FOUCAULT STUDIES

ARTICLE

Gaze and Norm: Foucault's Legacy in Sociology

DUŠAN MARINKOVIĆ & DUŠAN RISTIĆ
University of Novi Sad, Serbia

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we problematize the legacy of Michel Foucault from his genealogies of normalizing society. We claim that his most important concepts of normalizing society are gaze and norm, which are defined as the (social) technologies of power. Our assumption is that Foucault identified changes in social life and the emergence of the disciplinary diagram through the transformation of spatial practices. Thus, he "needed" Bentham's idea of the Panopticon. However, his reference to Bentham goes beyond the interpretation of the spatial aspects of the Panopticon. Namely, genealogies of gaze and norm point to different dimensions of the normalizing society, out of which we emphasize their utilitarian aspects. This utilitarian dimension brought to light different institutions, discourses, and practices, as well as the new "optical" technology of power. The main contribution of the paper is the claim that Foucault's recognition of the rise of the normalizing society is his most important legacy for sociology. This contribution needs to be recognized through his reading of Bentham but also in the interconnectedness of his genealogical analytics of gaze, norm, and space.

Keywords: Michel Foucault, Jeremy Bentham, gaze, norm, sociology, space

INTRODUCTION

> *Like surveillance and with it,*
> *normalization becomes one of the great*
> *instruments of power at the end of the classical age.[1]*
> Michel Foucault

The dramatic ceremony of the public execution of Damiens in 1757 happened less than thirty years before the publication of Bentham's *Panopticon.*[2] It is really surprising how

---

[1] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* [1975] (1995), 184.
[2] Jeremy Bentham, *The Panopticon Writings* (1995).

history untangled not only within a single century but within just a few decades, how a long history of punishing and stigmatizing the body was interrupted, and how the body entered a new genealogical flow of relationships and practices of power, knowledge, gaze, discipline, and obedience with new relationships of production and usefulness, new spatial relations, and a new temporal structure and distribution. Indeed, it is surprising, "[a]nd yet the fact remains that a few decades saw the disappearance of the tortured, dismembered, amputated body... The body as the major target of penal repression disappeared".[3] All those "gloomy festival[s] of punishment",[4] where the non-discursive form of "the public" was part of the social scenography, started to fade away. They finally disappeared from the scenography of daily life in European societies at the end of the 18th century.

Perhaps the history of the disappearance of medieval times, this unclear periodization, can best be tracked by following the genealogies of the body: the changes of practices *over* the body in places and spaces where history diminished and the Nietzschean "grey genealogy"[5] of the body began. These are the new practices of the spatial distribution of the body and its surveillance and discipline. These were the new spaces – prisons, hospitals, schools, and factories – in which the "distributed" docility of the body was inscribed. In those spaces, a new type of productive and useful power starts to circulate. Foucault repeatedly stressed that the history of the last centuries in Western societies did not manifest the movement of a power that was essentially repressive.[6] This is something that many who read Foucault did not get. It is a power that was produced and multiplied by new optical technologies. Its aim was to restore, protect, and multiply life within the new dispositive of regulation.

What we also recognize is that Foucault progressively strove to distance himself from the analysis of power founded on representation and put more focus on the set of mechanisms of power which *run through the body* of subjects; the body that, at some point, was no longer just the place of shame, injury, and death but also a place where gaze and the productive practices of movement were inscribed. In this way, the body was inscribed into the new dispositive over which the new expert discourses and *technologies of power* emerged. The next paragraph testifies how much *technologies* of power were important for Foucault to discern:

> The case of the penal system convinced me that the question of power needed to
> be formulated not so much in terms of justice as in those of technology, of tactics
> and strategy, and it was this substitution for a judicial and negative grid of a

---

[3] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* [1975] (1995), 8.

[4] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 8.

[5] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" [1971], in *The Foucault Reader,* ed. Paul Rabinow (1984), 76.

[6] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, vol. I: The Will to Know* [1976] (1978), 81.

technical and strategic one that I tried to effect in 'Discipline and Punish' and then to exploit in 'The History of Sexuality'.[7]

The body was inscribed in the epoch through the new technology of optics and light, or the new strategy of control, inscribed in the trihedral gaze-norm-measure.[8] In this way, the emergent utilitarian culture of the West (Europe) changed how power was exercised over the body. New practices of power were re-establishing *norm* and *measure* as a way of restoring *order* – the just order. Measure, like inquiry and examination, was at the same time a mean of exercising power and a rule for establishing knowledge.[9]

