

Why Allow a Mindless Appendage to Rule One's Life?

by lex Tuesday, Feb 6 2018, 6:51pm

international / prose / post

The title suggests a male perspective though this piece indirectly refers to Michel Foucault's [latest publication](#), his final book on sexuality, completed by the highly esteemed homosexual academic, now deceased, 34 years past!



It could easily be argued that Foucault was obsessed with and by sex and sexuality, perhaps as a result of his homosexuality, which he struggled socially with for most of his life as it was considered a vile, aberrant and devious illegal practice during his youth and early adult life.

Given that male and female homosexuals are generally more sexually focused than heterosexuals, Foucault's many books on the subject should not surprise anyone. However, Foucault's major contribution was his appreciation of SOCIAL POWER as process or a DYNAMIC not something that any person or entity POSSESSES.

Foucault quite rightly stressed that POWER is a dynamic constantly in flux and to a certain extent elusive, hence the obsession to maintain and wield it by those in any society that imagine they possess it as permanent.

I studied Foucault while at university many decades past, and for me, it was his appreciation of POWER that was his greatest contribution to the world, not solely to the academic world of impractical theories, the most popular of which was/is Marxism, a completely impossible and unrealisable political philosophy, which always results when applied in totalitarianism and/or despotism in one form or another, Marxism is therefore easily relegated to utopian philosophies, but I digress.

Power, as Foucault viewed it is PROCESS -- for those without a tertiary education in humanities an explanation is required, I hope that academics excuse the simplification; power is never possessed by anyone/thing, it is always dependent on the most powerful body, by sheer force of numbers, in any society, which group invests it, whether to an institution, group or person is irrelevant, as power is easily refocused and is always subject to extreme and radical flux/change.

Power is consequently wielded by those entities invested with it, however, it remains in constant flux and is therefore zealously and jealously guarded/maintained at all costs by those, usually minority interests, that wield it. Yet it really issues from the masses, which either invest it actively and/or

'passively' by doing nothing to affect an existing power dynamic; nevertheless it is ALWAYS the masses that issue it to their advantage or disadvantage, whatever the case may be, though the latter is more often the case as history verifies.

Nothing has changed in relation to social power since the time of the God-kings/Pharaohs of ancient Egypt, in which the masses invested 'divine' power in their fellow ruling mortals, a stupidity to say the least. Today however, Foucault astutely revealed (makes aware) that it is the masses that wield and determine that power dynamic though mostly unawares, for instance, slavery, which is one entity allowing another entity to rule and determine the course of their lives and thoughts exists today as it did in ancient Egypt, the shackles have always been and remain ideological, or based on beliefs -- and if those beliefs are analysed, it becomes evident almost immediately that they are mostly MYTH based and myths as everyone should know, are fictions, fairy tales or LIES, to put it bluntly, though of course they carry esoteric meanings -- so much for the evolution of human societies -- LOL -- as clearly nothing has changed in that regard for thousands of years and seems unlikely that that social dynamic would ever change.

The masses by active or passive choice, seem to prefer chains to freedom, as at any time this most powerful MAJORITY is able to cast off their shackles placed there by elite power wielding interests; there is no doubt that the masses REMAIN the most potentially powerful social force in ANY society. And so the 'game of power' is mostly played by AWARE elites or unrepresentative minorities that wish to rule in order to serve their own interests. Well, why not, as the masses clearly PREFER THEIR CHAINS OVER 'FREEDOM?' Which state is also myth, as few ask, freedom from what? And if answers arise or are 'given' then the masses fail to do anything to gain what they imagine is their freedom, instead they continue to serve LYING elite interests.

Foucault indirectly reveals that it is the masses that always possess the determining factor in the dynamic of power in any society and the larger it is the more potential power the masses are able to wield. Nevertheless, if the masses prefer slavery and to be led then clearly the outcome would always be slavery for the majority, while AWARE elite minorities vie continually for the investment of that power from the masses, which are ever-ready to surrender it.

O, sorry, it seems I have strayed completely from the title, so to return -- 'a man has two heads but only one has a brain!'

Good luck, suckers!

<https://www.rawstory.com/2018/02/philosopher-michel-foucaults-last-book-sex-finally-published/>

Jungle Drum Prose/Poetry. <http://jungledrum.lingama.net/news/story-3166.html>