Panoptic Power Space in *Travels in the Scriptorium* by Paul Auster

By

Abdul Wahid

M.Phil. (2021-2023)

Registration No: 02262111008

Area Study Centre for Africa, North and South America

Quaid-i-Azam University,

Islamabad.

2023

Panoptic Power Space in *Travels in the Scriptorium* by Paul Auster

QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY

ISLAMABAD

By

Abdul Wahid

Supervisor

Dr. Umaima Kamran

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

Masters of Philosophy in American Studies

Area Study Centre for Africa, North and South America

Quaid-i-Azam University,

Islamabad.

2023

Declaration

I declare that this thesis was composed by myself, that the work contained herein is my own except where explicitly stated otherwise in the text, and that this work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Abdul Wahid

Dedication

To myself, for the resilience and dedication that led me here.

To my parents, for their unwavering support and boundless love.

Together, we embrace the journey, forever united in purpose.

To each of you, my supervisor, professors, staff, friends, and DARBAR, your contributions have been integral to the completion of this thesis. I am deeply indebted to your support, guidance, and encouragement. Thank you for being a crucial part of this remarkable journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This study analyzes Paul Auster's *"Travels in the Scriptorium"* as a narrative of objectification and subjugation of the human subject. It examines disciplinary and confessionary techniques used as a tool of power to control and oppress the subject within enclosed space. The study explores the productive nature of space and the human self concerning power/knowledge, drawing on Michel Foucault's concepts of power, the panopticon, and human subjectivity found in *"Discipline and Punish"* and *"The History of Sexuality."* Other relevant works by Foucault, such as essays and lectures, are also considered to critically examine how the character Mr Blank is disciplined and objectified through the operation of power.

By examining societal physical spaces, such as jails, hospitals, and universities, the research provided insights into the underlying logic behind their construction as institutions that controlled and normalized human subjects. In modern times, methods of discipline, such as normalization and subtle control through surveillance, replaced torture and other forms of physical punishment. As a result, this work demonstrated the impact of these identified societal structures on the development of individual subjects. Thus, human subjectivity was perceived as the "micro-physics" effect of power/knowledge regimes.

Keywords   Power, Knowledge, Space, Panopticon, Self.

CHAPTER 1

1.1 Introduction

This thesis examined the productive nature of human subjectivity and space as products of certain power applications. For the purpose of understanding the central principle of the thesis, "subjectivity" and space concepts were treated distinctly and examined in relation to the idea of power. In the contemporary world, there existed an infinite number of procedures and techniques of human subjugation. However, this thesis focused on one method of disciplinary subjugation, namely "panopticism," a concept debated by Foucault in the twentieth century. During the process of disciplinary suppression, both space and individuals were objectified, reduced to mere objects subjected to the necessary exercise of power. In the later part of this thesis, the notion of "self" was discussed, primarily drawing from the volume *"The History of Sexuality, Volume 1,"* where confessionary techniques and strategies of the "self" were illustrated as methods for the production of individuality. Thus, the first part of this thesis focused on the panoptic method of self- or individuality-production, while the second part analyzed confessionary approaches to self-creation. The work was divided into chapters and sections to outline its discussion plan.

1.2 Background of the Research

In the novella, the character Mr. Blank finds himself confined within an enclosed room, unsure of his predicament. The room contains several objects, including a ceiling-mounted camera, an audio recorder, photographs, manuscripts, and a stack of files. This room serves as a multidimensional and complex representation of the prison as a disciplinary institution. Rather than depicting a "docile body," the room portrays a blank agency under constant surveillance. Through

the depiction of Mr. Blank's spatial confinement, the text presents a panoptic model wherein his subjectivity is subjected to various disciplinary techniques of power. Consequently, a significant portion of the novella explores the training of a docile body, employing power in conjunction with space management through observation, inspection, and the gaze as disciplinary procedures to subjugate the human subject (Blank) within the panoptic cell.

The field of space was regarded as an exporter of ideas rather than a consumer. Scholars in various academic domains increasingly engaged with geographers' insights to comprehend the social construction of space and its impact on human culture and society *(Ward and Arias, The Spatial Turn 1).* While numerous scholars had examined the concept of space, this work specifically focused on the perspectives of Foucault and Lefebvre. Additionally, literary writers, including Paul Auster, had explored the domain of space in their works. For instance, the article "Spaced-Out: Signification and Space in Paul Auster's *The New York Trilogy*" discussed the significance of space in Auster's literary oeuvre, it starts by stating:

> ―In Paul Auster's *The New York Trilogy,* we encounter genuinely puzzling characters and spaces: characters disappear from the space of the novel, characters seek to lose themselves by wandering through unfamiliar space…. By looking at how three spaces… function in the novels, we can see that thematically a relationship is established between selfhood, space, and signification (613)."

In the play *"Laurel and Hardy Go to Heaven,"* Auster's narrative has been treated in the context of spatiality. Ilana Shiloh in the work *"A Place both Imaginary and Realistic: Paul Auster's The Music of Chance,"* has travelled the spatial site:

─When I think of the wall, it's as if I were going beyond what I can think. It's so big, so much bigger than anything else. (Pause). And yet, in itself... in itself... it's just a wall. A wall can be many things, can't it? It can keep in or keep out. It can protect or destroy. It can help things... or make them worse. It can be part of something greater... Or only what it is. Do you see what I mean? It all depends on how you look (149)."

The author, Shiloh, explored the meaning of the wall not only as a physical barrier but also as a space with symbolic significance. In addition to Shiloh's works, there are other scholarly treatments of Auster's narratives, such as Brendan Martin's *"Auster's Literary Postmodernity,"* which examines a wide range of Auster's factual and fictional writings. Martin's work specifically delves into the concept of self and human subjectivity in relation to memory.

Auster's narratives were depicted as encompassing both space and the self, explored from multiple dimensions. However, among his works, *"Travels in the Scriptorium"* received minimal scholarly attention. One such article, *"Spaces of Memory: Performing Identity in Travels in the Scriptorium"* by Beatriz Solla Vilas, explored the spatial dimension of the novella in relation to human memory. This thesis aimed to address the research gap by examining the novella as a narrative of human subjugation within the context of space and its co-relationship with modern power. Additionally, Auster's narratives had not been extensively analyzed through the lens of Foucault's thoughts and theories. Therefore, this work *analyzed "Travels in the Scriptorium"* through the conceptual framework provided by Foucault.

In his influential work "Discipline and Punish," Foucault extensively discussed the concept of the panopticon as a highly effective mechanism for

controlling and shaping human subjects in accordance with the objectives of power. The panopticon is depicted as a powerful model of spatial control designed to exert continuous influence through surveillance and observation. Foucault views the panopticon as a surveillance technique employed to regulate the behaviour of individuals, replacing overt violence with a system of constant monitoring. Furthermore, Foucault highlights the parallel between the development of the "art of the human body" and the progress of Western Civilization. The techniques of disciplinary practices become the essential means of utilizing this art, constituting the cutting-edge "mechanics of power." By exploring what Foucault terms "political anatomy," we gain insight into how one can exert control over others' bodies to ensure compliance and dictate their functioning, techniques, speed, and efficiency. Consequently, discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies referred to as "docile bodies" (Foucault: pg. 139).

1.3 Research Questions

- How does the impersonal power in the text employ space as a tool for constructing and representing power?
- In what ways does the panoptic space within the text contribute to the objectification of the incarcerated subject?
- How do various social and disciplinary practices manifest the inextricable interrelation between space and the body?

1.4 Research Objectives

This research showed the subjugation of Mr. Blank as a docile body and vacant agency within a closed space in the story, according to the intentions of disciplinary power dynamics. It investigated how the human subject became an objectified subject

in relation to space through the use of disciplinary power. The key objective of this thesis was to demonstrate that *"Travels in the Scriptorium"* was not only the story of an author and the characters but also a text that contracted with the narration of human subjectivity in a space of contingency in relationship with power/knowledge realms. The study investigated how the closed space functioned as an expression of disciplinary power in the construction of human subjectivity. It also illustrated that space was a social reality and a setting for human actions that were produced by and affected certain forces of power/knowledge. The research showed that space itself became an expression of power and investigated the relationship of (enclosed) space with the human self and its influence on the development of human subjectivity, or in this case, Mr. Blank's self.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study aimed to explore the productive nature of both the "self" and space in relation to power. By examining societal physical spaces, such as jails, hospitals, and universities, the research provided insights into the underlying logic behind their construction as institutions that controlled and normalized human subjects. These spaces were not just physical structures but also architectural expressions of power, operating on the same principle as a prison within a model framework. In modern times, methods of discipline, such as normalization and subtle control through surveillance, replaced torture and other forms of physical punishment. As a result, this work demonstrated the impact of these identified societal structures on the development of individual subjects. Thus, human subjectivity was perceived as the "micro-physics" effect of power/knowledge regimes.

The second, but more significant, purpose of this study was to illuminate the concepts of norms and normalization as a complex network of societal forces that

regulate, oppress, and control human life. According to Foucault's perspective, the central objective of disciplinary power was to compel other forces to adopt the disciplinary viewpoint as the norm and to accept the set of disciplinary norms as absolute truth. Disciplinary power allowed those in positions of authority to dictate what was considered "normal" and then impose that notion on subordinates in the hierarchy. Over time, these exposed individuals came to perceive it as the new "normal." Thus, individuals were shaped and generated by the power structure, becoming subjects of its narrative of truth. This subtle form of oppression operated within society, molding individuals into politically compliant yet economically potent masses. The system aimed to curtail individuality, but at the same time, those who desired original and independent thought found themselves transgressing against the established norms.

1.6 Research Methodology

The method employed in this study was qualitative research, relying on secondary sources to gather data relevant to the research questions. To fulfill its investigative objectives, this work consisted of separate chapters dedicated to providing distinct descriptions of key concepts such as space, power, and human subjectivity. These concepts were thoroughly examined and analyzed through the lens of Foucault's scholarly contributions.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Paul Auster, a prominent figure in American postmodern literature, has captivated readers with his enigmatic and thought-provoking narratives. One of his intriguing works, *Travels in the Scriptorium*, published in 2006, explores the concepts of identity, memory, and storytelling within the context of fiction and metafiction. The novel is known for its complex and thought-provoking narrative, which challenges readers to question the boundaries between reality and fiction. This literature review aims to examine critical analyses and scholarly discussions of *Travels in the Scriptorium,* shedding light on its significance in the realm of postmodern fiction.

The narrative structure of *Travels in the Scriptorium* has intrigued critics and led to discussions about meta-fictional elements within the novel. Analysis by Thompson (2013) focuses on the blurred boundaries between reality and fiction, highlighting how Auster challenges traditional storytelling conventions to create an immersive and introspective reading experience. *Travels* belongs to the realm of postmodern fiction, a genre characterized by a self-conscious awareness of its status as a fictional construct and a tendency to challenge traditional literary conventions. The novel exemplifies several characteristics of postmodernism, such as questioning the nature of reality, playing with narrative structures, and exploring the fluidity of identity. One of the central meta-fictional elements in the novel is the concept of the scriptorium itself. The scriptorium is a mysterious room in which the protagonist, Mr. Blank, finds himself. He is surrounded by various objects and documents that seem to hold clues about his identity and past. This setting serves as a metaphor for the act of writing and storytelling. The scriptorium becomes a representation of the creative

process, where the author, like the scriptor, constructs a world and gives life to characters within the confines of the written page.

Furthermore, Auster's use of intertextuality is another metafictional aspect in *Travels in the Scriptorium*. The novel references and alludes to Auster's own previous works and characters, creating a web of connections that enrich the reading experience for those familiar with his bibliography. This intertextual play contributes to the sense of an interconnected literary universe and reinforces the idea that *Travels in the Scriptorium* is not an isolated work but part of a larger creative endeavour.

In the article ―Spaces of Memory: Performing Identity in *Travels in the Scriptorium*" the author has dealt with the ideas of space and identity in the text. How an incarcerated body is trying to shape his identity and within a confine space of a room? Mr. Blank the protagonist as understandable from his name is a blank agency. He is uncertain of his situation where does his body lies. He is confine in a lock room. He struggles with the past memory, objects in the room and significantly the visitors' which pay him more to de/construct his identity. Thus an empty agency is caused by the external objects of the surrounding space to reconstruct oneself in that given space. The author explains the concept of space narrated by different scholars and writers. The work marks space ―as an arena for human action" and ―subordinate to the concept of revolutionary time" (Alford 622).

The work further explains that human subject and space are inseparable. To be operational as a subject means to posit oneself in a certain space. Thus a body gives up its specific rights to be functional in that space. Meanwhile space is ―neither a _subject' nor an _object' but rather a social reality—that is to say, a set of relations and forms" (Lefebvre 116). Similarly, different social institution's space having their

own norms to operate the subject/self within it. Thus in the text Mr. Blank vacant agency is cause by the room objects which contains a table, a desk, a manuscript that all he reads as a text to get some sense of his own subject from his surround. Importantly the visitors whom he encounters to ask about his trapped and uncertain situation, they as an external force agents trying to shape and mold his body through their narratives and ideas.

In the essay *"A Foucauldian Reading of Paul Auster's Travels,"* the author perceives the text setting as a portrayal of a multifaceted prison, functioning as a disciplinary apparatus. The protagonist, confined in a locked room, undergoes a transformative process, assuming the consciousness of a prisoner, and attempts to unravel his predicament through the interpretation of clues provided by visitors and objects within the room. ―It is unclear to him where he is. In a room, yes, but in what building is this room located? In a house? In a hospital? In a prison?" (Auster: 2). As the protagonist reads a text and identifies himself as its author, the room's ambiguity aligns with Foucault's assertion that prisons, like other social institutions such as factories, schools, barracks, and hospitals, share analogous characteristics. The visitors who interact with Mr Blank, namely the nurses, ex-policeman, doctor, and lawyer, symbolically represent different prisons—hospitals, courts, and disciplinary institutions—enclosing the man within.

This thesis has ventured into a significant research gap by exploring the interplay between power/knowledge regimes and the constitution of the human self within the context of space. Unlike previous works, this study views both space and the human subject as products of the panoptic society, rather than considering them as independent entities. By adopting this perspective, the research delves into the

intricate connections between disciplinary power, spatial confinement, and the construction of human subjectivity.

Through an innovative approach, this thesis treats space not merely as a physical backdrop but as a social reality that is actively shaped by prevailing power dynamics. It recognizes that spatial arrangements, such as the closed setting of the scriptorium in "Travels in the Scriptorium," serve as expressions of disciplinary power, influencing the behaviours and experiences of the characters within it.

Furthermore, this study challenges traditional notions of the human subject as an autonomous agent, proposing instead that subjectivity is deeply entangled with the surrounding power/knowledge regimes. The panoptic society, characterized by surveillance and control, molds individuals' identities and agency, as exemplified in the novel's protagonist, Mr. Blank. His docile body and vacant agency within the confined space reflect the dominance of disciplinary power in shaping human subjectivity.

