

# Review of: "Foucault 40 years later – an intimate history"

Maria Pediconi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Urbino

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I condense my review of the article into a few brief notes.

1. The Author's first merit is to precisely identify his gain in his encounter with his Master Foucault: 'he was helping me to emerge from the typical provincial middle-class mentality'. The Master allowed him to emerge from his intellectual adolescence.
2. The Author's second merit is that he has outlined the steps of the scientific encounter with the Master with dedication and passion: the junctions, not always easy but confidently described, are conveyed to the reader as the possible map for a repeatable, sharable, verifiable encounter.
3. The reader realises that, thanks to the Author, he is approaching a great intellectual of the last century: eclectic, bold, and determined. Foucault brought the structuralist paradigm onto the cultural scene without hesitation. With this sharp blade, he entered all fields of knowledge to dissect them, exalting their errors and losses.
4. I would emphasise the precision and sagacity with which Foucault analysed the history of knowledge, including medicine, with his insightful *Naissance de la clinique: une archéologie du regard médical*. A 1963 paper that the Author of this article does not introduce in detail. I would add it to the precious texts we inherit from Foucault.
5. Finally, a rougher note could also be an issue to open a debate on. Foucault rubs humanity's decadence in the face at all scientific, political, and social levels. We could compare the *destruens* Master to the most famous Reformers of our Humanism.

There are two sides to this last question.

- The first side is paying *tribute* to those who offered Foucault the raw thinking material for some of the articulate arguments with which he handles ideas and history. What tribute does Foucault acknowledge to Lacan, Marx, and Freud? Did not he utilise ideas and conclusions from these and other thinkers who preceded him?
- Now, the second side. Does the *destruens* Master Foucault, who faces head-on the abyss in the twilight of history, resign himself to the extinction of humans, potentially replaceable by robots and AI, or does he secretly nurture a hope for rebirth? The Master of naked truth, who does not hesitate to lash out at history, what *costruens* alternative does he propose?