Socius: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial
Volume 4, Issue 5, December 2026, p 49-60
E-ISSN: 3025-6704
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24027411

The Cultural Machine of Interpretation: Nietzsche, Guattari, And Foucault on The Production of Meaning

Ferry Agustian Sukarno[1], Yohanes Maria Restu Dian Raharjo[2]
[1,2]Universitas Bunda Mulia

ARTICLE INFO
Article history:
Received 05 October 2026
Revised 15 October 2026
Accepted 29 October 2026
Available online 9 November 2026

Keywords
interpretation; culture; power; discourse; cultural machine

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.
Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Yayasan Daarul Huda

ABSTRACT
Human beings are simultaneously the producers and the products of the cultural machine of interpretation they themselves generate. Reading Friedrich Nietzsche, Félix Guattari, and Michel Foucault together yields a single layered model of that machine: interpretation as a drive that is never neutral but always imposes a particular perspective and value, expressed as the will to power; a mechanism through which that drive settles into culture as a machine that produces, reproduces, and standardizes texts, signs, and practices; and a set of discursive and disciplinary conditions, namely discourse, episteme, and biopolitics, through which that machine becomes socially operative. Four basic human potentials, intelligence, creativity, personality, and adaptability, serve as an anthropological starting point: the capacities through which human beings engage the world and are drawn to interpret it. On this basis, culture is better understood not as a finished outcome but as a temporary sedimentation of an unending, circular process: humans interpret the world and produce culture, while the culture thus produced returns, through its discourse and episteme, to shape humans as the subjects who interpret.

ABSTRAK
Manusia merupakan produsen sekaligus produk dari mesin kebudayaan dari penafsiran yang mereka ciptakan sendiri. Pembacaan terhadap karya Friedrich Nietzsche, Félix Guattari, dan Michel Foucault secara bersamaan menghasilkan sebuah model berjenjang mengenai mesin tersebut: penafsiran sebagai suatu dorongan yang tidak pernah netral melainkan senantiasa memaksakan perspektif dan nilai tertentu, yang diungkapkan sebagai kehendak untuk berkuasa (will to power); sebuah mekanisme yang melaluinya dorongan tersebut mengendap dalam budaya sebagai mesin yang memproduksi, mereproduksi, dan menstandardisasi teks, tanda, serta praktik; serta serangkaian kondisi diskursif dan disipliner yakni wacana, episteme, dan biopolitik yang memungkinkan mesin tersebut beroperasi secara sosial. Empat potensi dasar manusia (kecerdasan, kreativitas, kepribadian, dan kemampuan beradaptasi) menjadi titik tolak antropologis: kapasitas yang memungkinkan manusia berinteraksi dengan dunia dan terdorong untuk menafsirkannya. Berdasarkan hal ini, budaya lebih tepat dipahami bukan sebagai hasil akhir yang sudah selesai, melainkan sebagai pengendapan sementara dari sebuah siklus: manusia menafsirkan dunia dan menghasilkan budaya, sementara budaya yang dihasilkan itu kemudian kembali melalui wacana dan episteme yang budaya tersebut hasilkan untuk kemudian membentuk manusia sebagai subjek penafsir.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between language, interpretation, and culture has long attracted attention within the continental philosophical tradition, particularly through Friedrich Nietzsche, Félix Guattari, and Michel Foucault. All three are frequently cited in academic studies in Indonesia, but are generally applied separately. For instance, Nietzsche's concept of "will to power" is frequently discussed within methodological debates on interpreting philosophical texts (Nietzsche, 1968; Tandyanto, 2023). Meanwhile, the concept of "machine" from Deleuze & Guattari (1983) regarding the constant process of production and reproduction is frequently implemented as an analytical framework within studies on popular culture and consumerism (Nabilla, 2021), instead of being implemented as an independent conceptualisation to elaborate on culture in general. On the other hand, Foucault's concepts of "discourse", "episteme", and "power-knowledge relation" have been widely applied to study the phenomenon of subjectivity and power-knowledge relation

Corresponding Author
Email: ferriagustian@gmail.com

in broader contexts (Basaure, 2009; Candiotto, 2010; Poorghorban, 2023; Rachmad & Sasongko, 2023).