By investigating these connections between space, power/knowledge regimes, and human subjectivity, this research contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how individuals' identities are formed and influenced in contemporary society. It sheds light on the complex interdependencies between human beings and their spatial environments, paving the way for deeper insights into the relationship between power dynamics, subjectivity, and the broader social context. Ultimately, this thesis serves as a significant stepping stone in the exploration of the intricate mechanisms that shape the human self within the complexities of modern life.

CHAPTER 3

Theoretical Framework

The primary objective of this research was to investigate the construction and objectification of human subjectivity by power and knowledge regimes within enclosed spaces. To achieve this goal, it was crucial to establish a theoretical framework. The concepts of space and subjectivity were considered products influenced by specific power regimes. Of particular importance was the recognition that the organization of space played a significant role in exerting power and control over human actions and movements, thereby influencing subjectivity. While various scholars have explored the concepts of subjectivity and space, this study drew upon the conceptual framework provided by Foucault and Lefebvre to guide its investigation. Foucault's notion of the "panopticon" as a means to understand the function of enclosed spaces as prisons, and Lefebvre's concepts related to the production of space, were specifically chosen as the theoretical lenses for this research.

This work fundamentally draws upon Lefebvre's ideas to inquire about the production of space and, significantly, the constitution of an individual inside that space as a project of power. The protruding work ―The Production of Space" is the conclusion of a lasting intellectual job in which Lefebvre has pursued to comprehend the role of space, the significance of the urban setting, ―and the implication of everyday life in the perpetuation and super reproduction of the capitalist mode of production." He mentions that space is an arena for human actions and daily life happenings, as well as a project fashioned by the ―interests of classes, experts' roots, and other competing forces." It is not inherited from nature, passed on by the dead hand of ancient times, or discretely comprehended by the laws of spatial geometry as

per conventional location theory. Rather space is ―produced and reproduced"
according to power intentions, even if unforeseen consequences advance, and even
space constraints and other factors influence those who are producing it. Lefebvre
broadens the concept of space to include more than just a setting or neutral container
in which life occurs. Yes, it is the setting in which all the actions occur, but it is more
than that too. ―Architecture, human densities, and spatial relationships are all forces
that shape what can be done in space." They support the project of one and discourage
the aim of another.

This study will treat the idea of space as ―neither a ―subject" nor an ―object,"
but rather a social reality, that is to say, a set of relations and forms." Lefebvre defines
space in a very precise way, offering a meticulous account of its production, as he
explains:

―Space is not produced in the sense that a kilogram of sugar or a yard of cloth is
produced. Nor is it an aggregate of the places or locations of such products as sugar,
wheat, or cloth. Does it then come into being after the fashion of the superstructure?
Again, no. It would be more accurate to say that it is at once a precondition and a
result of social superstructures. The state and each of its constituent institutions call
for spaces ―but spaces which they can then organize according to their specific
requirements, so there is no sense in which space can be treated solely as an a priori
condition of these institutions and the state which presides over them (Lefebvre pg.
85)."

Second, the panopticon is a symbol of power to exert subtle control over
societal actions by erecting social institutions as a disciplinary apparatus to regulate
masses and individuals. The panopticon and panoptic power structures are in fact

spaces configured by power, ―in which the space itself becomes the source of the power… space is a resource for power, and thus it makes sense to investigate not space in general but rather systems of space-power co-relation" (Gordano, p. 95). As an investigation of this paper, by analyzing concrete space as a power dynamic, one gains the ability to think about and understand the structural logic of the construction of spaces such as prisons, hospitals, and schools, as well as see how power manifests itself through physical space.

In the story, Auster's Blank is reserved for an enclosed room. The room depicts a prison's multidimensional and complex role as a disciplinary mechanism apparatus, with ―a blank" agency or ―a docile body" existing within that apparatus. The room is enclosed, there is a camera in the ceiling as well as an audio recorder, there are many objects in the room, including photographs, manuscripts, and a pile of files, and most importantly, the inspection of the various visitors serves as a disciplinary coercion mechanism apparatus to device the subject's actions. This setting of the room offers a panopticon function in which surveillance of human subjects is in process. Thus, an exercise of power through observation, inspection, and gaze as a disciplinary tool is going on to subjugate the subject (Blank) inside a panoptic prison. Foucault, in ―Discipline and Punishment," maintains that prison has transformed the essence and appearance of punishment. The punishment presently enacted on criminals governs not only their physical lives, as in the past, but their whole existence. The overall regulation of the day-to-day life of the criminal, which is typical of the present-day prison, characterizes the modern-day surveillance authorized by modern disciplinary society (Foucault: p. 190-220).

According to Foucault, prison served as a model for other social institutions. The institutional control exercised in the prison is duplicated by other social

institutions such as hospitals, schools, and factories, and as a consequence, the typical control of the prison has become illustrative of the whole disciplinary social order. Blank also seeks to realize the reason behind his confinement: ―It is unclear to him where he is. In a room, yes, but in what building is this room located? In a house? In a hospital? In a prison?" (Auster: 2). Thus, wherever Blank's body is located, it is standing inside a panopticon, and his situation corresponds to Foucault's idea of resemblances between prison and other social institutions, therefore, no matter where Blank's body is located, it is always in control and inside the panoptic prison of societal power control.

CHAPTER 4

4.1.1 Space in the *"Travels in the Scriptorium"*

In his lecture ―*Of Other Space"*, Foucault notes that history was the nineteenth century's chief interest, with its focus on the previous cataclysms and turmoil as well as the expansion and progress of the current. But, in the words of Foucault, ―the present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space". He continues to argue that although the subject of space first emerged into public discourse after the Second World War, this epistemological dominance had probably already been active earlier. In this chapter this work will discuss the illustration of space in the novella *Travels in the Scriptorium* as an expression and production of power/knowledge regime to configure and style an essential subject such as Mr. Blank, of the story. It is a power driven space which frames individuals' behavior and attitude via the process of objectification and subtle control through surveillance. The manifestation of power regimes becomes obvious through diverse mechanism of special organization. In this section the ideas of Michel Foucault and Henry Lefebvre related to the production of space as a power consequence will be analyzed.

The thoughts Henry Lefebvre put forward in his work *"The Production of Space"* are an important intellectual undertaking that tried to understand the function of that space, the urban setting, and daily life played in the upkeep and expanded ―reproduction of the capitalist mode of production". This paper will draw upon the concepts of Lefebvre to examine the production of space and significantly an individual's constitution inside that produced space. Lefebvre claims that there has traditionally been a division between a few interconnected conceptualizations of space in Western thought: "physical space," or the space of nature, the Cosmos; "mental

space," or the space of formal abstraction about space; and, thirdly, "social space," or the space of social interaction. Lefebvre challenges all of these artificial differences and claims that they are all aspects of "social space," which is productive and falls within the focus of this inquiry as well. As a result, space would be regarded as "productive" or the production of power. In this approach, space is no more an inert surface or a blank slate; instead, it is produced. Lefebvre proposes a hermeneutic triangle to investigate space: "spatial practise," "representations of space," and "representational space" in order to examine its production. "Spatial practise" refers to a place that frames lived reality or the apparent space of daily ordinariness. It has relationships, networks, and patterns that connect people and places, pictures and realities, and leisure and labour. The conceived or conceptualised space created by urbanists, scientists, geographers, and social engineers is covered in Lefebvre's ‗Representations of space,' as an area where knowledge, power, ideology, signs, and codes interact. Their objective appearance is architecture, which is conceived of as a project embedded in a spatial context and a texture that calls for representations that will not vanish into the symbolic or imaginary realm. These depictions of space are intimately connected to production relations and are obvious through towers and monuments, in factories and office buildings. This aspect of space is what adopts a place's meaning by putting knowledge and ideology into practice. This space is undefined and absolute. By contrast, "representational space" is experienced through its mostly non-verbal pictures and symbols. The clandestine and hidden components of life may be related with this space, which disregards cohesion and uniformity regulations. This space pertains to the art. This is the area that imagination seeks to occupy and transform while using its physical characteristics symbolically. Lefebvre

talks about how this space is alive and speaks. It has a central or emotive idea, such as square, graveyard, church, or bedroom.

In order to better understand how space cannot be imagined without taking into account the creation of the other, third aspect of social space, this work takes Lefebvre's lesson into account. As space contains numerous currents, individual organisations and particularities, fairly constant points, movement patterns and flows, some of which are interpenetrating, others of which are in conflict, and so forth, space is not a static object, but rather an organic, alive, and "hyper-complex" entity. Thus, the connection between the perceived-conceived-lived areas is not steady nor amenable to linear understanding. Lefebvre had already stated explicitly that capitalism was in fact a profoundly territorial project in _The Survival of Capitalism':

> ─In the century after the publication of *Capital*, capitalism has succeeded in generating growth because it has been able to attenuate, if not completely resolve, its fundamental conflicts. We cannot calculate at what price but we know the means by occupying space, by producing a space."

This study depicts space primarily as a phenomenon that is socially produced. Lefebvre's concept of space is further comprehended in the essay *"The space of Lefebvre".* Space serves as a stage for human behaviour and everyday events. The project of space is moulded and formed by class interests, the backgrounds of experts, and other competing forces. According to standard location theory, it is not inherited from nature, transmitted either by dead hand of the past, or automatically understood by the laws of spatial geometry. It is created and propagated by humans, despite unintended effects, space limitations, and the influence of people who are making it. Lefebvre expands the notion of space as more than just a neutral setting or a container

for life. It is the location where all the action takes place, but it is much more than that. Architecture, population concentrations, and geographic relationships all influence what can be done in space. They support one person's initiative while obstructing another person's goal.

Thus, space is more than just a collection of components or a medium; it is also a web of geographical form, built-in surroundings, symbolic meaning, and daily schedules. People argue about the kind of reality it produces, not some kind of turf. According to this logic, space is no more a passive surface or a blank slate; rather, it is made, either for purposes of dominance or as an appropriation to satisfy human desires. It is used in dominance to facilitate the state's power and Lefebvre has referred to this abstract goal as the ―abstract space." In the latter scenario, space is divided up into real estate parcels for market exchange, with cubes and volumes defined and divided into tradeable commodities. Space is a result that represents the triumph of homogeneity and is a product in both its entirety and individual components. This work demonstrates how space is a social reality, or a collection of relations and shapes, rather than a subject or an object. Lefebvre elaborates on how precisely he defines space while providing a comprehensive narrative of its production:

> ―A yard of fabric or a kilogramme of sugar are not produced in the same way that space is. It is also not a compilation of the sites or areas where things like sugar, wheat, or textiles are produced. Does it then materialise in a manner similar to that of the superstructure? No once more. It would be more correct to argue that social superstructures are both a cause and an effect of it. There is no sense in which space can be considered merely as an a priori condition of these institutions and the state that governs them.

The state and each of its constituent institutions ask for spaces, but spaces which they can subsequently organize according to their individual requirements."

According to Lefebvre space is a social interaction and a product. One that, in actuality, is fundamental to property relationships and is intricately linked to the forces driving production. For him, ―though a product to be used, to be consumed, it is also a means of production; networks of exchange and flows of raw materials and energy fashion space and are determined by it" (85). The concept of space and its connection to the subject (Mr. Blank) will be examined in the chapters that follow in relation to power.

4.1.2 Space and body Correlation

If space is a created product, it must have a producer. Lefebvre asserts that the body generates space, but not in the sense that occupation may be considered to produce spatiality. Instead, the development of the body in space and its occupation of space are directly related to one another. As a result, everybody not only makes and has space, but it also is space. People therefore build a space around themselves and make themselves the focus of it whenever they situate themselves in any region. The competition for the de/territorialization of space put forward by Deleuze and Guattari then proves to be true. It has been explained that when someone is put in a space or thinks about it, they may unintentionally or intentionally appropriate it. When there are several subjects occupying the same place, a conflict arises over the territorialization of the area, or the competence of each subject to hold it. ―This clash, which takes place in open and closed, public and private areas, is not a struggle for a physical space, but rather one for a redefining of this space," the author writes in the

piece. Each of the characters in a space wants to claim it as their own, and they use their discourse as a tool to show off their dominance.

"American Space/American Place: Geographies of the United States," by John Agnew, begins with the following sentence:

> ‒Space denotes a field of endeavour or region in which a group of individuals or an organisation functions, kept together in the popular consciousness by a map-image and a narrative or a story that conveys it as a meaningful totality. Place is the point in space where humans come into contact with other people and objects. It speaks to the ways in which some social groupings and organisations engrave daily life in space and give it significance. Powerful individuals exerting their influence and narratives on others might be considered ‗top-down' actors in space. The perspectives and behaviours of more common people are represented by place, which can be thought of as ‗bottom-up.'"

Space has been characterised in the article *"A Journey from Place to Space in the Humanities"* as the "abstract" and "intangible-reality" that could be created. Since space is what we long for and it is still out there as an imaginative and intangible world, the work addresses the concept of space from Yi-Fu Tuan's book ‒*Space and Place."* In his book, Yi-Fu Tuan explains the concept of space in relation to place and establishes a distinction between the two, stating that "'Space' is more abstract than 'place.'" As we learn to know it better and give it worth, what starts out as undifferentiated space transforms into location (p. 6). In other words, space has abstract value and is an undifferentiated intangible reality. However, Tuan describes the value of space as "a concretion of value" when it becomes a place (p. 12).

Power connections thereby establish a connection between space and the body. The arrangement of the human body in a specific frame of constructed space produces a necessary, submissive, and effective ‗body,' which is how the exercise of power becomes expressive. If there is no body present in the measured space, the function of that found space also becomes meaningless. This work provides a discussion in the following chapter to go into additional detail about the organization and structure of created space.

4.1.3 Spatial Organization

Foucault developed the idea of the panopticon as a machine of power to hold and mold individuals in accordance with the demands of the power objectives in his well-known book ―*Discipline and Punishment*." It was designed as a place where power may be used constantly and without disruption. By describing a plague-stricken town in the seventeenth century where authorities used surveillance to stop the spread of the disease, Foucault presents the model of the panopticon as a power-driven environment or space. First, the town's strict ‗spatial organization' isolates its residents, and the division of the town into distinct localities, each of which is under the control of a power authority. ―It is a segmented, immobile, frozen space." Each person is firmly fixed in his place and is not allowed to move. Everywhere, the gaze is alert, and investigation never ceases. (Foucault: p 22)

In his book ―*Travels in the Scriptorium,*" Paul Auster describes this type of spatial division. An old man named Mr. Blank has been confined in a room as the *object* of an investigation. In the same way that the panoptic running of the space in the text is mirrored, the room functions as a panoptic cell and allows for intense monitoring, daily checkups, and assessment of Mr. Blank's condition. Weapons, physical violence, or material restraints are not required to control an individual, or

Mr. Blank in this case; all that is required is a gaze. This monitoring is done by each person both for and against themselves. It aims to stop people from doing malevolent and, in fact, to undermine their very desire to do so. Modern society runs along this driving idea in spaces like schools, hospitals, jails, malls, and airports. Any other modern institution or public space is set up using the panopticon idea. Let's talk about some of the instances where power was used to construct space in order to make particular knowledge and power ideas available and successful.