Damien's body – as Foucault informed us – was one of the last places into which the practices of the old penal politics would deeply plunge. This was a body/place into which the epoch, for a long time, wrote its dreary dramaturgy of the rituals of punishment. The *convicted* body was a point of localization into which the power of the king's body was temporarily dislocated in order to express its sovereignty in one place. This served the purpose of expressing its "wholeness", its "homogeneity", which would unexpectedly and quickly fade away and be scattered in a diffuse and capillary form of microphysics of power: discipline. Public, ritual punishment of a convicted body was just one point of the transformation of practices of punishment over the body into all those future discourses of expertise (from psychiatry to the human and social sciences). This was no longer just an issue of "a limited localization"[10] but a matter of the birth of new social procedures, new statements and discourses, and a new gaze and medicalized social space where the "eye governs". It was also about the establishment of the "new relationship between space, perception, and language"[11] and a question of "how the medical gaze was institutionalized, how it was effectively inscribed in social space".[12]

Although Foucault had a critical attitude towards sociology,[13] his legacy in this science, and generally in the social sciences, is certainly multifaceted. The effects of his research can be seen today in almost all fields of the social sciences, from sociology to psychology, pedagogy, and history all the way to architecture, urbanism, and medicine.[14] He

---

[7] Michel Foucault, "The History of Sexuality" [1977], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (1980), 184.

[8] Dušan Marinković and Dušan Ristić, "Foucault's 'Hall of Mirrors': an investigation into geo-epistemology," *Geografiska Annaler: Series B Human Geography* 98:2 (2016).

[9] Michel Foucault, "Course Summary," in *Penal Theories and Institutions: Lectures at the Collège de France 1971-1972*, ed. Bernard Harcourt (2019), 230.

[10] Gilles Deleuze, *Foucault* [1986] (2006), 26.

[11] Peter Johnson, "Foucault's spatial combat," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26:4 (2008), 618.

[12] Michel Foucault, "The Eye of Power" [1977], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon (1988), 146.

[13] For example, he writes about the "strange entities of sociology or psychology which have been continually making fresh starts ever since their inception," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality – with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault,* ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (1991), 54.

[14] We questioned the importance of his concepts for the sociology of knowledge as well in another article: Dušan Ristić and Dušan Marinković, "The Foucault effect in the sociology of knowledge," *Philosophy and Society* 34:1 (2023).

considered himself a kind of "empiricist" who does not "try to advance things without seeing whether they are applicable".[15]

In this article, our main aim is to present and problematize gaze and norm as concepts that are not just important in Foucault's *oeuvre* but are crucial for understanding his legacy for sociology. Furthermore, our task is to contextualize those concepts within the genealogy of what he called *the normalizing* or *disciplinary society*. By doing this, we are able to recognize his importance in the understanding of the genealogies of the institutions of (Western) societies and the emergence of the very subject of sociological research: society.

THE BIRTH OF THE GAZE

The 18th century was a century of tension, clashes, and battles between two social, political, economic, and historical models which, for a short and tumultuous period of time, occupied the same spaces of the West: "At the moment of its full blossoming, the disciplinary society still assumes with the Emperor the old aspect of the power of spectacle".[16] However, the body of the convict was no longer playing the main role in this dramaturgy. It seems that it was also no longer the king's body that was *ritually regenerated* by punishing the one that committed the crime. When, at the turn of the 18th century, the pain, suffering, and stigma "left" the body, what would the new concept of punishment refer to? It was the body that was spatialized in a new analytically arranged space of visibility, light, and gaze. This new arrangement is recognized by Bentham and later Foucault through the concept of the panopticon. The body was the starting point of punishment but also the starting point of control and order. And the practice of punishment "will tend to become the most hidden part of the penal process".[17]

This was an epoch in which the last great pandemics of the plague ended; however, there was still a dark cloud of fear in the form of great wars and the plague. Leprosy had already disappeared. The lepers had long faded from the scene at the end of the Middle Ages, and what would remain were the spaces for the isolation of the diseased, such as asylums or leprosariums. Then, the heterotopias – the separated and forbidden spaces of the others,[18] which until then had belonged to families, houses, towns, workshops, guilds, administrations, abbeys, and monasteries – became divided, distributed places in *other* spaces:

> At the edges of the community, at town gates, large, barren, uninhabitable areas appeared, where the disease no longer reigned but its ghost still hovered... From the fourteenth to the seventeenth century, by means of strange incantations, they conjured up a new incarnation of evil, another grinning mask of fear, home to the constantly renewed magic of purification and exclusion... The game of exclusion

---

[15] Michel Foucault, "On Power," in *Politics, Philosophy, Culture*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (1988), 106.
[16] *Discipline and Punish*, 217.
[17] *Discipline and Punish*, 9.
[18] Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" [1984], *Diacritics* 16:1 (1986).