These three readings indicate that each framework possesses considerable explanatory strength at its own level. Nietzsche provides an account of what drives the interpretation process, or called the drive (Nietzsche, 1966, 1967, 1968). Then, Guattari provides an account of the mechanism of the way the interpretation process is produced and settles in a continuous manner (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983; Guattari, 1995; Mollison, 2022; Plé, 2021). Meanwhile, Foucault provides an account of how that mechanism of the interpretation process contextually and empirically operates at the level of knowledge and disciplinary enforcement (Foucault, 1970, 1972, 1977, 1978). However, these three readings are rarely brought together into a single layered account. Despite all this, minimal endeavor has been made to bring together these three conceptual frameworks into a single coherent and layered framework regarding how culture operates as the production "machine" of interpretation, which simultaneously shapes humans as the subject who interprets. Therefore, this article is trying to fill the gap by making an endeavor to do so.

Based on the gap explained above, this paper seeks to answer two fundamental questions. First, it seeks to answer how the human act of interpretation can be explained as a continuous process that moves from the drive (Nietzsche), through the mechanisms of cultural production and reproduction acting as a machine (Guattari), into its concrete operations at the levels of discourse, knowledge, and power (Foucault). Then, it also aims to answer how this interpretation process reshapes the human being as a subject who simultaneously interprets and is being interpreted by their own era.

The significance of this paper lies in its attempt to construct a conceptual framework that synthesizes three traditions of thought that have been discussed largely in isolation within the literature. By bringing Nietzsche, Guattari, and Foucault into a single coherent and layered framework, rather than merely implementing them as independent references, this paper aims to offer an alternative model for interpreting culture: viewing it not as a fixed end product, but as a dynamic "machine" for the production and reproduction of meaning, wherein human beings act simultaneously as both producers and products. This framework can subsequently serve as a foundation for further studies seeking to examine contemporary cultural phenomena more comprehensively, avoiding the pitfalls of applying a single theoretical framework in isolation from others.

METHOD

Research Approach

This study employs a qualitative approach utilizing a descriptive-interpretative library research design. This approach was selected based on the nature of the research subject, specifically philosophical ideas concerning interpretation, culture, and power, which cannot be addressed through quantitative measurement but instead require in-depth reading, comprehension, and interpretation of primary and secondary texts. Library research was chosen because the necessary data comprising the ideas of Nietzsche, Guattari, and Foucault, along with studies analyzing those ideas, are available in written form, ranging from primary philosophical works to scholarly journal articles that discuss and apply the thought of these three figures.

More specifically, this study employs a philosophical hermeneutics design as its methodological framework. This design was selected because the research objective is not merely to describe the ideas of each figure in isolation, but rather to interpret and synthesize them into a coherent conceptual model. A hermeneutic approach enables the researcher to move

dialectically between reading individual texts and interpreting the overall argumentative structure being constructed, a movement known in the hermeneutic tradition as the "hermeneutic circle," which involves a back-and-forth process between the parts and the whole until a complete and coherent understanding is achieved (Alsaigh & Coyne, 2021).

Source of Data

The data sources in this study are divided into two categories: primary and secondary. Primary data sources consist of the original works (or their translations) of the three figures who are the focus of the study, namely:

1. The works of Friedrich Nietzsche that address the concept of the “will to power”, in particular Beyond Good and Evil (1966) and the collection of notes published under the title The Will to Power (1968), and On the Genealogy of Morals (1967);
2. The works of Félix Guattari, both those co-authored with Gilles Deleuze entitled Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1983) and Guattari's independent work entitled Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm (1995), which address the concept of the desiring machine and the production of subjectivity;
3. The works of Michel Foucault that address discourse, episteme, and the power-knowledge relation, in particular The Archaeology of Knowledge (1972), The Order of Things (1970), and Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (1977).

The secondary texts are scholarly articles, national and international, that discuss, interpret, or apply the three figures' thoughts, including the studies reviewed above. These serve two purposes: checking that the reading of the primary texts does not drift from readings generally accepted among scholars, and mapping how far the three frameworks have, or have not, previously been woven together.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Data collection for this study was conducted using a documentary study technique, involving the (1) identification and (2) gathering of written texts relevant to the research focus. The process began by identifying key themes serving as the study's foundation: interpretation, the will to power, the machine, discourse, and *episteme*. Subsequently, the researcher located primary works and journal articles addressing these themes via scholarly databases and digital library catalogs. The gathered sources were then selected based on their relevance to the research's argumentative framework, prioritizing primary sources as the basis for understanding key concepts and secondary sources as references for mapping the current state of research. The selected data were recorded in a reading log and organized thematically—specifically around the impulse for interpretation, mechanisms of cultural production, and the workings of discourse—to facilitate a systematic analysis.