A "genealogical" study of Foucault's archaeological investigation on man as the subject who knows and the object of knowledge is presented in *"The Subject and Power."* In this essay, Foucault lists three ways that individuals might be objectified—or turned into things. The first technique for turning people into things or object is known as "dividing practises." Foucault cites a few instances, including the isolation of lepers during the Middle Ages, the development of current psychiatry centers, institutions and their establishment into hospitals, jails, and clinics during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, as well as the medicalization, stigmatisation, and normalisation of sexual deviance in contemporary Europe. Similar to Mr. Blank in the narrative, the subject/occupants in each of these examples is objectified through a method of separation, whether from himself or from others, utilising a variety of disciplinary ways and with varying degrees of effectiveness. Through this process of institutional objectification and categorization, individuals are given a sense of identity. Practices that combine exclusion with scientific mediation—often in a spatial sense, but always in a social one—are essentially distinct from other practises. The subject of Auster's text, Blank, is significantly shaped by these power-division procedures; otherwise, he would just be a blank subject, with power controlling his entire behaviour in a well regulated power-space.

In-depth researches engaged in current on the idea that space and spatial organisation are created and structured in and by the structure and dynamics of social relationships. We have been taught that space is about social relations and that spatial properties are constructed in and through a myriad of social processes that unfold at various social levels and geographical scales by Marxists, realists and structuralists, post-structuralists, deconstructionists, and an entire host of many other ‗-ists,‗ all with great variation and friendly critique. Similar to how machinery and equipment in a corporation or factory increase productive forces, but on a different level, so does the spatial organisation of a city, a region, a country, or a continent. One employs space in the same way that one uses a machine. As a result, social space is taken into account in the contemporary mode of production along with the productive forces and ways of its production.

Another illustration of spatial organisation is Lefebvre's claim that how as a result of globalisation, many ideas, beliefs, and desired patterns come into conflict on a global scale and are all put to the test ‖by space." The stakes are significant because without a space, classes or groups ‖cannot establish themselves or recognise one another as subjects". This statement helps explain the dissolution of European governments that we have seen in the near past, even though he could not have had had it in mind. Stability is particularly improbable if many modes of generating space are permitted to compete near to one another. Special interests attempt to carve their social vision into the land after being freed from the Soviet Empire in order to sustain and develop a culture. Ideas, beliefs, and lifestyles that don't make their stamp on the space and don't create the right morphology will become meaningless signs, amorphous descriptions, or fantastical ideas. The creation of space is not accidental; it is a systematic process.

The fundamental genius of the panoptic society and foucauldian power is how simple it is to create the panoptic society as the accepted *norm*. A populace is indoctrinated into panoptic modalities at a young age, which makes them docile and willing to accept the purpose of the panoptic institutions. Timothy Mitchell's book ―Colonizing Egypt" illustrates that panoptic mechanisms of power were used at all social strata to strengthen the colonial realm in Egypt during the 19th century. The entire community was constructed by the government in a modular style, with living spaces that could be changed according to the number of people occupying the unit. Due to the concentration of these settlements, it was simple for the authorities of the regime to monitor the populations, as well as the actions and movements of the inhabitants, and to continue to be both covert and overtly involved in their daily lives. In Lancaster, boys attended classes to help them become ready for the military. There, a rigid daily routine with precise time slots set aside for each waking minute and stringent regulations was used to encourage discipline. They were made docile and malleable through physical coercion and discipline, and they were placed in the disciplinary frame. Even though they received their training and education together, they were psychologically separated to help them submit to authority more readily. Throughout history, the spatial arrangement has been created to aid the powerful in controlling populations and changing their conduct. Timothy Mitchell goes into great length in his book *Colonizing Egypt* about the Foucaultian techniques used to synchronise many aspects of Egyptian society. The Lancaster schools prepared young men for military duty by demanding rigorous observance of daily routines and social customs. Settlements were constructed using modular structures that could be modified to meet the specific desires of the occupants. The book presents a well-researched example of historical panopticism in the old-style, where the gaze is very

physical, very tangible, and where the hierarchical power structure is in apparent, and people were made to follow a rigid timetable that eliminated any sense of uniqueness while being told how to stand or sit and behave on their masters' commands.

All of these brief historical incidents demonstrate the precise spatial organisation of the surrounding environments as well as the organisers' fundamental goals to produce the necessary and obedient objects or people there. It demonstrates how certain necessary subjects can be produced through a particular spatial structure that is shaped and controlled by power regimes.

4.1.4 Space as Power Expression

The panopticon has repeatedly shown to be ineffective when employed as Bentham originally intended. The panoptic theory has not, however, also been a failure, despite what it might imply. The panopticon and other panoptic power structures are examples of spaces that are built by power and "make the place itself the source of power." It makes sense to concentrate on the connections between space and power rather than space in general since space is a source of power. By considering physical spaces as an expression of power dynamics, we are able to consider and appreciate the structural rationale behind the creation of places like prisons, hospitals, schools, and industries. We may also see how effectively the power dynamic is expressed in actual physical settings. The ability to examine power relations objectively is made possible by inquiry into the technologies that enable them. According to Johanna Oksala's article, *"Freedom and Bodies,"* we never escape the circuits of power that outline our lives, but we always have an opportunity for thinking and doing differently within them. Even though nothing is always possible while one is free, one's current way of thinking and being is also not required. It is extremely difficult to truly be free of the systems of power that society has established

to control and coerce those who dwell in it, that is proven even more difficult if someone chooses to remain a member of society. As a result, because the observer is touched by these power systems, it is also impossible to view them totally objectively. Foucauldian theory, on the other hand, supports focusing just at power structures that such an observer can see clearly, such as prisoners in a prison, and relating what can be seen there to the environment one is in.

The tangible character of the techniques and tools that are used distinguishes contemporary disciplinary panopticism out of its original Benthamite paradigm. Technology has improved, distorting and changing the panoptic design that Bentham originally intended to use in his prisons while taking use of the panopticon's flaws in terms of physical operation and underlying ideology to change society. Humans have been freed from physical restraints, but mental stuff have taken their place as norms, and how internalization of these laws, norms has taken the place of exterior violence is one of *Discipline and Punishment's* central concerns. The establishment of the asylum might be viewed as a critique of contemporary awareness and an allusion on the formation of subjectivity.

4.2.1 Foucauldian Power Model in "*Travels in the Scriptorium*"

The goal of this section of the study is to outline the fundamental idea of contemporary power and how it operates to produce and direct the behaviour of individuals or groups, like in the case of Auster's hero Mr. Blank, that how does Mr. Blank's subjectivity manifest itself in the narrative through the use of various power mechanisms? The traditional understanding of political power, which connects it to concepts of sovereign and the state, is thrown upside down by Foucault. He replaces this terminology with another that is better equipped to describe the growth in

administrative powers that manage life without the need for the state's organisation or its laws. By using the conceptual tools that Foucault offers, we can more fully comprehend contemporary institutions and discourse patterns as well as his recommendations for solving issues relating to contemporary power relations. The sovereignty over people's lives is no longer exercised in modern society, according to Foucault's description of power relationships. Instead, he contends, human existence is now created by being "governed" from the inside out, through the insertions of mixed discourses. Mr. Blank is a subject that is governed and controlled by the exercise of power. In Blank's scenario, the embodiment of power play is vibrant.

The first book of ―The History of Sexuality" begins with a discussion of the key components of what Foucault refers to as the "repressive hypothesis." This viewpoint contends that repression or prohibition are the primary ways in which power manifests itself in daily life. This is especially evident in the field of sexuality, but the fundamental pattern is present in every aspect of power in addition to in the matter of the book. "Power acts by binding and fettering agents to prohibit actions from becoming performed, words from being expressed, and thoughts from being thought," claims the repressive hypothesis. Foucault wants to know what exactly has been bound and restrained, not really what or whoever is conducting the binding. By looking into this, Foucault highlights the view of human nature that is included in such urges to power as repression. Repression and liberation only make sense when a [power] foundation is present. An understanding of power as repression may incorporate untested presumptions about the nature of what is suppressed into its model, which ironically could serve to strengthen the power relations that liberation is meant to weaken. In addition, Foucault expresses scepticism on the connection between sex and the worst aspects of human nature. According to Foucault, this

appears to preserve the key components of the philosophical framework that initially "repressed" sex.

Repressive hypothesis appears harsh in its attack on the restrictions imposed by the power elite and in its claim that what has been suppressed would now be freed. The understanding of the human subject established by the instincts and urges that are later suppressed is what this assessment keeps intact and assumes. By applying Foucault's critique, what once appeared to be a freedom can now be seen as a deep entrenchment of a specific interpretation of the subject. The actual activity of power, according to Foucault, is the production of this subject and the desire that it engenders. Therefore, since conduct and needs of the subject are so closely correlated with power, the subject's freedom is no more an attempt to escape power than the initial suppression was. By releasing need and its expression inside the subject, one would be merely granting a power that used itself to create these very desires full run. If there is a desire, Foucault notes, "the power connection is already present; [it is] an illusion to accuse this relation for a repression imposed after the act; but vanity as well, to go seeking a desire that is outside the grasp of power." There is no unregulated pure self that exists within power dynamics and may be freed from restraint.

Looking at the five ideas that Foucault makes about power will help us better comprehend what he means by it in contrast to the juridical-discursive model that he criticises. First off, one cannot think of power as something they can have or own. The illusion that the subject is above power and that the person's acts are somehow unrelated to the workings of power would so continue. Instead, according to Foucault, the problem is a design of power, and this power is so intricately tangled with the subject that it is impossible to speak of the subject without reference to power

relations. Second, power does not just restrict certain manifestations in order to dominate other relations (such as sexual, financial, and familial ones). These relationships naturally contain power, which contributes to their unique nature. However, there is no method for distinguishing which aspects of these relationships are used to produce power from those that are natural or unavoidable. From the previously discussed viewpoints, Foucault's claim about the usefulness of power is clear. Repression and prohibition are neither the exclusive or even the main instruments of power. The third idea put out by Foucault is that control doesn't merely limit a subject and its relationships; rather, it constructs them. Furthermore, the problem is not a fundamental exercise of power. This is to say that, in Foucault's view, human subjectivity is a situational reality brought about by the specific ways in which power is manifested in distinct cultures. In more than one work, Foucault argues that it could be conceivable to pinpoint the moment when power started to manifest itself through the context of human subjectivity. Fourth, Foucault rejects the notion that one can hold or acquire power, and connected to this rejection, he also contends that power emanates from below rather than from above, thus power Relationships cannot be defined as the supremacy of one oppressed group over another, nor can power be wielded by those in positions of authority over others at the bottom of a hierarchy. Additionally, Foucault suggests that we stop thinking of power as merely separating the world into rulers and the ruled in the metaphor "to cut off the king's head." In accordance with Foucault, the numerous power relationships that emerge and are active in the mechanisms of production, in families, small groups, and institutions, set the groundwork for the extensive effects of cleavage that permeate the social body as a whole. More complicated than interactions between those above and below are the power relationships that bind people together. Power can be seen as an

interconnected network in which everyone is based. Each component in the web has an impact on the others, some more so than others, but no component is immune to its movement.

However, Foucault also has difficulty demonstrating that, despite being intentional and purposeful, power encounters are universal and apply to all subjects. Foucault is not a conspiracy theorist, implying that the plan for establishing power relations in society is hidden away in a safe. Even while the sensation of power may be obvious, this does not entail that those who create the means of power have articulated it or planned its objectives. This relates to the claim made earlier that a subject cannot own or attain authority. The argument Foucault is developing is that because ties of power are at the core of the subject, it is difficult to comprehend the accumulation of power as though it were the option of a subject who could just as readily choose some other expression. Attributing aim without subjectivity is difficult. Although the acts of power fall below the threshold of subjective intention and purpose, this does not imply that they are entirely devoid of these elements.

If we accept the aforementioned assertions made by Foucault regarding power, we would get hopelessly entangled in these ties. Foucault seems to suggest that even our desire for liberation from these forms of domination merely serves to ensnare us even more tightly. However, for Foucault, it is not essential to make an effort to live without power relations. This would be challenging. We must recognise that every form of power creates the possibility of a form of resistance through its form. Power consistently generates more force than is necessary to accomplish its goals when it is applied. The likelihood of opposition to power moves is represented by this excess. Every space where power is used has the potential for this pushback. To accept the duality between freedom and power, which Foucault opposes, is to succumb to

desolation since power is constant and constantly present. It is incorrect to say that freedom can only exist when there is no power. Instead, according to Foucault, "if there are power relations in every social domain, this is because there is freedom everywhere." For Foucault, the most important thing is to promote behaviours free of dominance rather than freedom exercises that are bound by power.

It is implied in Foucault's *Sexuality* that human subjectivity is a creation of power dynamics, although much of the development of this idea is described in earlier work, ‒*Discipline and Punishment".* In this book, he examines the development of modern prison to demonstrate how political subjectivity is changing. Prior to the modern era, Foucault claims, punishment was ceremonial, in which the sovereign formed the truth therefore, through confession, the one who was blamed participated in it and was condemned. It served as a demonstration of the sovereign's authority and of his or her unique capacity to create the truth—specifically, the truth about the crime and the punishment for it.

According to Foucault, humanitarian concerns serve as a disguise and a distraction from the methods wherein power affairs are reorganised within societal structure and the body of the lawbreaker throughout the reforms period that happened mostly in 18th and 19th centuries and gave rise to the prison. The criminal's status as a jurisdictive subject, or the soul as Foucault suggestively but sometimes misleadingly refers to it, has taken the place of the body and its pain and discomfort as the object of criminal torture. The discussion of the immoral act that a sovereign punishes by working on the offender's body did not last very long. Instead, it becomes the responsibility of the legal system to keep the delinquency linked to the criminal out. In order to achieve this, it becomes crucial that the criminal's confession of wishes, habits, and fancies, which was so crucial in establishing the truth of the criminal's

immorality in the previous model, be continued. This reform is a rebuilding of the immoral in impulses and habits, necessitating a more or less comprehensive surveillance as well as a consistent and uniform use of disciplinary power to the individual. This criterion establishes the jail as a complete institution, with its unavoidable control over time and space.