would be played again, often in these same places, in an oddly similar fashion two or three centuries later.[19]

The dramaturgy of public executions would still be a vivid, recent memory. But the ceremony placed in the scenography of the public square was moved into the center of *daily life*, whose economy was penetrated by a new structural dynamism of the bourgeoisie. It is in daily life where the erosion of sovereign forms of power is to be recognized; a daily life intersected by a new axis of privacy and publicness. This daily life accumulated the practices for the deritualization of old religious practices and representations and was still ruled by an anachronous fear that legal and penal mechanisms would desecrate the bodies, painfully and publicly mark them, banish them, and impose an impossible punishment upon them.

This was a daily life in which the fears of public execution would finally fade away and new fears of imprisonment would come to life. Banishment societies, redemption societies, stigmatising societies[20] would give way to the *normalizing society*. This is also the *punitive society*, "but only since the end of the eighteenth century".[21] The old, faded world was not acquainted with prison as a general model of punishment.[22] Only an occasional body was incarcerated, and only temporarily, until the proper punishment was implemented as a sovereign revenge for the injury to the body and thus a measure was established again. It was temporarily incarcerated until the inquisition's investigation (*enquête*) established the facts.[23] "The judiciary only arrested a derisory proportion of criminals; this was made into the argument that punishment must be spectacular so as to frighten the others."[24] This was so until prison became a space where punishment would be transferred and distributed and a space where the gaze would become examination (*examen*); a new form of analysis based precisely on legal, judicial, and new penal practices.

The *panoptical space*, not only the prison but all its modules, now had its own *natural* and its own *laboratory* side.[25] Its natural side firmly relied on the model of a botanic garden, on those "unencumbered spaces in which things are juxtaposed".[26] Those were the spaces where objects were seen in order to be categorized and classified so that the power (of expertise or gaze) could establish *differences* to make a table. Its "laboratory side" would rely on the practices of research and investigation.

In only a few decades, from Damiens to the Panopticon, the inversive dynamics took place: the inversion of the gaze as the inversion of power and the inversion of space. Of the many gazes directed at the convict's body, the Panopticon offered the "aristocracy" or

---

[19] Michel Foucault, *History of Madness* [1961] (2006), 3-6.

[20] Michel Foucault, "The Punitive Society" [1994], in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth – The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, Volume 1*, ed. Paul Rabinow (1997), 23.

[21] Michel Foucault, "The Punitive Society," 23.

[22] "The Punitive Society," 63.

[23] Michel Foucault, "Théories et institutions pénales" [1972], in *Dits et écrits Tome II, 1970-1975*, ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald (1994), 390.

[24] Foucault, "The Eye of Power," 155.

[25] *Discipline and Punish*, 203.

[26] Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* [1966] (2002), 143.

rather "tyranny" of the gaze of one-to-many. Sovereign power was inverted into the *networks of institutional power* and thus the "scattered" forms of gaze.

The theology of light from the age of cathedrals[27] and the aesthetics of light from the time of the Renaissance were inverted into the light that would enable surveillance for the gaze as well as for discipline and control. It seems that, in the inverted optics at the end of the 18th century, light gathered everything that was the opposite of the faded epoch and became the part of this new gaze:

> A fear haunted the latter half of the eighteenth century: the fear of darkened spaces, of the pall of gloom which prevents the full visibility of things, men and truths. It sought to break up the patches of darkness that blocked the light, eliminate the shadowy areas of society, demolish the unlit chambers where arbitrary political acts, monarchical caprice, religious superstitions, tyrannical and priestly plots, epidemics and the illusions of ignorance were fomented.[28]

Simultaneously, through a lit space, the gaze penetrated the bodies, minds, movements, and desires: "It's also the areas of darkness in man that the century of Enlightenment wants to make disappear".[29] In the technology of panoptical surveillance, the gaze was placed inside the being. Its optical exterior was only an instrument to acquire the form of the interior because two things were at play here, "the gaze and interiorisation",[30] and there are two principles of the *power/gaze*: the visible and unverifiable.[31] The relationships of power crossed over into the interior of the body. The optics of the exterior, as the optics of an ever-present visibility, still had something of the old mechanics in it because every disallowed movement, action, and intention caught by the gaze but which could not be seen would be punished.

A classifying thought or "loquacious gaze" occurred because of the dispositives which marked the erosion of a diagram of sovereignty and contained the new "historically situated ensembles of techniques for organizing and regulating the objects and resources of governing".[32] Social classifications were established through discourses, but it was always and "only" on the surface. The gaze was starting to become structured as power/game; a new interdependence of the exterior and the interior which was articulated through discourse.