Data analysis of this study employed a hermeneutic-interpretive approach comprising three stages: (1) description, (2) interpretation, and (3) reflection or synthesis. In the description stage, key concepts, namely Nietzsche’s will to power, Guattari’s machine, and Foucault’s discourse and episteme, were outlined based on primary and secondary sources, without initially interlinking them. After that, the interpretation stage involved examining the meaning and implications of each concept in relation to the research questions, particularly in explaining the act of interpretation as part of cultural mechanisms. Finally, in the reflection or synthesis stage, these three frameworks were integrated into a coherent conceptual model: Nietzsche was used to explain the impulse for interpretation, Guattari to explain the mechanisms of its production, and Foucault to explain its operationalization within the realms of knowledge and power. The trustworthiness of the analysis results is ensured through source triangulation by comparing the understanding of key concepts in primary sources with interpretations found in secondary

sources, thereby ensuring that the resulting synthesis rests on an academic foundation rather than being merely the researcher's subjective interpretation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The five subsections below trace a single argument, from the drive behind interpretation, through its cultural and machinic production, to its concrete operation as discourse and power, rather than presenting Nietzsche, Guattari, and Foucault as three separate expository chapters.

The Four Fundamental Human Potentials as a Point of Departure

Human beings are creatures endowed with four fundamental potentials, namely (1) intelligence, (2) creativity, (3) personality, and (4) adaptability. Through these potentials, they undertake a wandering through the world: less a journey through space and time than an engagement with a world that presents itself as full of wonder, mystery, possibility, and unpredictability, provoking trembling, astonishment, and awe.

These four potentials are proposed here as the conceptual point of departure for this study, rather than a category drawn from established psychological or anthropological theory, and they serve as prerequisites for what follows. Intelligence lets human beings grasp and process the world; creativity lets them go beyond what is merely received through the senses to produce new meaning, a productive process social and cultural as much as individual (Lee, 2022); personality is the locus where interpretations settle as subjectivity; and adaptability is the bridge that lets human beings be reshaped by the very culture they produce, in line with findings linking cross-cultural adaptability to how individuals manage themselves within their social environment (Alifuddin & Widodo, 2022). These four potentials, in short, are not merely a list of traits but a mechanism that makes human beings interpreting creatures who are, at the same time, interpreted by their own culture.

Interpretation Is Not Neutral: The Drive (Nietzsche)

The concept of *"wonder and awe"* is what drives human beings to interpret. Human beings do more than experience the world. Instead, they seek to understand, articulate, and give meaning to the world. These actions unfold through language and text that function not only as means of communication but also as media for interpreting and giving meaning to the world. Thus, human beings may be understood as creatures who interpret or create interpretation.

However, the interpreting or interpretation process is not a solely passive and neutral activity. From the perspective grounded in the notion of *"will to power"* (Nietzsche, 1968), human beings do not simply receive the world as given. However, this perspective argues that human beings continuously interpret, assign value, and *"impose"* particular perspectives upon it. Within this context, *"the act of imposing"* does not simply mean repressive or violent actions; instead, it also names an effort to assert, expand, regulate, shape, direct, and overcome resistance (Park, 2022). As a result, the interpretation process can be read as the process in which human beings assert, expand, regulate, shape, direct, and constest the meanings and perspectives.

This reading on the concept of interpretation process can be anchored directly in Nietzsche's own texts. In the Genealogy of Morals, Nietzsche (1967) argues that the function of a thing is never fixed by its origin. Whatever exists is *"again and again reinterpreted to new ends, taken over, transformed, and redirected by some power superior to it"*, referring to a continuous sign-chain of ever new interpretations. By reading it this way, the concept of *"will to power"* is seen not merely a drive that accompanies interpretation, but it is a concept that operates within the interpretation by seizing on what is given and stamping the interpretation itself with new meanings. Furthermore, a parallel move also appears in Beyond Good and Evil, where Nietzsche (1966) treats even the physicist's *"conformity to law"* as itself an imposition of perspective, conceding

that *"this too is only interpretation"*. Finally, the Nachlass notes state the position more starkly still: *"there are no facts, only interpretations"* (Nietzsche, 1968). Those works show that Nietzsche always treats an idenfied stable meaning or fact not as a description existing independently of perspectives but as the current and constestable outcome of one perspective having prevaild over its rivals. As a result, within the context of Nietzche's concepts, the interpretation process can be read as a productive activity that involves both meaning discovery and production, which is in line with the contemporary studies on the concept of support (Anderson, 2024; Tandyanto, 2023).