The second subject matter of *Discipline* is that the law, which serves as a symbol of power, is replaced in disciplinary institutions with the norm, which is not violated but deviated from, together with the results of compliance and offence. With its reliance on a notion of law and disobedience, the sovereignty model of power is shown to be inadequate by this development. The norm serves as a baseline against which an individual is evaluated so that a punishment can always be determined precisely in relation to the aberrant individual. This punishment seeks reformation or correction rather than punishment or suppression. Ironically, the frame against which the person has measured normalises by identifying the source of this difference in terms of its own sets while also allowing for difference and individualization. This is a portion of what Foucault means when he says that the exercise of normalising power is what gave rise to the modern distinct subject. Adopting the disciplinary framework in which one finds oneself establishes one as a subject and an individual. This entails recreating behaviours and motivations within the framework of an external norm. As previously said, it goes without saying that such reconstruction will inevitably contain excesses that were not anticipated at the time it was implemented. Similar to how there are always several simultaneous reconstructions of various norms that occasionally compliment one another, occasionally put one another in conflict, and occasionally even contribute to the ongoing struggle. This fact indicates that resistance is conceivable even when there is no fundamental aspect of human nature

that can be used to object to a norm. In actuality, it is the only argument for this fundamental human nature that allows one to oppose the relationships of power responsible for creating the rules that establish it. Power interactions create "games of truth" and contests of domination and opposition in an unstable and ever-changing environment.

In his own account of the disciplined reconstruction of the person and the extension of the social scientific system, Foucault provides a crucial illustration of the ways in which his work on the disciplines included in penitent practise might be extended outside the walls of the jail. The success of corrective approach in establishing human subjectivity has made it possible to observe and predict the behaviour of a large number of people. Contrary to popular belief, Foucault claims that the practises of discipline did not rely on social scientific ideas but rather that these theories were based on how the individual was moulded within the disciplinary institutions. Naturally, the dependency is not as mild as this suggests. The disciplines and social science worked together to create a docile and productive human subjectivity. The industrial capitalism organisations were the setting in which this alliance of disciplinary approaches and the scientific comprehension of persons was initially realized. Foucault wonders how all of the institutions of early capitalism come to resemble prisons. Schools, hospitals, factories, and the armed forces all use different techniques from those used in jails but adopt procedures that are motivated by the same objectives of enhanced output and subjection. Space and time are rigorously segregated and meticulously focused toward effectiveness in these institutions. People are positioned inside these infrastructures and fashioned like objects to unrestrictedly conform to them. Human bodies are inserted into capitalism's mechanism through these institutions.

According to Foucault, the use of what he refers to as "micro power" is one of the factors that determines how well discipline works. This term describes the features of power as a tool that can be utilised to influence behaviour at a level lower even than the person, rather than only as something that is imposed from above. To enable an anticipated and completely proficient action, each part of the body is divided and trained in a specific motion. By using military drills to impose both skill and regularity, the simple act of putting a gun to one's shoulder was broken up into multiple distinct actions, according to Foucault. The assembly line and other early capitalist methods make extensive use of this discipline practise. The fact that no single person is perceived to have made up the norm characterises this form of power. A potential for resistance and insurrection was established when the supreme implemented a law by punishing a lawbreaker at the location where the lawbreaking and the offender were divided. When disciplinary power is used, there is no room for protest. The extensive institutional framework in which the subject learns about itself assumes the reliability and, in actuality, the necessity of the rules represented in it. The subject's presence in this structure occupies it to such a high degree in the development of these standards that it is possible to say that now the norms have indeed been embedded into the subject's structure.

The work ―*The Foucauldian Concept of Power"* discusses Foucault's theory of power, which holds that power is the ability of one entity to direct the actions of another entity. These links appear to be present in every aspect of life. In the view of the author, Foucault defines power as the assortment of force relationships that are intrinsic in the area in which they function and that establish their own organisation. According to Foucault, the absolute or sovereign authority served as a symbol of power in mediaeval civilizations, and it used awful brutality to exercise its

dominance. The development of a new power mechanism with extremely specialised procedural skills led to a change in the way that power is exercised in modern society. To subjugate, soft disciplinary power has replaced terrible power. A strategic position or network of relationships can give rise to power. It is not anybody's power since it is a network of connections between acts rather than between actors. Nobody can escape the network. Defiance involves cooperating with power rather than challenging it. To be free from power, one must be completely alone and devoid of every enculturation that makes social creatures. Power cannot or will not be escaped. When there are multiple agents, a complicated web of constraining interactions starts to take shape. The key idea is that interpersonal connection is impossible in the absence of power dynamics. In the world in which humans act as both agents and subjects, power is an omnipresent force that cannot be taken, acquired, or shared. Power needs to be evaluated to determine whether it circulates or simply works in a chain. It is never appropriated as money or a commodity, scattered around, or in the possession of any one. It is employed and exercised using a net-like framework. People continuously are placed in a position to both move along its thread and experience and wield its power. Power could not be in the hands of the state or any other kind of group or organisation. Instead, it symbolises a collection of relationships between groups, teams, and people that only exist when it is in use. The only time a ruler is seen as a ruler is when he has subjects. It is therefore a collection of interpersonal connections that either already exist or are purposefully imposed by social organisations. There are complex sets of power relations that have solidified into institutions and governments at every level of a social organisation. The essay goes on to explain how power is not regarded as a link between the oppressed and the oppressor but rather as a network of linkages or chains that extend across society. The individual is where power is exerted

and where it is challenged; the subject is the pipeline of power, not its application point.

According to Foucault, monarch authority was clearly visible in the ancient form of power and was frequently on display. These power interactions are opposed by disciplinary power. Power now actively seeks concealment, and the object it works on is made visible. The secret of the disciplinary power apparatus is the outcome of constant lookout. According to Foucault, modernity should reconsider the power of exceptional effects, therefore the significance of monitoring does not belong in the prison but rather in the institute. Knowledge is the checking, reasoning, and ideological inspiration in panoptic space, with the power being the reason that a structure or institute exists. The running of power/knowledge as a disciplinary and normalising force is connected by the tool of the gaze. It exerts control because a control mechanism is impossible to have without control. Justifying and distinguishing such space in any clear structural arrangement stays ineffective unless and until that information is ignored and undervalued. The purpose of space is to provide observation, the possibility of punishment, and corrective action. The dynamic force is what forces normalisation. The organisation and division of a prison or other institution's space would only be ghost design if panopticon inspection goes unobserved.

The idea of power in Foucault is not domination. It consists of a complicated network of control, compliance, and oppositional behaviours. Power restricts actions rather than people. People who act in ways to surreptitiously and anonymously affect other people's decisions and behaviours are said to have power. Instead of simple control, this system of power aims for irresistible managing, which can be accomplished through enforcing restrictions and limitations. In Foucault's analysis of

the subject, a fresh explanation of how unavoidable running is accomplished by enabling concepts, descriptions, and explanations that support and build manners governing norms is provided. The violent subjugation of the weaker by the powerful is only one aspect of power. The most significant component of Foucault's writing is his emphasis on how the productive aspect of power is used in contemporary society. His main objective is to displace the negative connotation and trait of the power-producing nature. It generates truth and realism. Power, in Foucault's view, may be understood in terms of the methods used to exercise it. Power structures come in numerous forms in society, including judicial, administrative, military, and commercial ones. They all rely on basic application methods or strategies, and they all draw some authority from assertions about scientific fact or truth. Conferring to Foucault, power is not only about saying no to individuals and exerting pressure on them or their social classes or inherent characteristics; rather, power is generative. Instead than only restricting freedom and forcing people, it develops patterns of behaviour and situations. In ―The History of Sexuality," volume one, Foucault makes the claim that: ―if power was never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you really believe that we should manage to obey it?" (HS-1, pg, 36), people must be driven to conform by something unique and far from suppression. According to Foucault, power can be understood in terms of the means through which it is employed. It produces particular kinds of cultural awareness and ordering.

In his writings, he analyses how the nineteenth century saw an increase in concern about male children masturbating and how this led to the publication of various guidance manuals on how to dissuade or avoid such behaviour, which in turn resulted in a close examination of boys. rather than limiting our understanding of this

to the exploitation of children's sexual behaviours and aspirations. Foucault covers the following in *"Power/Knowledge":*

> ―Was the sexualising of the infantile body, a sexualising of the bodily relationship between parent and child, and a sexualising of the family domain . . . sexuality is far more of a positive product of power than power was ever a repression of sexuality." (Foucault: pg 120)

A set of sexual objectification interactions and the emergence of problematic sexuality were caused by the discussion of children's sexuality and the monitoring, counselling, and punishment of teenagers who engaged in sexual activity. Power shapes various behavioural patterns and forms of discipline in people's lives. As a result, the marks *Discipline and Punishment:*

> ―We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it excludes, it represses, it censors, it abstracts, it masks, it conceals. In fact, power produces reality, it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production." (pg. 120)

For a variety of reasons, power and compulsion, in Foucault's opinion, would not be restricted to the same concept. To categorise something as having coercive elements, one must acknowledge that power is applied from a single source and that it is a single object. Power shapes particular behaviours by controlling routine public activities. As opposed to being oppressive, as it was under the Victorians, power, evolved into an object of knowledge that, beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, was combined with the governing framework of the social institutions. According to Foucault, if there is power, there must be resistance. It allows us to see that there are more than just oppressor-victim or master-slave relationships when it

comes to the relationships between those involved in power struggles. Every time power is used, a reaction is required. In fact, Foucault goes so far as to claim that a power dynamic cannot exist without conflict. Power is exercised with a memory of resistance. One must examine both the public and the unseen transcriptions of power in order to fully understand a power relationship. Every possible connection of power requires the ability to resist. Foucault continues that the practise of power affairs requires resistance. According to him, strife and contestation are necessary for power since else there would only be total supremacy, submission, and obedience. Strength and the capacity for resistance are now seen as being mutually exclusive. Power cannot be seen as utter deference or dominance. The expression of resistance is the first step in the growth of power through social interaction. Power has an innate tendency toward opposition. It is a situational one that is dependent on power. There is resistance everywhere and at every level. Power can only be used against free subjects, in Foucault's view. Foucault defines freedom as the potential to act and respond in many ways. It is no longer a matter of a power relationship if such potentials are curtailed by enslavement or ferocity. Without the potential for resistance or revolt, there is no power.

4.2.2 Power and Knowledge Relationship

In order to provide a methodology to examine the link between power and knowledge, Foucault created a study of power and knowledge as some reciprocal ideas. Power is therefore built on knowledge and uses knowledge. Power creates knowledge by 42rganize it after its hidden purposes. In *Travels in the Scriptorium,* knowledge is the means by which power is produced, and power reproduces its own field of application. ―Discipline" presents the relationship between power and knowledge as:

‒Power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another: that there is no power relation without the correlation constituting of field of knowledge nor knowledge that does not presuppose and constituted as the same time power." (pg. 27)

According to Foucault, power generates knowledge through the exchange of ideas, and knowledge generates power. He is aware of the proverb ‒knowledge is power." According to Foucault, sovereignty derives from power. A person's body is targeted for punishment through torture, same as in pre-modernity, as a means of oppressively ruling and controlling people. The setting of Auster's Blank is consistent with the power/knowledge concept that has been examined. In order to study and objectify human subjectivity, power tactics have created the knowledge object known as Blank. Mr. Blank's imprisonment demonstrates how he continuously contributes to the use of power to generate the knowledge required to forward the objectives of power forces.

Fundamentally, Foucault was ‒less interested in power as a property of agents" in his work. Instead, he focuses on the way that space is 43rganized, regimentation, population control, and bureaucracy are used to wield power. By implementing an organized regime and direct monitoring or surveillance, disciplinary authority seeks to reduce internal resistance rather than to achieve dominance. No one has entire control over discipline power; it is a force that has to be employed in concert with a surrendered mass and is not ultimately held by one individual or even one group.

4.3.1 Panopticon in the "*Travels in the Scriptorium*"

"Discipline and Punishment" outlines the methods that have been used to enforce discipline over the centuries to constitute human subject. When people once enter into the disciplinary apparatus or system, they become merely "bodies", and Foucault writes about regulating labourers and populations and normalising things to brand them more docile bodies and passive subjects. This chapter of the study concentrates on one particular form of disciplinary apparatus that Foucault highlights, as a panopticon, used to exercise disciplinary power on human subject. The setting of the novella *Travels in the Scriptorium* has been portrayed in this chapter as a panopticon and power-driven space, with Mr. Blank's ‗body‘ there being under constant watch, examination, and order supervision. Mr. Blank's subject is located inside a power laboratory, where he is used as a test subject for various studies involving the use of Foucauldian power on him.

Jeremy Bentham's 1791 creation of the Panopticon, a design prison and architectural frame, receives a fresh explanation from Foucault: ‒those inside are subjected to continual surveillance; the subjects of the panopticon‘s machinery are permanently aware of being located within a well regulated, well monitored, social matrix", and he chooses to use this paradigm as a referent point and connects it to the urban setting, and terms this constrained area as is ‒the utopia of the perfectly governed city" and explain as:

> ‒This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the
> individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements
> are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted
> work of writing links, the centre and the periphery, in which power is
> exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchal figure, in
> which each individual is constantly located, examined and distributed

among the living beings, the sick and the dead –all this constitutes a compact model of disciplinary mechanism (Discipline 198)."

In the same chapter, he states the following:

─the panopticon is polyvalent in its applications; it serves to reform prisoners, but also to treat patients, to instruct schoolchildren, to confine the insane, … It is a type of location of bodies in space, of distribution of individuals in relation to one another, of hierarchical organization, of disposition of centres and channels of power, of definition of the instruments and models of intervention of power, which can be implemented in hospitals, workshops, schools, prisons (205)."

As a consequence, the panopticon is essential for keeping an eye on and confining people. The difference between the idea and Bentham's jail, according to Greg Elmer in ─The Panopticon, Discipline, Control," is perspective since Foucault focuses not only on the gaze of the watcher but also upon the gaze of the watched. Elmer claims that for Foucault, the act of seeing while unseen denotes something else and is intimately related to power. A sociopolitical technology figure that can and should be detached from any specific function is the panopticon. It is a representation of the power mechanism in its optimum state, not a structure from a dream. Its operation must be shown as a wholly architectural and optical system, free of any hindrance, resistance, or conflict. The panopticon has never accurately been executed in the way Bentham first suggested, but Foucault shows that even though this is not always the case, it has nevertheless been discreetly ingrained into public conscience, accepted as the norm, and acknowledged as a technique used it to safeguard the citizens and work in our best interests.

In the subsequent sub-chapters, I will take into account the panoptic-modality of power concepts that were just discussed and relate them to Mr. Blank's position as a subject situated within the panopticon or panoptic space of the text to examine how power and space both shape Mr. Blank's subjectivity and how they work to run a power network.

4.3.2 Panoptic prison in the text

In the book, Mr. Blank is confined in a room while also being constantly watched over. Blank is unsure of his precarious position. The room's space suggests a multidimensional and intricate role of prison as a tool for disciplinary action, one that houses a blank agency as like Mr. Blank. The room is enclosed, there is a camera on the ceiling and an audio recorder as well, there are many objects in the room, including photographs, manuscripts, and a pile of files, to train the subject accordingly. Most importantly, however, are the various visitors who tend to exert their control over Mr. Blank's blank body or agency through inspection, scrutiny and constant interaction with him.

