık Ergüden-Ferda Keskin, Istanbul: Ayrinti Yayinlari.

Foucault M. (2005c). *Ozne ve Iktidar Secme Eserler 2*, Trans. Isık Ergüden-Osman Akinhay, Istanbul: Ayrinti Yayinlari.

Hacking I. (1986). "The Archaelogy of Foucault", *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, Edit.: David Couzens Hoy, Basil Blackwell, New York, 27-40.

Jenkins K. (1997). *Tarihi Yeniden Dusunmek*, Trans. Bahadir Sina Sener, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayinlari.

Keskin F. (1996). "Foucault'da Siddet ve Iktidar", *Cogito*, Sayı 6-7, Istanbul: YKY, ss. 117-122.

Megill A. (1998). *Asırılıgın Peygamberleri*, Trans. Tuncay Birkan, Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayinlari.

Newman S. (2006). *Bakuninden Lacan'a Anti-Otorieteryanizm ve Iktidarın Altust Olusu*, Trans. Kursad Kızıltug, Istanbul: Ayrinti Yayinlari.

Rouse J. (1994). "Power/Knowledge", *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Edit. Gary Gutting, Cambridge University Press, New York, 92-114,

Sarup M. (1995). *Postyapisalcilik ve Postmodernizm*, Trans. A. Baki Guclu, Ankara: Ark Yayinevi.

Taylor C. (1986). "Foucault on Freedom and Truth", *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, Edited by David Couzens Hoy, Basil Blackwell, New York, 69-102.

Walzer M. (1986). "The Politics of Michel Foucault", *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, Edit.: David Couzens Hoy, New York: Basil Blackwell, ss. 51-68.

Young R. (2000). *Beyaz Mitolojiler*, Trans. Can Yildiz, Istanbul: Baglam Yayinlari.