Despite implicitly showing that the interpretation process always involves continuous meaning discovery and production, the concept is actually scattered across those three texts written for different purposes (Nietzsche, 1966, 1967, 1968). This results in the absence of an explicit and unified theory of the interpretation process, although those three texts can nevertheless be systematized to support an account of the *"will to power"* as the drive of *"interpretation"* or *"interpreting process"*. Filling this gap, this systematization is what this study performs towards textual material that Nietzsche left scattered rather than as a restatement of the thoughts he had already explicitly developed.

In conclusion, departing from Nietzsche's perspectives, the interpretation process is never entirely neutral because every interpretive act carries and embodies a particular perspective, value, and position, operating through not only repressive action but also persuasive mechanisms, language, education, norms, symbols, habits, and institutions. This dynamic is also reflected in genealogical study on Nietzschean morality shows in tracing how values emerge from historical dynamics of repression and power that become institutionalized as social norms (Hassan, 2021). Consequently, what counts as true, good, beautiful, or valuable always exists within a field of contestation among perspectives, a position reinforced by recent interpretations of Nietzschean perspectivism that rejects the possibility of a single and absolute representation of the world (Anderson, 2024).

From Interpretation to Cultural Production

Culture, on this view, is born from this activity of interpretation, but it does not remain a mere product of human activity. Once produced, culture reciprocally shape human beings as subjects. Through this reciprocal process, the adaptability, which is one of the four fundamental potentials of human beings, becomes manifest most clearly. In other words, human beings adapt to a culture that that is itself the product of their own interpretation. This relationship between human beings and culture reflects a broader dialectic process in which individual and social structures continuously shape one another, as recently reaffirmed in renewed studies of the social contrustion of reality (Fraser & Turcan, 2025).

In this sense, human beings remain creatures of *"nature"*, while becoming the human through *"culture"*. While *"nature"* refers to the biological given, *"culture"* denotes to the humanly produced order of meaning that reworks how the biological condition is interpreted and transformed. As a result, humans are born as natural organisms, although they become human subjects through language, signs, values, norms, and cultural institutions, which is in line a pattern documented in cross-cultural psychological research on how language and culture dynamically shape one another through development (Altarriba & Basnight-Brown, 2022).

Within this cultural and interpretive process, no language, word, phrase, or sentence can represent an entity in a final and exhaustive manner. All text leaves open possibilities of meaning that remain unarticulated, consistent with the hermeneutic claim that an object of interpretation possesses a *"primordial meaning"* that can never be fully grasped once and for all (Figal, 2023). Language and texts are also expressions of their historical circumstances, shaped by the social

conditions and power relations that enable their production. Nevertheless, once produced, a text does not remain confined to the context of its origin; instead, it enters into a network of relationships with other texts, signs, and cultural practices. This openness becomes particularly evident when texts cross linguistic and cultural boundaries, since translation may preserve an intended meaning while transforming or diminishing other dimensions of the source text. For example, Raharjo & Tarigan (2025) found that Indonesian idiomatic expressions were frequently rendered into English through paraphrase, which enabled learners to convey their intended meanings but often resulted in the loss of idiomatic and cultural nuance. This corresponds to the concept of intertextuality, which understands every text as emerging through the composition and interpretation of preceding texts (Guadu, 2023). A text therefore becomes part of an ongoing network of meaning production: it is interpreted, generates new texts or signs, and is subsequently interpreted again. Meaning thus remains an open-ended process rather than one that ultimately arrives at a fixed or final point.

Culture as Machinic Production (Guattari)

This notion of ongoing, unfolding production connects to Félix Guattari's concept of the *"machine"* developed chiefly in his account of the production of desire, subjectivity, and culture. For Guattari, a machine is far broader than a mechanical device that generates a product. It is an assemblage or productive mechanism enabling processes, relations, and production to unfold without a fixed endpoint (Guattari, 1995). This understanding is reflected both in studies applying the concept of the ongoing reproduction of desire in contemporary culture (Nabilla, 2021) and in Guattari's notion of ecosophy, where subjectivity is an emergent process always in the making (Plé, 2021).