It is frequently claimed that the development of prisons and their substitution of torture as an acceptable penalty for serious crimes represents a victory for humanity and compassion. However, Foucault argues that the removal of criminality from the political sphere and its relocation into the less antagonistic world of deviation and normality is the result of jail expansion. It is not because punishment, torture, and discipline are options for how society handles deviation, according to Foucault, but rather how they are used to portray deviance as revolt, delinquency, or crime. It is simpler to supervise a crime when it has been reconstructed as delinquency and to turn it into less risky kinds of illegality.

The historical panoptic concept is founded on the idea of cage, which puts society's unwanted elements out of sight and concealed while making them feel out of place. They are divided up, and both psychological and architectural constraints forbid the formation of groupings. With this division, it will be possible to track people's whereabouts and how to find them, set up efficient conversations, interrupt others, and continuously monitor each person's behaviour. The power agents who pay timely visits to Blank they inspect, regulate, control, and observe his daily routine activities instead of allowing him to run according to his preferences and desires. They forced him to communicate, eat, drink, put on clothes, and even restrain his basic actions inside a sealed room. It demonstrates how Blank is reduced to being a mere "body" and experiment subject within a power lab or panoptic. His behaviour being controlled by unidentified authority is an example of impersonal power being used against him. In *Discipline,* Foucault argues that jail has changed the meaning and outward form of punishment. Criminals are currently subject to punishment that controls all aspect of their lives, not only their physical well-being like in the past (Discipline). The modern surveillance allowed by modern disciplinary society is characterised by the overall control of the criminal's daily life, which is typical of the modern prison.

With this in mind, Foucault claims that despite its failure to achieve rehabilitation, the institution of prison has succeeded in achieving its ultimate goal. Power, in Foucault's view, functions objectively rather than subjectively, therefore this goal should not, of course, be ascribed to the specific desire of any one or group of individuals. This goal, according to Foucault, is the transformation of crime into delinquency. It is not enough for a penal system to punish criminality in order to rehabilitate or repair an individual criminal. A particular crime is seen as being

inextricably linked to the delinquent's entire existence, which is frequently seen as a cycle of violence, one of destitution, and one of abuse. In contrast to the criminal, the delinquent is bound to the offence "by a whole bundle of complicated strands" (instincts, impulses, dispositions, character). A penitential process must completely modify and overhaul the delinquent's life and personality. The classification of the offender's life around the norm and not the law is made possible by the difficulties of this rehabilitation and the attention on all aspects of the offender's life rather than simply those that directly conflict with the law.

According to Foucault, prison served as a paradigm for other social structures. Other social institutions like hospitals, schools, and factories imitate the institutional control used in prisons, and the typical control used in prisons has come to represent the entire disciplinary social order. The setting of Blank's room in the book depicts an institutionalised model of how power is exercised inside of a sealed environment to objectify the person (Blank). Mr Blank seeks to comprehend the reason behind his confinement: ―It is unclear to him where he is. In a room, yes, but in what building is this room located? In a house? In a hospital? In a prison?" (Auster: 2). It demonstrates how Blank's body falls inside a Panopticon and is subject to power's monitoring and clandestine manipulation wherever it is placed. The situation of Blank is analogous to Foucault's theory on the parallels between jail and other social institutions: If we take into account the people who visit Mr. Blank—an ex-policeman, two nurses, a doctor, and a lawyer—then the chamber suggests a penal institution, such as a hospital or a court. He is subjected to a power play through strict disciplinary arrangements. Foucault has addressed a number of methods that facilitate the exercise of power. Space is ordered in a specific way, as seen in the text, beginning with enclosure, which refers to the idea that individuals are segregated into institutional space, such as

prisons for criminals, hospitals for the sick, and schools for children. These divided, contained places' inhabitants are further ranked. All of these areas have been designed to physically rule a subject.

The novella presents a panoptic space that is driven by an unidentified Foucauldian power, in which a daily inspection and an invisible eye tend to control and practise the exercise of power over the subject (Mr. Blank) in order to objectify and regulate him. Blank is a victim of an anonymous power manipulation in his trap. The arrangement of the room's artefacts and the interactions of the visitors are indications of the apparent authority that controls both them and Blank. In addition to providing an invisible eye of control over which Blank is oblivious, the camera in the ceiling and the audio recorder in the room imply that Blank is constantly being watched in the text's panoptic power realm.

According to Foucault, if power is hidden, it may firmly hold its subject under control. One of the most important characteristics of disciplinary mechanisms, as stated in *Discipline,* is the invisibility of power and the manner in which it is exercised: "as power becomes more anonymous and more functional, those upon whom it is exercised tend to be more strongly individualised" (Foucault: 193). In addition to withholding information from the visitors and the objects in the rooms, the fragmentary hints also retain the visitor's anonymity, which makes Blank more reliant on them.

In a panoptic jail, the visitors serve as power agents who monitor, configure, and control Blank and his daily activities. They reported on the prisoner's condition every day while he was confined to the room and was being constantly watched and evaluated. Foucault describes the organisational structure of a plague-stricken city as

a "spatial partitioning" of the space and a split of the city into quarters, with the intendant accountable for each quarter and a syndic in charge of each street and expected to submit a report to the intendant. Thus, the exercise of power would take place in a complicated chain continuously and, most importantly, anonymously. The same disciplinary procedure is used against Blank; the agents pay him visits in order to exert control over him and assess his circumstances. According to Foucault, the inmate who is "visible" (Blank) is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication" and cannot see anything outside of the room (Foucault: 202). Thus Mr. Blank certainly becomes an object of information and scrutiny rather than a subject in communication.

Since the Panopticon is a metaphor for a contemporary disciplinary society, everyone in the society fits into this pigeonhole and is subject to observation, not just the inmate (Blank). In the modern world, when our relationships and behaviour are governed by an omnipresent eye, we are all constantly under surveillance. According to Foucault, who maintains that all forms of discipline require a highly ritualised review process, the findings demonstrated the subjectification of people who are seen as object and the objectification of those who are subjected. The insertion of power and knowledge links becomes all of its blatant brilliance in the test. Every action Blank makes is meticulously and systematically recorded and watched.

According to the subjectivity model, the subject is spatially categorised and put in a specific location based on the changes and responses. Blank's constrained condition is fixed and immovable in a frozen panoptic environment, where he is constantly watched over by an invisible eye and under the direction of power agents within a cell as the subject of various experimental operations. He does not behave or move in accordance with his self-control. The severe division of space and isolation

has the same immediate result as the plague-ridden city: immobility and fixity. Only the intendants, syndics, and guards will relocate, according to Foucault. It is a divided, frozen, stationary space. Every person has a definite position. In the text, the visitors take on the roles of syndics and intendants who supervise Mr. Blank by conducting routine inspections and making scheduled visits. Mr. Blank's circumstance is consistent with that of the power mechanism's panoptic inmate. For instance, Anna forced him to eat breakfast, dressed him up, and even set up a bath. It demonstrates the lack of self-control displayed by Mr. Blank in his activities. In the story, several control, examination, and inspection mechanisms are in action. While Blank was reading, James Flood, an ex-policeman, called and was agitated by him. The doctor, Samuel Farr, calls him in a similar manner to inform him that the screenplay Blank is reading is literature. Sophie carrying his food causes a pause in his narration as well. As a result, numerous interruptions and visits make the prisoner's situation worse by putting him under constant control. Mr. Blank's desk is situated in an area with no exits. The arrangement of the space in the room provides a schematic of a disciplinary scenario with its mechanisms of scrutiny and control to exercise power to subjugate the subject already present in that panoptic power space.

The subject's body is crucial to the current power structure. According to Foucault, a person is reduced to nothing more than a "body" in order to exert power over it; rather than being a subject, the person becomes a muted body that operates under constant observation. Foucault discusses the pervasive idea that power is ascribed to, exerted by, and applied to actors in his piece "Power and Subject." It is a comprehensive course of action that doesn't immediately or directly impact individuals. According to Foucault, power is interpersonal, relational, and blind. It is neither control nor dominance. Auster's Blank is essentially a vehicle for exerting

control over him through ongoing observation. He serves as the vehicle for the power that agents wield over one another. In another words, Blank is the carrier of power exercised by agents and is exercised on an agent.

4.3.3 Panopticon as Norm provider

In *Discipline*, Foucault claims that the panopticon has always served as a testing ground for the application of power. It might be employed as a tool to conduct experiments, modify behaviour, or instruct anyone or groups. To test different medications and observe their effects, as well as to subject inmates to a variety of penalties based on their character and criminal history in order to choose the best ones, and more significantly sets norms. The analysis that follows will be based on the mentioned indicated concepts.

Blank meets Anna for the first time while still in his pajama, and she wants him to change into all-white attire: ―The clothes turn out to be all white: white cotton trousers, white button-down shirt, white boxer shorts, white nylon socks, and a pair of white tennis shoes" (Auster.25). Here the all-white dressing shows that the subject is under the experiment of some sort and wearing a uniform as the norm of the practice. Mr. Blank is under a sort of experimentation and they are altering his behavior through the application of disciplinary power force. Anna keeps checking on Mr. Blank's actions, later she asks him to take pills, as well. In some way or another Mr. Blank investigates about his inspection from Anna and expresses his displeasure and response ―What's wrong with me? Mr. Blank asks. Am I sick? No, not at all. The pills are part of the treatment" (Auster. 14). He is under some sort of treatment and pills acts as power doses and given to him to experiment with some medicine.

After some time, Blank begins to feel uneasy wearing his white tennis shoes. He objects and tries to reattach the slipper, but he chooses not to because ―the slippers are black, and if he put them on he would no longer be dressed all in white, which was something Anna explicitly asked of him" (27). Thus the white dress of the subject depicts the uniform of specific practice or action as a norm and on the other hand, the resistance shows a power relationship in which Mr. Blank is trapped. The operation on Mr. Blank's ―body" is constantly going on inside the panoptic power space of the text through diverse experiments. According to Foucault, the panopticon is a special location for experimenting upon men and for conclusively studying the changes that result from them. On the other hand, Blank's resistance to the tennis shoes shows the presence of power, as previously it has been discoursed that where there is power there is inevitably resistance to it. If there is no resistance to it then it is not a power relationship.

Surveillance of the kind exercised on the prisoner in the text is typically Foucauldian. Mr. Blank himself is unaware of such surveillance. Appropriately, the Foucauldian version of the panopticon is categorized by the invisibility of the gaze. If Mr. Blank is unaware of his being observed, Foucault's panopticon allows the subject knowledge of his being under surveillance. However, in both Auster and Foucault, the ultimate aim is to exercise control. As a complex disciplinary apparatus with a careful ordering of its objects, the room conjures up a subjugated subject in Mr. Blank. Unquestionably, every single object in the room is intended to confuse distract, and evoke firm responses in the prisoner. A camera and a voice recorder help in mustering the visual and auditory evidence for his actions. The photographs and the typescript which trigger memories or vague connections in Mr. Blank attest to the clarity and coherence his consciousness is regaining. Interestingly, the walls and all the objects in

the room are labeled and the window itself is tightly barred by nails driven into its frame. At one moment in the novel, all the labels on the objects are curiously misplaced. Horrified at the sudden destabilization of his world, Mr. Blank immediately tries to restore order by remedying it.

The labeling that appear inside the room space as explanation of its objects shows the marks of anonymous power presence in the novel in addition to clothing exercise. At the beginning of the narrative, the narrator tells:

> ―There are a number of objects in the room, and on each one a strip of white tape has been affixed to the surface, bearing a single word written out in block letters. On the bedside table, for example, the word is TABLE. On the lamp, the word is LAMP. Even on the wall, which is not strictly speaking an object, there is a trip of tape that reads WALL (Auster 1)."

Before Mr. Blank learns that someone has relocated the labels and he is unsure of who and when:

> ―As the old man goes on tipping back and forth in the chair, however, his eyes fall upon the strip of white tape affixed to the surface of the desk. He has looked at that piece of tape, no fewer than fifty or a hundred times during the course of the day, and each time he did so the white strip was clearly marked with the word DESK. No, to his astonishment, Mr. Blank sees that it is marked with the word LAMP. His initial response is to think that his eyes have fooled him in some way, so he stops rocking back and forth in order to take a closer look (Auster103)."

Mr. Blanks finds it difficult to accept the change and most importantly unable to find who did it. It shows the presence of the invisible eye's gaze on him and that invisible gaze becomes the norm provider to the subject (Blank), to train him subtly according to the required objectives. However, the labeling of room objects itself marks the presence of power and which drives the whole space of the room by marking the objects to train the subject that lies inside. Tagging of the room objects is visible power that controls and subjugates its subject of dominance. Thus here the panopticon function as a norm provider to its occupant or subject by giving names to the objects. This shows the operation of impersonal power that is unknown but observatory as a Foucauldian power idea. Mr. Blank is now the object of manipulation since he is in a controllable environment—a room that serves as power lab. Establishing norm criteria that will serve as standard to train and meausure the subject. In this manner, the person is made obedient to this play of disjointed motions that are repeated mechanically. Normalization is fundamentally just a method used to create a more effective and productive individual altogether.

The primary objective of disciplinary power, according to the Foucauldian perspective, would be to persuade all forces to embrace the disciplinary perspective as the standard and the disciplinary ideal as the whole truth. Discipline power permits those in positions of authority to determine what constitutes "normal" and then impose that idea on those who are lower down the hierarchy; over time, those subjected "bodies" tend to consider it as "normal" as well. Power creates and shapes people according to its version of reality. It is a subtle form of oppression at action in a society that moulds people into politically unstable but economically potent combinations of people. The system's aim is to restrict individuality, but in the process, subjects and those who want to think independently and independently of

others are breaking the rules. The person receives a social and personal identity through classification and assessment processes. He or she develops a distinct identity as a delinquent. Delinquents are thus created by disciplinary power through discursive objectification and physical manipulation of the body. In an endless effort to resemble the standard, we alter our conduct, and in the process, we take on particular types of subjects.

In the game of power and knowledge, the knowledge also categorises people and establishes social norms, and people are compelled to abide by the established guidelines. Under this manner, society is split up into jails, hospitals, mental health facilities, and military establishments. In each of these establishments, a patient, a lunatic, and a criminal must be held and kept under panopticon observation. The Panopticon is indeed a sign that reveals the connection between social control techniques and people subject to disciplinary action. Observing others gives us information and power. It declares the transition to disciplinary authority. All activities can be documented and every move can be watched during surveillance. Adoption of rule and regulations is the effect of observation. Panoptic surveillance aims to alter people's behaviour such that it conforms to predetermined dimensions and direction. People control and monitoring are at the heart of panoptic surveillance. Instead of surveillance, panoptic discipline is persuading a populace to accept that surveillance produce situation to achieve appropriate behaviour. By watching other activities being in check, the watcher gains authority. The knowledge an observer gains from keeping an eye on others gives them power. The tools of surveillance increase the active and effective use of power.

According to Foucault, power can be acquired through knowledge, which is a sort of power. It is possible to gather knowledge through observation. Sociology,

psychology, linguistics, economics, and even medicine are human sciences that attempt to define as well as name human beings. The interaction of human sciences with places like prisons, mental hospitals, factories, schools, and courts has significant and unique consequences on people. The human sciences carefully explain what distinguishes normal conduct from deviant behaviour and then use these explanations to control behaviour. One of the primary methods used to establish power relations in society is the study of abnormality. When an abnormality and its reliable standard are identified, the normal person has always a control of the abnormal. The criminologist speaks about the criminal, the psychiatrist about the patient, and the psychologist about the insane person, but the public is never supposed to hear the latter speak about the latter. This strategy is employed by certain persons to convince others of their point of view. The ones who decide what information is even available are the most knowledgeable.

The norms that are defined within the institutional and ideological framework in which the individual is situated are assumed to be legitimate and, in reality, inevitable. The individual is so deeply entangled in the creation of these standards through their contribution to this framework that it is reasonable to presume that the norms have already been ingrained into the person's framework. The subject's submission to the norm or standard is deliberate, or at the very least there are no obvious alternatives. Every time the norm is suggested in a person's behaviour and every time it influences that person's thinking and behaviour through institutional structure and language, it serves as a model for that person. What makes normalisation possible as a constant implementation of disciplinary power is the pervasiveness of the norm as a model that is always incorporated into the person's daily life.

The ironic way that disciplinary power individualises while also homogenising is a separate aspect of it. The development of techniques for estimating the degree of deviation from a norm is essential to its construction. The advancement of the examination as a teaching tool, for instance, enables people to be positioned alongside each other and the norm in a plane relationship. People are distinguished from one another in this way for the purpose of individualised dealing, but this distinction has the power to transform every difference into something that can be expressed by the measuring standard referring to the norm. The subject becomes an individual through this process, albeit a particular kind of individual. A norm's unobserved establishment is what gives a subject their character. The person is handled in a way that has the advantage of bringing her closer to the norm, and it allows the subject's life to easily fit in with the pre-existing frameworks that shape her experience of life. Unquestionably, this is the process by which the subject becomes a willing participant in its submission to the norm implied by the institutional and discursive frameworks that govern its life. In fact, according to Foucault, this willful submission to societal rules creates the subject itself. It is misleading to refer to this as willing subordination because the subject's willingness only emerges inside a normative framework that comes before it. The subject is called out as something that consists in the judgements it marks about the norms it acknowledges as given by this framework and the disciplinary and discursive procedures that make up it.

The normalisation of power dynamics is oppressive. Every aspect of life is taken over by them, and it is subsumed into an organisational and administrative complex that is supported by a strict code of conduct and constant monitoring. These connections don't just leave an express mark on the living person and place restrictions on it. In today's society, power relationships focus on human subjectivity,

creating the subject through the control of discourse and the taming of the body. In this way, the subject is painted as a supporter of a system of power for which there is no apparent alternative. Since the subject is a byproduct of the particular disposition of power in terms of subjectivity, the subject cannot be said to be oppressed by these power affairs. The very power that is sought to be established by confrontation with power structures, even when it presents itself as an endeavour to liberate or reclaim authentic human subjectivity, only serves to solidify that authority.

4.3.4 Mr. Blank as a passive subject and docile body in the panopticon

The single subject, in Foucault's view, is never an independent autonomous agent but rather a social construct. I wish to differentiate autonomy from agency in order to evaluate the veracity of his viewpoint on the matter. However, in theory, autonomous persons would be able behave, acquire opinions, and have experiences independent of any social framework. They were able to go beyond any rules and procedures that a regime of authority or expertise could have recommended. The notion of a ‑sovereign, originating subject," which Foucault strongly discards, is similar to this concept of autonomy or autonomous subject; autonomous subjects, however, might set and manage themselves independently of others. In difference, agents simply exist in particular societal circumstances, and these conditions not ever regulate how they effort to formula themselves. Although agents exist within regimes of power and knowledge, these regimes have no influence over the experiences, beliefs, techniques of exercising reason, or attempts at action that agents may have. Agents are creative beings; the only difference is how their creativity is impacted by the social context in which it occurs. (Foucault: pg, 222)

However, it seems irrational if we see Foucault's anger of the subject as a critique of agency. It is possible to declare that a subject starts out with a social context that has an impact on him while also claiming that he may act and think in original, creative ways to change this backdrop. This is known as denying autonomy. We must include agency if only because we are unable to distinguish between actions or ideas based solely on the social environment. Due to the fact that different people adopt various views and take different acts against the backdrop of a comparable social structure, there must at the very least be a space where people can freely choose their beliefs and behaviours. We cannot individuate every action and belief by reference to a certain regime or episteme of power/knowledge in the way we would need to if we were to reject agency if some acts and beliefs are not shared by everyone in that regime or episteme. Therefore, we must accept that the subject is an agent, albeit not an autonomous one.

Foucault's particular elision of the distinction between autonomy and agency accounts for a large portion of the difficulties, as well as a large portion of the excitement, of his work. When he discusses the pervasiveness of power or the absurdity of the idea of an instituting subject, he sometimes appears to reject only autonomy, but other times, when he 60ormalization confession as self-regulation in line with a regime of power and the individual as a straightforward result of power, he appears to reject agency as well. Therefore, one could distinguish between an agitated Foucault who is against the subject as an agency and a composed Foucault who is just against autonomy. Undoubtedly, people are more familiar with the exuberant Foucault, who views the individual as little more than a byproduct of social power. Unwaveringly articulating the matter at hand, Foucault depicts the self as a constituent of an episteme, disciplinary rules, or something related to such. He

highlights historical accounts that purposefully omit references to specific, intentional human actions. However, the composed Foucault, who allows the subject to become immersed in the system of power, does not appear frequently, especially in his most recent writings on governmentality and a self-care ethic.

Mr. Blank is positioned in a cell room in the novella because he is ―a man without identity and, thus, without agency" (Auster: p,g 12). Even though Mr. Blank attempts to put together his identity through flashbacks, this power location stops him from doing so. As a result, the protagonist constantly spirals into desperation since he cannot 61ormaliza himself as a subject. The piece expresses Blank's hazy idea of himself as an empty agency, oblivious of the confined state in which he had just awoken and found himself in an unidentified room. He lacks self-knowledge as a passive self and is unable to conform to his former circumstances. Mr. Blank is a blank piece of paper in *Travels in the Scriptorium,* and his agency is an empty place that serves as the foundation for the development of his subjectivity.

The author of an article describes Foucault's ―Technologies of the Self" as a chain of procedures that enable people to control their bodies, their 61ormaliz, and their thoughts in order to work on themselves. It is claimed that practicing these steps will enable one to achieve some level of excellence, contentment, purity, and knowledge. ‗Technologies of the Self' are methods to make an effort to express the truth, live the truth, and be transformed by the truth. Self-knowledge is one of the vital technologies of the self, to know oneself requires identifying a truth about oneself because even just 61ormaliza this reality requires an effort to become flawless. The self does not spontaneously occur in man, relatively, it is assembled by a game of truth, relationships with those in positions of power, and ways of relating to oneself and others. Since there is no reality to 61ormaliza, people are unable to 61ormaliza

the truth about themselves. People are unable to escape the institutions and discursive frameworks that establish regulations. According to Foucault, the concept of the self is created by the methods used to determine it. According to Foucault, the subject is produced by discourse rather than existing outside of it. Instead of expressing the subject's knowing, thinking, and speaking, discourse creates the subject. This method of self- and subject-formation is similar to how Mr. Blank has been constructing his identity as a passive actor.

The subject's consciousness or identity is given, despite the fact that the individual believes it to be who she or he is. Redefining one's subjectivity involves acknowledging the imposed identity. The contemporary soul is the result of numerous processes involving oversight, reprimand, and restriction. With Blank's subject in the text, the same problem is clear. The development of Mr. Blank's consciousness in the novel serves as an illustration of how disciplinary techniques create a soul that can be governed in ways other than only imposing physical restraints on the body. When managing spirits, discipline develops docile, competent, and obedient bodies. Dani Cavallaro contends in ―*Critical and Cultural Theory"* that the subject is a result of language and culture:

> ―A subject is both active and passive. For example, the subject of a sentence may denote the person that performs the act described in the sentence or the person on whom the act is performed (_Mary ate a bear'; _Mary was eaten by a bear'). The passive side of the subject is also borne out by a phrase such as _the Queen's subjects' and by the idea of the subject as medical patient. Post structuralism has emphasized that the subject is not a free consciousness or a stable human essence but rather a construction of language, politics and culture." (86)

The subject has opposing active and passive characteristics. There are always two sides to every story. Subject believes that it has an open consciousness in one aspect and that all of its independent faculties drive its activities. Another factor is the subject's passive nature; according to Blanks, the subject is literally an obedient follower who always submits to authority. The passive nature of the subject is described by post-structuralism; it is not only passive but also lacks a free or open consciousness. The panoptic power space has built the subject's entire identity.

The human subject has a big part in Foucault's discourse. He distinguishes between the subject and the individual, and he is concerned in the sort of power that turns subjects into people. Foucault uses the word ―subject‖ in two different ways: first, in the sense of being controlled by others, as is the case with Blank, and second, in the sense of being associated with one's identity through consciousness and self, which Blank lacks. The self, in Foucault's view, is a construct that is produced by techniques that are intended to do nothing more than mould it. According to Foucault, the subject does not precede language; rather, it is a result of discourse. ―Cities and bodies‖, says Esteban Muoz, ―define each other‖ (90). Although he alludes to Chicano people and their analogous relationship with Los Angeles in the work, this is a statement that also applies to *Travels* if one switches out cities for apartments or other confined settings. Mr. Blank, a character without an identity and thus without agency, is placed inside the book's enclosed space by author Auster. Even though Mr. Blank makes an effort to recreate his identity using memory, the isolated setting prevents him from doing so, which causes the protagonist to become constantly distracted because he is unable to recognize itself as a subject.

In the modern world, the introduction of a surveillance link into the subject's constitution is a crucial component of normalization's expanding significance and its

substitution of law and restraint. The subject must take on the responsibility of applying the norm to their lives in a way that goes beyond the control of any outside monitoring. Panopticism allows for the development of a component of the subject's self-surveillance into the area of desire and intention. The norm turns into a tool for portraying the subject's entire existence, both inside and out, in a way that closely resembles the person. These 64ormaliza of the self, by which people observe, act upon, and shape their own conduct, are therefore not inventions of the individual; rather, they are standards or yards that pre-exist in any society and that are suggested, put forwarded, and applied on individuals. This is true even though there is an imperative feature of individual agency and an active self-constitution implied here. It is not a matter of one's own unadulterated creative energies enabling unrestricted autonomy in one's self-creation, but rather of the establishment of a set of 64ormaliza that articulate one's agency and initiative.

According to Foucault, the advancement of a ―art of the human body‖ has accompanied the advancement of Western Civilization. The ―disciplines'‖ principles provided an obvious presentation of this art and a cutting-edge ―mechanics of power‖. We can better grasp ―how somebody can get a clasp on certain people's bodies, not just to ensure they do what one desires, but also to ensure that they act as one desires, with the tactics, the rapidity, and the effectiveness that one determines‖ by looking at what Foucault refers to as the ―political anatomy.‖ Therefore, discipline fashions ―docile bodies,‖ or bodies that have been subjected to and trained. This essay will examine Foucault's ideas on docility and the ―docile body‖ in the 64ormaliza part.

Auster's Blank appears to be only a ―body‖ to covertly manipulate and function in accordance with the goals of the power brokers. In his essay ―Disciplinary Power,‖ Marcelo Hoffman provides a summary of Foucault's disciplinary model, which he

claims creates an organic personality through exerting control over physiological functions, much like the state of the novella's protagonist. In terms of disciplinary power, Foucault categorises people into the idea of _bodies', where individuals are subjected to various power modalities and ultimately become a part of the disciplinary system. Having docile or passive bodies, or bodies that carry out commands in the most advantageous way possible, is ideal for hierarchal dominance. The use of timetables and daily schedules while assigning each body a certain location to be in at all times during the day. It would be true if we assume that Mr. Blank is treated as a mere body to manage and assessed against some desired norms because his body is constantly monitored and his daily schedule is run on a schedule by meticulously 65ormalizatio his behaviours.

Hoffman contends that there are four ways in which the body is subjected: first, through the division of time in to the segments, such as periods of exercise or training; second, through the 65ormalizatio of these segments into a plan starting with the most basic components; third, through the attribution of an end to these segments in the form of an exam; and, finally, through the creation of a series that assigns exercises to each individual (Hoffman. 112). In Blank's situation, he has been controlled in terms of how to carry out specific tasks and held to a strict schedule that has deprived him of his feeling of identity. Or, to put it another way, classical panopticism eliminates the differences that exist between people or the people around them in order to produce primed people who can be customized to match a particular stereotype that is most advantageous to the regime in place. Panopticism poses the query while simultaneously attempting to prevent us from asking it. What makes this person unique? The subject was reduced to a script, an odd collection of file folders connected by a name, by the panoptic gaze. In the novella, panopticism is employed

more quietly to affect Blank's concise and force him to follow norms, making it impossible for him to sense its influence.

It is possible to create, employ, and modify a docile body. A diligent, subservient, helpful creature with a conscience is what the web of discipline attempts to formalize as the docile man required by an efficient, technological, and rational society. The body that can be controlled, moulded, and taught receives the most focus since it is able to comply, react, acquire expertise, and grow its power. Auster's *Travel* spends a significant amount of time on how restrictions, prohibitions, and obligations might be used to teach a submissive body.

Mr. Blank's subject advances as a rhizome in the narrative as well. The very first observer must be familiar with rhizome characteristics in order to examine Blank's subjectivity as rhizomatic. The rhizome is a body that ―connects any point to any other point… is reducible neither to the One nor to the multiple… It has neither beginning nor end, but always middle from which it expands and which it overspills," according to Guattari and Deleuze in their book A Thousand Plateaus (23). The writers go on to discuss other aspects of this centerless item, but we'll 66ormali the most pertinent one to understand the *Travels* protagonist. A similar concept to Guattari's and Deleuze's rhizome, Mr. Blank seems to be a blank person who, like a sponges, gathers whatever he finds in order to form his subject. Mr. Blank knows nothing about himself or his surroundings and remembers nearly nothing. Therefore, the rhizome is crucial since Mr. Blank's evolution is comparable to it. The development of the rhizome is yet another important characteristic, as ―it has neither beginning nor finish". This feature is also prevalent in Blank, as expressed at the conclusion: ―It will never stop. He will always be lost". (Auster)

Although monks and soldiers had long used discipline procedures, they only became widely accepted forms of dominance in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In comparison to vassalage or slavery, the disciplining of individuals was more effective and had a different goal in mind. According to Foucault, the instant of the disciplines was a moment when an artist of human body was born. This artist was focused on the development of the human body's abilities as well as the strengthening of its control, then also on an establishment of the link which made a body more obedient as it became more useful. On the other hand, when a subject is established in the relationships of their discipline, the body becomes more useful and efficient, but at the expense of the subject. The entire body is enmeshed in mechanisms that control its use while 67ormalization67n the attribute of obedience. When he claims that discipline creates subjugated and 67ormaliza bodies, Foucault refers to this aspect of disciplinary procedures as passive bodies. The incorporation of these bodies into the 67ormalizatio of work at the time of its application is both influenced by and contingent upon the docility of bodies. However, docility is created not only via the use of disciplinary measures but also through the use of a monitoring and 67ormalization process that Foucault refers to as ‑panopticism."