What is therefore significant about a machine is not merely the product it generates but the mechanisms of production and reproduction through which production is continuously sustained. A machine does not produce something only once; rather, it enables production to recur through interconnected and organized procedures involving standards, divisions of labor, control mechanisms, rules, and institutions. Guattari emphasizes that maintaining a machine's operationality requires the continuous renewal of its components, while its reproducibility involves not mere programmed repetition but a process encompassing both ontogenetic and phylogenetic difference (Guattari, 1995). This principle can also be observed in visual media, where meaning is produced through the systematic organization of recurring formal elements. Sanjaya et al. (2025a), for example, show that cinematographic composition operates through arrangements such as visual balance, rule of thirds, and variations in looking room to produce particular emotional and symbolic effects; balanced compositions convey unity, whereas narrow or imbalanced compositions contribute to the dramatization of tension and sadness. A similar dynamic can be observed in organizational routines, which generate products while simultaneously reproducing patterns of action and social structures (Feldman & Pentland, 2022). The machine can thus be understood as a mechanism through which production, repetition, organization, standardization, and reproduction are continuously sustained.

Building on this framework, this study cautiously extends Guattari's *"machinic"* conception to propose the notion of a *"cultural machine"*. This formulation is not a concept that Guattari explicitly develops in these terms; rather, it constitutes a theoretical construction of this study that generalizes his conception of *"machinic"* production from the psychic and social registers in which it is developed to the broader register of culture. From this perspective, culture is understood not primarily as a collection of cultural products but as a network of mechanisms through which cultural production and reproduction are organized. These mechanisms include cultural procedures, standards, divisions of labor, control mechanisms, legal rules, institutions,

education systems, and forms of legitimation that shape what can be produced, accepted, disseminated, and reproduced as culture. Such an understanding is consistent with sociological research on the reproduction of culture across generations (Lu et al., 2022).

The Cultural Machine Is Productive, Not Merely Repressive (Foucault)

A question therefore remains concerning how the cultural machine concretely operates to shape human knowledge and subjectivity. Michel Foucault's concepts of discourse and *"episteme"* provide a more detailed account of this process (Foucault, 1970), although the connection between the two frameworks is a theoretical construction of this study rather than a position advanced by Foucault himself. Foucault did not present discourse, *"episteme"*, or biopolitics as completing a Guattarian machine, and his archaeology of knowledge developed independently of Guattari's machinic theory. Nevertheless, his analysis of power and knowledge offers a useful framework for specifying how the cultural mechanisms described above become effective in shaping what human beings can know, think, and become.

For Foucault, power does not simply reside above individuals and command them from an external position (Rachmad & Sasongko, 2023). Rather, it is dispersed throughout social relations, rules, norms, forms of knowledge, and even the ways in which individuals understand themselves: *"everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere"* (Foucault, 1978). From this perspective, language and interpretation, the cultural processes previously considered through Guattari's framework, are not merely neutral vehicles through which power is expressed but constitute part of the medium through which power operates and circulates (Poorghorban, 2023). Power therefore operates not only through explicit commands or coercion but also through the cultural and linguistic conditions within which knowledge and subjectivity are formed.

These conditions are encountered from the beginning of human life, since individuals enter cultural environments that already contain established languages, values, norms, and categories. Foucault refers to these underlying cultural codes as *"the fundamental codes of a culture... [that] establish for every man, from the very first, the empirical orders with which he will be dealing"* (Foucault, 1970). Human beings therefore do not encounter the world from a position of complete neutrality; they perceive and organize experience through categories already available within their culture, which can be understood, within the framework proposed here, as products and mechanisms of the cultural machine. The organization of visual signs similarly demonstrates how perception can be guided through culturally intelligible forms. Sanjaya et al. (2025b), for instance, show that cinematographic composition functions as a visual language in which the arrangement of elements within a frame directs audience attention and shapes emotional responses; their analysis associates visual balance with unity, while visual imbalance and restricted visual space communicate uneasiness, tension, and other emotional conditions. Discourse consequently does more than provide knowledge: it establishes the boundaries of what can be known, thought, said, and imagined, thereby constituting the *"conditions of possibility"* for what can count as knowledge or truth within a particular field (Foucault, 1972). The operation of discourse, however, depends on a deeper historical configuration that determines which forms of knowledge can emerge as possible in the first place.