In Discipline and Punish, Michel Foucault's concept of docile bodies draws on the idea that the docile body is a flexible object, and that when disciplinary power is imposed through reliance and control, the subject becomes constrained by the rules of such disciplinary 67ormaliza. The docile body, in the words of Foucault, ‑is something that can be manufactured; out of a formless clay, an inapt body [from which] the required machine may be fashioned." As a result, Foucault promotes the idea that a submissive body is amenable to manipulation and can be willingly trained.

In this regard, he 68ormalizat the training regimen since it fosters a key aspect of the mechanics of power to impose its dominance on the submissive body.

After examining instances where people are instructed to behave docilely and profitably as needed in settings like hospitals, prisons, schools, and mental institutions. According to Foucault, such an institution seeks to create submissive people who are eager to carry out the obvious mission of maintaining the status quo through 68ormalization68n of surveillance and 68ormalization. As a result, according to Foucault, ―the body becomes a ‗political field,' inscribed and produced by power relations" through the construction of a ―docile, serviceable body." (2000) (Deveaux).

CHAPTER 5

Foucault's view of the Subjectivity

In later writings and in conversations, Foucault insisted that his task had been to investigate and historicalize how particular "truth games" with in social sciences, such as psychanalysis, ecology, pharmacology, criminology, and economics, had improved knowledge and practises to serve people in recognising oneself in western civilization. Foucault not only offers a substantial break from previous narratives on the self, but also introduces concepts like governmentality, disciplinarity, ethics, and liberty, in addition to strategies for power politics, corporeality, or its social-historical context. His exact self-regarding beliefs changed throughout the course of several years. He notes that recently his initiatives possibly will be "centred on the technologies of domination and power" (Foucault 19). Foucault, however, believed that the self is instituted by together _technologies of dominance' and _technologies of self', produced exceptional influnces. They define the individual and guide their behaviour by using a sort of authority or power network that Foucault called "governmentality" to create obedient, useful citizens who are practical and docile. They also mark any person as an important member of the society. Foucault was driven by Nietzsche to examine the processes by which people become objects without any motivation. In order to advance Nietzsche's "genealogy" and Heidegger's theories into "technologies of the self," Foucault examines Greco-Roman antiquity and early Christianity. In regard to power, knowledge, and discourse relations, Foucault thought about Cartesian-Kantian rationality and Heidegger's critiques of subjectivity. A criticism of phenomenology is made by this stance alongside humanism since Foucault believed that the subject was situated inside a genealogical narrative or specific historic-cultural framework.

Foucault historicized ontological issues by eschewing genealogical studies of the subject in favour of a philosophical effort to define the ‗core‘ of human origin that sought to disclose historical circumstances of ‗being‘ and the contingent. He does not see the subject or oneself as a person; rather, he sees it as a configuration that is not always or primarily identical to itself. Because the word "self" means "auto" or "the same," comprehending the self requires an understanding of one's identity. Additionally, Foucault connected Heidegger's theories on techne with technology. Heidegger examined our connection to the vital tenet of modern technology, it treats ―all—including people—as raw commodity‖ with the aim of increasing output at the lowest possible cost. Foucault, on the other hand, historicized ontological inquiries and as a result, was not fascinated with conceptions of ―Aletheia‘‖ or an inner, underlying reality or core of individuality, in contrast to Heidegger, ―who focused on understanding‖ an "essence" or root of existence or ―dasein‖.

The four interconnected "technologies" that Foucault names are the "technologies of the self," "technologies of production," "technologies of symbol systems," and "technologies of power or dominance." Each consists of a set of attainable goals that are subjected to a dominant dominating style that denotes some form of instruction, shaping, or personal development. In contrast to an instrumental understanding of technology, Foucault defines "technology" as a means of projecting reality in the Heidegger‘s term. He is particularly interested in techniques of the self and of power, the ability individuals' actions are predetermined by technologies, who also subject them to dominance or particular purposes, objectifying the subject. The "Technologies of the Self" are a variety of adjustments that people make to their physical and spiritual selves, as well as their thoughts, actions, and ways of being,

either on their own or with help of someone else, in an effort to attain the state of well-being, wisdom, perfection, or immortality.

In his early publications, Foucault examined the ways how normalisation, classification, and objectification procedures in the human sciences create the self and how such technologies of dominance are used in the political repression over "docile bodies" under the authority of disciplinary authorities. Foucault himself argued that inadequate was said about agency, and Addressing a number of the fundamental political assumptions in the prior study, he re-explained power as self-regulation that limits agency. He emphasised the interplay between practises of the self and ethical self-constitution to assist individuals in continuously forming themselves as ethical subjects. The power he alluded to may not be founded entirely on compulsion, dominance, or repression. At this point, Foucault had developed the view that individuals were autonomous entities that might challenge and subvert the hierarchical systems of modern society. Individuals are capable to ethically instituting themselves on their own, without the assistance of a priest or therapist.

In the first volume of *Sexuality History,* "technologies of control" were no longer referenced. In western culture, it is pretty apparent that the body, whose urges, and its sexuality convey the truth about the individual. From such a point onward, if one speaks the "truth" about their sexuality, their innermost truth will become apparent, allowing them to live a true life in tune with who they truly are. Those ―regime of pleasure-power-knowledge" as mechanisms of ―the art of living" or "an aesthetics of existence" have developed into narratives and define how we construct ourselves as a result of us disclosing the "truth" about our sexuality and about ourselves. Foucault claims that since it is a common cultural feature to have forceful restrictions against sexual desires on one side and forceful invitations to speak the

truth on another, his work has turned into an origin of this relationship, questioning how people had just been made to recognise themselves through contexts of what had construed, namely the relationship among ‑truth and asceticism".

Foucault addressed the evolution in his thinking regarding the relationships between truth and subjectivity in a conference titled *"The ethics of the concern for self as a practise of freedom"*. He had previously thought about the connection between subject and "games of truth" through representations either by manipulative tactics, ‑psychiatry or prison", or ‑theoretical-scientific narratives", the analysis, ‑of languages", of living beings, primarily in *"The Order of Things"*. In his later writings, he broke free from this connection and started to see truth plays as an ascetic practise of self-formation rather than as a tool for coercion. In this context, the term "ascetic" refers to an act of self-exercise performed in an effort to grow, change, and achieve a particular style of being. Work done by the self on itself is an ascetic practise that should be viewed as a Kantian exercise of freedom rather than in terms of conventional left-wing concepts of liberation. This is a crucial difference for Foucault to establish since it acknowledges the possibility of a hidden self or inner essence that was obscured, alienated, or imprisoned by oppressive systems. According to this paradigm, the liberation process frees the "real" self from imprisonment or repression.

Foucault, in contrast, historicized ontological questions by arguing that there are no essences, only "becomings," and that the self can only be understood through its hermeneutics or phenomenology, which is the process of fabricating one's identity. According to him, achieving freedom does not enough, and exercising one's freedom does not preclude achieving freedom; rather, they enable both individuals and society to determine what constitutes a political society that is permissible and acceptable. The techniques of circumventing the use of unnecessary, ‗arbitrary', or ‗abusive

authority' —must be framed in terms of rules of law, rational techniques of government and ethos, practices of the self and freedom", and he discards Sartre's idea that power is evil, uttering instead that "power is games of strategy". (pg. 299).

Liberation and freedom are two diametrically opposed forms of self-interpretation that, according to Foucault, should only be used when a country or state has established a political society and attained some degree of independence. He argues that the latter is greater extensive than the former. Around the themes of emancipation and freedom, there might be some issues with translating between English and French. For instance, a person in shackles is not free, and even if they may have certain options, thier lack of freedom severely restricts these. To be free to practise his principles, a person must be liberated or released from all forms of dominance. Ethics refers to a way of living or acting. Since ethics are the practises of the "free" individual, freedom that resembles liberation is thus a requirement for ethics. From a philosophical and political perspective, that ethical challenge of liberty in regard to sexuality, in Foucault's view, is far important than just maintaining the pursuit of liberating sexual desire. In other words, he attempted to comprehend freedom as such essential prerequisite for ethics, especially when freedom takes the form of some sort of critical reflection. He continued by elaborating on this pervasive idea in the context of the ancient Greek directive to "take care of oneself."

Foucault's emphasis moved to the hermeneutics of the self in "Technologies of the self", a seminar series, as he read —the first two centuries AD of Greco-Roman philosophy and the fourth and fifth centuries of the Roman Empire, when Christian" monastic and spirituality doctrines stood pervasive. The *Delphic* moral maxim "know yourself" (—gnothi sauton"), according to Foucault, overtook a previous maxim and series of exercises known as "take care of yourself" or "be concerned with oneself"

("epimel sthai sautou"). One of the major principles for interpersonal behaviour and also the art of living in ancient Greek towns was the care of oneself, according to Foucault. These two ideas were tied to one another, and it was based on this principle that the Delphic moral—a practise of "technical counsel" or guidelines to be adhered to "when the oracle was consulted"—came into being. The moral precepts of modern western society have been updated, perhaps in part because Plato emphasised the idea of "know yourself," which later gained enormous prominence in philosophy. Since people frequently perceive self-care as egotistical, immoral, selfish, and a means of avoiding regulations, Foucault has argued that the austere principle of "know yourself" is the most important one today.

Although there are no direct connections from past to the present, Foucault's "genealogy of sexuality" indicates various elements of continuity as well as some of the Ancient Greek roots of modern "sexual ethics". First, Christianity modified and appropriated concepts from classical philosophy, turning self-renunciation into a requirement for salvation when, ironically, self-renunciation was required in order to know oneself. Second, the secular tradition's conception of morality involves self-interest. The principle "know yourself" has been repurposed as "take care of yourself," in line with assertion in "The genealogy of Morals". According to Foucault, respect "for external law", as opposed "to a more internalized" conception "of morality, is associated with an ascetic morality in which the self can be rejected". Furthermore, since Descartes, theoretical philosophy has pointed to "the cogito", the "thinking subject", and self-knowledge as the starting points "for western epistemology". Because that Delphic saying had grown dominant and closely linked to the creation of subjects who could be dominated during the Age of Enlightenment, Foucault urged for the reintroduction of the old adage about taking care of oneself.

Both the Stoic, Christian, and Greek Platonic methods of the self have been explained by Foucault. The first of the stoic methods is writing ―letters to friends and self-disclosure," then comes ―the examination of one's self and conscience," which ―entails a review of what needed to be done, what ought to have been done, and a comparison of the two." The third method is "asking Sis", which is not a disclosure of the secret self but a recalling, and the fourth is dream interpretation. He has argued that, rather than renunciation, this is the gradual ―contemplation of self, or mastery over oneself," which is attained via assimilation of truth, which is characterised by paraskeuaz_, rather than through the rejection of reality "to get ready" (Pg., 25). The stoic philosophy of self-transformation of truth into a principle of ethos, or action, or ethics of subjectivity, includes two sets of practises known as the gymnasia and melet. The melee helped one develop their ideas about how they would react in hypothetical situations. It was a philosophical meditation. The gymnasia are rigorous physical training sessions that may involve physical pain, deprivation, sexual abstinence, and ceremonial purification. Despite being a common practise, according to Foucault (1988b), the Stoics were typically sceptical and critical of dream interpretation. It is incredible to observe how some of these self-care practises have reemerged in the various psychotherapies of the 19th and 20th centuries, and Foucault makes a special effort to highlight ―the philosophical and historical roots of some of them. Foucault's focus on the role of truth in regard to the self may be furthered by the concept of "others" as an intimate, audience, or public. This performance method opens the door to the politics of (auto)biography and confession."

Foucault did not contest the fact that "caring for others" is an obvious ethical principle in and of itself while discussing Greek philosophic conceptions of ―care of the self". He acknowledged the importance of the early Greek concept of taking care

of oneself, which is epitomised in the phrase "care of the self." Since a dictator cannot care for others if he does not care for himself, this idea is all-encompassing and prohibits authoritarianism. Foucault seems to exhibit a startling naivete regarding the goodness of people by accepting this expansive definition, wherein care of the self covers a substantial degree of ‒generosity of spirit" and pleasant ties for a monarch of others, whether they be one's wife, children, or slave. He made it clear that taking care of oneself should always come first, even when taking care of others became an evident ethical principle.

The concept of truth games was further developed in a series of lectures titled "Discourse and truth: the problematization of parrhesia." According to Foucault's genealogy, the practise of parrhesia is problematic in conventional Greek culture. These traditions are widespread in the West and have many distinct expressions. He shows how these practises connect truth-telling and education through patterns that still influence our current subjectivities, making it crucial for understanding how power and control are practised in everyday life. The classical Greek term "parrhesia" and its cognates are used to show how the standards of stating the truth have changed over time. In order to demonstrate the importance of education for "care of the self," the crisis facing democratic institutions, and public life, Foucault examined the parrhesia practise in education. He did so in an effort to show that dealing with the problem of the truth-teller or the activity of telling the truth rather than the problem of the truth is more important than dealing with the problem of the truth. According to him, Socrates developed the four difficulties of "who can tell the truth, about what, with what consequences, and with what relation to power" as a separate set of philosophical conundrums (pg. 170).

Confession as we know it today derives from early, pre-Christian philosophical ideas in addition to the Catholic Faith's impact and its techniques for confessing somebody's sins. In these methods, guilt is frequently equated with human sexuality, so confession became the primary technology for having to manage the sexual lives of believers. Additionally, they have been greatly influenced by conventional Rousseauian, Romantic models of the self and confessional practises embodied in Puritan views of the self and its relationship to God. Foucault traces the evolution of confessional practises in secular modern societies ―from the religious to the medical, then to the therapeutic, and finally to educational contexts." Foucault's clear definition of confession is the methods used to urge the subject to create a discourse of truth about his sexuality that has the potential to have an impact on the subject itself. In contrast to other societies, which have an ―ars erotica" or ―erotic art" where ―truth is drawn from pleasure itself, western society has Scientia sexualis means of revealing the truth about sex that are a kind of knowledge-power that start in confession." In confession, the person who tells does not have the agency of dominion; rather, the person who asks and listens does. Sexual confession is formed in scientific terms through a clinical codification of the incentive to talk, the assumption of a general and diffuse cause, the idea of an essential latency to sexuality, the method of interpretation, and the medicalization of confession's effects. However, he shifted from concentrating on the sexuality confession to the typical indicators of confession in the modern environment. In the final chapter of "Technologies of the Self," Foucault makes the crucial point that verbalization techniques of confession have advanced the ―human sciences, into which they have been inserted and transposed, and where they are cast off without renunciating the self but rather to

genuinely create a new self. The use of these techniques without self-renunciation amounts to an obvious violation".