This deeper configuration is what Foucault calls the *"episteme"*: the historical condition of possibility that makes particular forms of knowledge and discourse possible within a given time and space (Foucault, 1970). The *"episteme"* should therefore not be equated with a dominant discourse. Whereas a dominant discourse refers to a particular discursive formation that becomes influential or prevailing, the *"episteme"* refers to the underlying historical configuration that determines what can become intelligible and sayable as knowledge at all. In this sense,

discourse operates within the epistemic conditions that make its claims possible, while the *"episteme"* defines the broader field within which competing discourses can emerge and acquire meaning.

The distinction between discourse and episteme consequently shifts the analysis of human behavior from the content of particular statements to the historical conditions that make those statements intelligible and authoritative. Understanding human behavior within a given place and time therefore requires situating individual action within the discourse, discursive formation, or broader cultural machine through which it becomes meaningful, while also examining the historical formation of the mode of knowing that sustains it. Such an analysis asks how particular forms of knowledge acquire the status of truth, which institutions authorize and reproduce them, and which subjects are granted the authority to produce and circulate them. Epistemology, in this Foucauldian sense, cannot therefore be separated from the operation of power (Linda & Susilo, 2025). Once knowledge becomes organized through such relations of authority, its effects extend beyond what can be thought or said to how individuals and populations are governed.

These effects become particularly visible in Foucault's analysis of biopolitics, through which power operates at the level of populations by regulating life, health, bodies, and collective existence; related analyses connect this rationality to the broader concept of governmentality (Candiotto, 2010). Discourse provides the categories through which bodies and populations can first become intelligible and consequently governable, while disciplinary power acts primarily upon individual bodies and biopower operates at the level of populations. Governmentality further concerns the rationalities and techniques through which such populations are governed. Norms, classifications, surveillance, and other regulatory practices therefore depend upon discursive distinctions that make particular forms of intervention possible. Discourse is thus not itself reducible to an administrative instrument of power; rather, it constitutes a condition through which disciplinary, biopolitical, and governmental forms of power can be exercised.

Consequently, human beings are constantly situated within discursive relations of power that establish and reinforce distinctions between normal and deviant, true and false, and good and bad. These distinctions do not necessarily operate through direct coercion; they are also reproduced through norms, habits, education, institutions, and everyday practices. Power therefore works not only by prohibiting certain actions or expressions but also by producing the categories, forms of knowledge, and regimes of truth through which individuals come to understand themselves and the world. In this way, the cultural machine can be understood as operating through discursive and epistemic mechanisms that continuously produce, organize, and reproduce the conditions under which human subjects perceive reality and constitute themselves within it.

The Productive Circle

Read together rather than in isolation, the three frameworks outlined above yield a consequence that none produces on its own. The drive that Nietzsche locates in every act of interpretation cannot be understood as a pure or independent origin. By the time it operates through an actual interpreter, it has already been shaped by the cultural mechanisms of production and reproduction described through Guattari and conditioned by the discursive structures of possibility identified by Foucault. The perspective that an individual brings to the world is therefore partly constituted by the very cultural conditions that the individual subsequently participates in reproducing. What appears, from a purely Nietzschean perspective, as a spontaneous assertion of will can thus be understood within the combined framework as an interpretive act already conditioned by machinic and discursive processes.

This integrated perspective also has direct implications for understanding cultural change and resistance to dominant interpretations. A rival perspective, even when asserted with Nietzschean force, is not sufficient by itself to transform an existing cultural order. For such a perspective to become culturally effective, it must enter the mechanisms of production and reproduction described by Guattari and negotiate the Foucauldian discursive conditions that determine what can be recognized as intelligible and legitimate knowledge. Cultural change therefore requires movement across all three levels: a transformation in the values and perspectives asserted through interpretation, a corresponding transformation in what cultural mechanisms reproduce and standardize, and a shift in the discursive field through which the new perspective becomes intelligible as something other than deviance or error. A dissenting will to power may consequently fail to produce cultural change not because it lacks force or conviction, but because the prevailing discursive and cultural conditions prevent it from acquiring broader intelligibility and reproducibility.

Viewed in relation to the four potentials identified at the outset of this study (*intelligence, creativity, personality,* and *adaptability*) this integrated model further clarifies the role of these potentials in interpretation and cultural production. They should not be understood simply as individual faculties that exist in a fully formed state prior to cultural experience. Rather, they are themselves shaped through the cultural and discursive configurations that precede individual interpretation and are subsequently redeployed in further acts of interpretation and production. Human beings therefore occupy a dual position within the cultural machine: they are shaped by its existing structures while simultaneously contributing to their transformation and reproduction. They are neither merely the machine's raw material nor its autonomous engineers; they function simultaneously as its products, operators, and subsequent inputs.

Culture, accordingly, is better understood not as a final product of human activity but as the temporary stabilization of an ongoing process of production and reproduction. What appears at a particular historical moment as *"culture"* represents a provisional configuration within a process that remains open to further transformation, while what appears in a given era as "truth" reflects the epistemic conditions that determine its intelligibility and legitimacy at that time. Within this circulation, human beings interpret the world and produce cultural forms, while those forms are reproduced through cultural mechanisms, discourse, norms, and epistemic conditions that, in turn, shape subsequent human subjects and their modes of interpretation. The resulting process is recursive starting from (1) the interpretation producing texts and signs, being continued into (2) texts and signs entering networks of meaning and contributing to cultural production, and being followed (3) culture operates through machinic mechanisms of production and reproduction. Consequently, these mechanisms function within discursive and epistemic conditions that shape human beings including their potentials as subjects who interpret the world while being simultaneously formed by the historical world they inherit.

CONCLUSION

Based on the elaboration within the *"Findings & Discussion"* sections, the two central questions posed in the *"Introduction"* can now be answered. First, the human act of interpretation is best understood through three complementary layers, namely *(1) the drive*, *(2) machinic production*, and *(3) discursive-disciplinary operation*, rather than as a single and undifferentiated act. These layers are analytically interdependent: a perspective expressed through the will to power acquires cultural form only when it enters processes of production and reproduction, while its claims can function as knowledge only within discursive conditions that render them intelligible and legitimate. No single layer, therefore, is sufficient to explain why some

interpretations become culturally established while others remain isolated acts of will. Second, this process subsequently returns to the human beings who participate in it. The discourse, norms, and epistemic conditions reproduced through the cultural machine shape how subsequent interpreters perceive, think, and interpret the world. The four potentials identified at the outset (*intelligence, creativity, personality,* and *adaptability*) are consequently not fixed capacities operating independently of culture but capacities that are continually shaped and reworked through the cultural conditions they simultaneously help produce.

Taken together, these findings support the central claim of this study: culture is not a finished product of human activity but an ongoing process of meaning production and reproduction, in which any particular cultural form represents only a temporary stabilization. The principal contribution of the study is therefore the development of an integrative theoretical model that places three frameworks often treated separately into a common analytical structure. Nietzsche provides an account of the interpretive drive through the will to power; Guattari provides an account of the machinic processes through which production and reproduction are sustained; and Foucault provides an account of the discursive and epistemic conditions through which particular forms of knowledge and subjectivity become possible. Read together, these frameworks offer a layered explanation of how human interpretation produces culture, how culture is reproduced through institutional and discursive mechanisms, and how those mechanisms subsequently shape the human subjects who engage in further interpretation.

REFERENCES

Alifuddin, Moh., & Widodo, W. (2022). How Is Cultural Intelligence Related to Human Behavior? *Journal of Intelligence*, *10*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10010003

Alsaigh, R., & Coyne, I. (2021). Doing a hermeneutic phenomenology research underpinned by Gadamer's philosophy: A framework to facilitate data analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211047820

Altarriba, J., & Basnight-Brown, D. (2022). The psychology of communication: The interplay between language and culture trough time. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *53*(7–8), 860–874. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221114046

Anderson, R. L. (2024). What is Nietzschean about Nietzsche's perspectivism? Preliminary reflections. *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, *67*(5), 1193–1219. https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2023.2299348

Basaure, M. (2009). Foucault and the 'Anti-Oedipus movement': psychoanalysis as disciplinary power. *History of Psychiatry*, *20*(3), 340–359. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957154X08337638

Candiotto, C. (2010). The political governmentality in Foucault's thought. *Filosofia Unisinos – Unisinos Journal of Philosophy*, *11*(1), 33–43.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. R. Lane, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2022). Routine dynamics: Toward a critical conversation. *Strategic Organization*, *20*(4), 846–859. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221130876

Figal, G. (2023). The task of hermeneutics. *Critical Hermeneutics*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.13125/CH/5433

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human science* (English). Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A. M. S. Smith, Tran.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Tran.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (R. Hurley, Tran.). Pantheon Books.