The two primary self-disclosure techniques that evolved throughout the early centuries of Christianity were ―exomolog_sis" and ―exagoreusis". Although they both require rejecting one's will or oneself when the self is revealed, the former is dramatic, whilst the latter is verbal. The initial exposure of self includes _exomolog' or "awareness of reality," which includes a public affirmation of the truth of one's religion as a Christian and a ritual of admitting one is a sinner and remorseful. Foucault claimed that exposure is the core of _exomolog' since it both purges the sin and identifies the perpetrator. Penance came to be defined as the renunciation of self, death, and martyrdom, as well as of agony, life, and identity, with the idea that dying was preferable to giving up or compromising one's religion. According to Foucault, Christian penance entails renunciation or rejection of the self, making it evident that self-revelation also involves self-destruction. While the penitent held that truth about oneself was overlaid through severe rupture and separation, the stoics thought that self-examination, judgement, and discipline lead to self-knowledge through superimposing truth about oneself through memory, which is like to Christians memorising rules. Also nonverbal is ―exomolog sis". It is ritualistic, theatrical, and figurative. According to Foucault, a number of methods for unveiling the self, known as exagoreusis, began in the fourth century and entailed "verbalising exercises or prayers" that included a description of one's daily behaviours in regard to norms, similar to "Senecan self-examination". With the advent of monastic life, confession took on a hermeneutic function, drawing on the ideas of contemplation and obedience, in evaluating the self in respect to someone's purity and hidden inner thoughts. Confessional practises have evolved greatly over time. However, as confession was a

yearly event in the church, there was little need to monitor or confess sexuality until the Council of Trent, when a new set of guidelines for the purification and education of church workers emerged. Since the Reformation, confession has undergone tremendous transformation and now includes both one's thoughts and behaviours. Then, in the late 1700s, Foucault claimed that a very rapid drop had occurred—not in the demands and commands to confess, but rather in the creation of confessional practises. At this point, harsh medical procedures that just call for the patient to recount their story or write it down started to appear.

The history of Sexuality looks at the procedures used in confession, examination, and therapeutic settings, where the subject is required to discuss their feelings or psyche with a therapist or priest who, in their capacity as an expert interpreter and observer, judges whether or not a truth, or even the fundamental truth that the subject was oblivious to, has been articulated. Experts ―in the psychological sciences or assisting professions, such as doctors, priests, psychologists, psychiatrists, counsellors, and psychoanalysts, can administer specific technologies for listening, speaking, transcribing, recording, and redistributing what is said, such as observing the conscious and unconscious, and admitting one's innermost feelings, thoughts, wishes, attitudes, and motives regarding the self and one's relationships," to assist in retrieving this "truth" or inner self. They might use their expert knowledge to reconstruct and reframe what someone says. But when one attains this level of self-awareness, they also become known to others and are a part of the healing process. The self may then be found through this.

As confessions became more secularised, numerous approaches in psychiatry, education, literature, and medicine were developed, with psychoanalysis or Freud's cure being the most effective. In light of this, according to Freud, the secular model of

confession has been scientized through new individualization and normalisation techniques, such as case-study methodologies, clinical codifications, general documentation, personal data collection, a variety of therapeutic techniques for normalisation, and the dissemination of interpretive schemas. These, in turn, force us to be free since self-evaluation and new techniques for self-control replace confession. This new confessional model incorporates cutting-edge individualization strategies that connect us to others as soon as we express our identities. It is a declaration of who we are and of our self. When one openly admits who they are to others, such as teachers, parents, lovers, oneself, and friends, they become subjectified by the other person who dictates the format of the confession". An individual establishes themselves through speaking practise and confession. While the definition of a confession is an admission, it can also involve disclosure, a declaration, or an admission of a mistake, criminal activity. The confession is to some extent identifying oneself by outlining one's personal beliefs or emotions that make up a significant portion of one's identity. Confession comprises the verbal admission of one's sins to another in its religious context. This confession must be made as repentance in the pursuit of liberty.

Technologies of the Self" are defined by Foucault in "The Use of Pleasure" as models for establishing and growing relationships with the self, for self-reflection, self-knowledge, self-examination, for deciphering the self independently, and for the transformation one aspires to with oneself as the object. In order to understand the "aesthetics of existence" and to inquire about the control over oneself and others, Foucault has also examined the "arts of the self." He argued using self-writing as a means of coping with the dangers of doing things in private and in front of others while also considering how it functions as a confessional process as it works on

thoughts and engagements. It supports a retrospective analysis of writing's function in the philosophical tradition of the self prior to Christianity, including its tight relationship to apprenticeship, its application to intellectual currents, and its function as a veracity test. In the mythical meaning, confession traditionally included aspects of recognizing the self in a meticulous, self-conscious endeavour to articulate and describe oneself to the spectators within whom the person occurs and pursues confirmation, such that, writing the self. Therefore, confessing is a narrative wherein we (re)make ourselves by creating our story and reworking the past in the open, or at the very least, in discussion with another. It is both an expression and a communicative act. The topic appears to feel obligated to be honest about itself when confessing and presenting itself. Because of this, confession includes a kind of "discipline" that includes instruction in the subtle arts of conscience, self-evaluation, and self-regulation. This discipline ranges from the control of one's body, speech, and action in school, through the mental drill instilled in school and university, to the Puritan practises of personality and obedience to divine reason. Confession is personal, persuading us to narratively reassemble ourselves, but it is also about giving our lives a meaning that seeks the truth. Therapies like psychotherapy or counseling—the "priesthood" of our secular civilization—which have replaced the theological norms of confession can be helpful in this regard. Even if listening techniques and self-discovery go hand in hand, contemporary counselling both inside and outside of schools does not include the elements of reprimand, guidance, and punishment that are included in traditional forms of confession.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

There are countless ways to suppress human subjectivity, but this study was only interested in the art of discipline or disciplinary power regimes as forces that control and regulate human subjectivity in a closed space. The subject is objectified through certain ―spatial organization‖ and confessionary techniques, and then the individual is introduced to the practices of inspection, examination, and control of daily routine as a tool of a disciplinary power regime to generate required knowledge from the observation of another subject. Thus human objectification according to the essential intentions of power regimes occurs. According to Foucault, the subject eventually finds himself in a maze of societal power structures or institutions, rendering subjectivity not autonomous but rather a social product. As a result, society is a panopticon, or ―no-exit‖ place, in a variety of social institutions to control and regulate individuality, and it is constantly denying the sovereignty of any individual self through the implementation of its own proposed norms or normalization as a disguise technique of control, regulation, and governing individual subjectivity.

Subsequently, discipline fashions bodies to make them more docile so they can become more efficient and obedient products of the power dynamic in a panoptic diagram of our society. According to Foucault, the history of Western civilization has been accompanied by the "art of the human body." Discipline procedures discovered the most inevitable use of this art as "mechanics of power" to produce more docile and efficient humans. As he asserts, ―one may have a hold over other people‘s bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but also so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed, and the efficiency that one determines."

Thus discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, ―docile bodies." (Discipline pg., 138)

Secondly, an important consequence of this study is that, as human beings, we are constantly in a labyrinth of power networks that govern our lives. Thus, we gain an understanding of the unspoken purposes of societal institutions or any other abstract spaces, as well as their construction logic, that is, how they control masses through disciplinary control mechanisms. Foucault asserts that prison has provided a model for other social institutions. The institutional control exercised in the prison is duplicated by other social institutions such as hospitals, schools, and factories, and as a consequence, the typical control of the prison has become illustrative of the whole disciplinary social order. As a result, the individuals become the agents or carriers of power inside the panopticon or panoptic institutions of the societal setup.

6.1 Future Scope of the Thesis

Furthermore, this study suggests its most recommended finding in *"Travel in the Scriptorium"* as a further project to investigate Mr. Blank's identity as a fluid self of the present age. In the story, Mr. Blank's subject progresses as a rhizome, which is an object completely opposed to an arborescent structure, a body that ―connects any point to any other point... is reducible neither to the one nor to the multiple... It has neither beginning nor end, but always middle from which it grows and which it overspills" (22). Blank knows nothing about himself or his surroundings, and he remembers almost nothing. He looks like a blank being that, similar to ―a sponge, absorbs everything he finds around himself" to construct his subject, ―which transforms him into a parallel entity to" Guattari's and Deleuze's rhizomes. The rhizome, therefore, is key because Mr. Blank has a similar development. One more

foremost feature of the rhizome is its development, as: ―it has neither beginning nor end" (24). This characteristic is also present in Mr. Blank, as stated at the end of the book, "It will never end," and "He will always be lost" (128). ―When one is lost, there is neither beginning nor end", and Mr. Blank does not identify from where he has come, what he is doing, or where he is progressing. This shows Blank's identity, a sort of "saturated self," as a human of contemporary existence. So this paper suggests that we are out of control of societal structures and institutions as a post-modern self, likewise Auster's hero. Therefore, our status of control and regulation falls out of the grip of structures, and the post-modern self is always fluid and more open to the affairs of the contemporary world order.

To conclude, the analysis of the notion of an organic or pure self as a dilemma of societal power projects stayed the primary focus of this study. In this study, the pure self-concept has been explored through the concepts of panopticism and confessionary strategies as a disciplinary force to subtly act upon the subject to coerce and control its development through the application of power/knowledge. Thus, the conclusion of this thesis demonstrates that the human self, or individuality, is the result of the "micro-physics" of power and knowledge regimes. In other words, the self is surrounded by networks of societal constraints that force it to inevitably submit to the regimes of power/knowledge. The panoptic system is an architectural paradigm for the application of power/knowledge systems to objectify the human self. According to C. Colwell, the panoptic scheme is the ―geographical organization" of modern power. The human subject is a real and organic entity, but it is problematic.

WORKS CITED

Alford, Steven E. ‒Spaced-Out: Signification and Space in Paul Auster_s *The New*

    York Trilogy‖. *Contemporary Literature,* vol. 36, no. 4, 1995, pp. 613-632.

Auster, Paul. *Travels in the Scriptorium.* Faber and Faber, 2006.

Barros Grela, Eduardo. ‒Performances of Uncertainty in Spaces of Contingency:

    Aesthetic Confinement and Mechanisms of Silencing in Paul Auster,

    HarukiMurakami, and park Chan-wook.‖ *Relational Designs in*

    Literature and the Arts: Page and Stage, Canvas and Screen, edited by

    Rui Carvalho Homem*,* Rudopi, 2012, pp. 387-398.

Briones Herranz, Alberto. ‒Sociedad contemporánea‖ *El País,* 29 dic. 2013.

    [Accessed 07 may 2019]

    https://elpais.com/elpais/2013/12/28/opinion/1388252651_246048.html

Chute, Hillary. ‒The Popularity of Postmodernism‖. *Twentieth Century Literature,*
vol.

    57, no 3/4, 2011, pp. 354-363.

Connor, Steven, ‒Postmodernism and literature.‖ *The Cambridge Companion to*

    Postmodernism, edited by Steven Connor, Cambridge University Press,

    2004,pp. 62-81.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus.* A&C Black, 2004.

Elmer, Greg. ‒Panopticon-Discipline-Control.‖ *The Handbook of Surveillance*
Studies,

    edited by D. Lyon,K. Ball, and Haggerty, Routledge, 2012, pp. 21-29.

Esteban Muñoz, José. ‒Memory performance: Luis Alfaro‗s: Cuerpo
Politizado.‖ *Corpus Delecti: Performance Art of the Americas,*
edited by Coco Fusco,Routledge, 2006, pp. 89-104.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Knopf
DoubledayPublishing Group, 2012.

---. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.*
KnopfDoubleday Publishing Group, 2013.

---. ‒Of Other Spaces‖. Translated by Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics,* vol. 16, no. 1,
1986, pp. 22-27.

---. ‒What is an Author?‖. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays
and Interviews*, edited by Cornell University Press, 1980, pp. 113-138.

Harvey, David. ―The Condition of Postmodernity: Time-Space Compression
and thePostmodern Condition.‖ *Knowledge and Postmodernism in
Historical Perspective,* edited by Joyce Oldham Appleby, Elizabeth
Covington, AllisonSneider, David Hoyt and Michael Latham,
Routledge, 1996, pp. 494-508.

Jameson, Fredric. ‒Postmodernism and Consumer Society.‖ *Postmodern Culture,*
edited by Hal Foster, Pluto Press, 1985, pp. 111-125.

---. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism,* Duke University
Press,1991.

King, Nicola. *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self.*
EdinburghUniversity Press, 2000.

Klein, Stanley B., and Shaun Nichols. ‒Memory and the sense of personal identity.‖ *Mind, v*ol. 121, no. 483, 2012, pp. 677-702.

Lefebvre, Henry. *The Production of Space.* Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith,Blackwell, 1974.

Locke, John. *An essay concerning human understanding: and a treatise on the conductof the understanding. Complete in one volume with the author's last additions and corrections.* Hayes & Zell, 1860.

Martin, Brendan. *Paul Auster's Posmodernity,* Routledge,

2007.McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction.* Routledge,

2003.

Powell, Kimberly. ‒Remapping the City: Palimpsest, Place, and Identity in Art Education Research, Studies in Art Education.‖ *Studies in Art Education,* vol.50, no. 1, 2008, pp. 6-21.

Royle, Nicholas. ‖Being Paul Auster—A Trip through the Teeming Brain of the Author.‖ *The Independent*, 30 October 2006. [accessed 08 May 2019]. http://enjoyment.independent.co.uk/books/reviews/article1938887.ece

Shiloh, Ilona. ‒A Place Both Imaginary and Realistic: Paul Auster‗s The Music of Chance.‖ *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2002, pp. 488-517.

Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-ImaginedPlaces.* Blakwell, 1996.

Solà-Morales Rubió, Ignasi de. ‒Presente y futuros. La arquitectura en las ciudades‖.

In *Presente y futuros. Arquitectura en las grandes ciudades*, edited by Ignasi de

    Solà-Morales Rubió, Collegi Oficial d_Arquitectes de Catalunya /

    Centre deCultura Contemporània, 1996, pp. 10-23.

Sobel, Richard. ‒Idéologie, sujet et subjectivité en théorie marxiste: Marx et
Althusser‖. *Revue de Philosophie Économique,* vol. 14, no. 2, 2013, pp. 151-192.

Tally Jr., Robert T. *Spatiality.* Routledge, 2012.

Warf, Barney and Santa Arias. ‒Introduction: the reinsertion of space into the

    social sciences and humanities.‖ *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary*

    perspectives, edited by Warf, Barney and Santa Arias, Routledge,

    2009, pp. 1-10.