Fraser, N. M., & Turcan, R. V. (2025). Reconstructing the social construction of reality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *76*(3), 657–662. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.13190

Guadu, A. (2023). Intertextuality as an inherent tool for the composition and interpretation of texts: A theoretical reappraisal. *International Journal of Literature and Arts*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijla.20231103.11

Guattari, F. (1995). *Chaosmosis: An ethico-aesthetic paradigm* (P. Bains & J. Pefanis, Trans.). Indiana University Press.

Hassan, P. (2021). Nietzsche's genealogical critique of morality & the historical zarathustra. *Ergo an Open Access Journal of Philosophy*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3998/ergo.1121

Lee, H.-K. (2022). Rethinking creativity: creative industries, AI and everyday creativity. *Media, Culture & Society*, *44*(3), 601–612. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221077009

Linda, L., & Susilo, D. (2025). Representation of female sexuality in the context of romantic relationships on @18FESSS social media accounts on X Platform (Twitter). *Journal of Science and Education*, *6*(1), 922–932. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.58905/jse.v6i1.557

Lu, Y., Scandurra, R., & Bonal, X. (2022). An integral model of cultural reproduction: The case of China. *Current Sociology*, *70*(6), 897–920. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921211028626

Mahon, M. (1992). *Foucault's Nietzschean genealogy: Truth, power, and the subject*. State University of New York Press.

Mollison, J. (2022). Deleuze's Nietzschean mutations: From the Will to Power and the Overman to Desiring-Production and Nomadism. *Deleuze and Guattari Studies*, *16*(3), 428–453. https://doi.org/10.3366/dlgs.2022.0485

Nabilla, A. (2021). Gaya Hidup Konsumerisme dan Komodifikasi Hijab di Era Instagram pada Akun Selebgram @Megaiskanti. *CONNECTED: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *2*(1), 71–83.

Nietzsche, F. (1966). *Beyond good and evil: Prelude to a philosophy of the future* (W. Kaufmann, Tran.; First Vintage Books). Random House, Inc.

Nietzsche, F. (1967). *On the genealogy of morals* (W. Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.; Vintage Books). Random House, Inc.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). *The will to power* (W. Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.; Vintage Books). Random House, Inc.

Park, J. (2022). Mengurai makna tokoh Saruta dalam komik Phoenix melalui pendekatan Roland Barthes. *SEMIOTIKA: Jurnal Komunikasi*, *16*(1), 24–35. https://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/semiotika/article/view/3492

Pesic, M. (2023). Critical discourse analysis as a critical social study: Norman Fairclough's approach. *Politička Revija*, *74*(4), 89–113. https://doi.org/10.22182/pr.7442022.4

Plé, N. (2021). Guattarian ecosophy. A thought of emergence. *Philosophy Kitchen*, *15*, 119–131. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.13135/2385-1945/6220

Poorghorban, Y. (2023). On Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge, discourse, and subjectivity. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *17*(2), 318–328. https://doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v17i2.9749

Rachmad, T. H., & Sasongko, Y. P. D. (2023). Moral genealogy of Michel Foucault in the Ad Hominem argument in the terminology of "Cicak" and "Buaya." *Jurnal Komunikasi*, *17*(2), 104–116. https://doi.org/10.21107/ilkom.v17i2.20121

Raharjo, Y. M. R. D., & Tarigan, V. I. K. (2025). English learners' Indonesian-English translation of idiomatic expressions within "Malin Kundang" folklore: Strategies, loss, and gain. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *16*(1), 2025. http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture

Saar, M. (2008). Understanding Genealogy: History, power, and the self. *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, *2*(3), 295–314. https://doi.org/10.1163/187226308X335976

Sanjaya, W., Thamrin, H., Chaysalina, I., & Sukarno, F. A. (2025a). Cinematographic composition in building the dramatization of sadness in "Akhir Tak Bahagia" music video. *Judikatif Jurnal*, *7*(2), 91–104.

Sanjaya, W., Thamrin, H., Chaysalina, I., & Sukarno, F. A. (2025b). Dramatisasi kegembiraan dan kesedihan pesan lirik lagu melalui komposisi visual pada video musik "Satu-satu." *Jurnal Desain*, *13*(1), 194–214. https://doi.org/10.30998/jd.v13i1.39

Tandyanto, Y. (2023). Reinterpeting Nietzsche: An introduction to the textualists' approach. *Jurnal Filsafat*, *33*(1), 154–177. https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.71785