The gaze as a *system of knowledge* included techniques and practices of power but also the discourses that legitimized its performance and application and the way it acquired its positivities. The gaze presupposed a *deep space,* i.e., the creation of spatial analytics and places in which it was performed. These would become places where discourses and practices were intersected as technologies of the gaze (prisons, hospitals, schools, etc.); places

---

[27] Georges Duby, *The Age of the Cathedrals: Art and Society, 980-1420* [1976] (1983).

[28] "The Eye of Power," 153.

[29] "The Eye of Power," 154.

[30] "The Eye of Power," 154.

[31] *Discipline and Punish,* 201.

[32] Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (2008); Francisco Klauser, Till Paasche and Ola Söderström, "Michel Foucault and the smart city: power dynamics inherent in contemporary governing through code," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32:5 (2014), 872.

as spatial articulations and shapes of power/knowledge. While the scene was necessary for the "old" form of sovereignty, the non-discursive order of power, the scene as a "beam of light" which was always directed at one point, at the convict's body, i.e., the loquacious and disciplinary gaze (panopticism), became an expression of the new geometry of sovereignty. It was articulated because of the fractalization of sovereignty and light. It became multiple – from a singular scene to a multiple gaze. Into each "new eye" in this multitude of knowledge, decision and power were inscribed. It signified the crash of representation, the end of the era of the "representative public", and an exit from the "darkness" of sovereignty where subjects stood opposite the ruler. It signified a new disciplinary program which no longer relied only on *force* as a technique of power but on discourse, knowledge, and space as technologies of power.

The gaze did not have its *temporal timetable* of appearance and disappearance, presence and absence. It became *constantly present* not only at the level of the optics-mechanics matrix but also at the level of the interior-psychology matrix. Once it was moved "inside" the body, there was no need for "real" surveillance. The panoptic aim had been achieved when the external surveillance had been interiorized and turned into a self-preserving discipline and self-regulative order. It was also an inversion of space and time and an inversion of practices and discourses. For practices were no longer penal – they were surveilling and disciplining. And the discourses were no longer inquisitorial-exploratory. They became increasingly investigative and expert. These were no longer statements that "wandered" across the juridical field. These were now the discourses of sciences on man. Finally, with the emergence of the gaze, a "civilization of representation" was inverted into the "civilization of surveillance" towards the *normalizing society*.[33]

PANOPTICON, PANOPTICISM AND THE DISCIPLINARY DIAGRAM

Despite the significance of Bentham's ideas in the fields of the philosophy of utilitarianism, legislation reform, morality, economics, education, and penal laws, he will be remembered as the inventor of the Panopticon. It was one of the most controversial ideas[34] at the very center of liberal ideology at the end of the 18th century. It was also a programmed utopia that did not prove to be as liberal as first thought.[35]

Although it was originally about a simple architectural project of the ideal prison, Bentham's idea was much more. It was a programmed utopia or "at once a programme and a utopia".[36] And its utilitarian, surveillance, and control dimensions remained part of the development of the disciplinary dispositives of modern capitalist societies from the end of the 18th century.

---

[33] Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976* [1997] (2003), 39.

[34] Philip Schofield, *Bentham: A Guide for the Perplexed* (2009), 70.

[35] Elissa S. Itzkin, "Bentham's Chrestomathia: Utilitarian Legacy to English Education," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39:2 (1978), 303.

[36] "The Eye of Power," 159. "In fact, Bentham does not even say that it is a schema for institutions, he says that it is a mechanism, a schema which gives strength to any institution, a sort of mechanism by which the power which functions, or which should function in an institution will be able to gain maximum force." Michel Foucault, *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976* [2003] (2006), 74.

It is based on a really simple principle: a round or polygonal building where cells were placed on the interior rim, and on the external rim of the cells, there was only one window with only one function – to let light in. And the light had only one function – to enable the gaze, to enable surveillance, and to enable the penetration and wandering of the gaze/surveillance of those who were placed in the center of the circular building. On a high tower, the constantly "wandering" gaze could become surveillance. This was a gaze that simultaneously surveilled and penetrated into cells, behavior, thoughts, and feelings. This was a gaze which constantly moved across bodies, motions, intentions, and desires. But this was also the gaze which could not be seen; in every cell there was one convict, madman, student, worker, soldier, sick person, or subordinated supervisor – one body, separated by a compartment from another body. Bodies distributed in space; bodies whose actions were distributed in time. A circular building, cells, the body, light, a tower, a gaze, surveillance, discipline, control, and order all at once.

> Morals reformed – health preserved – industry invigorated – instruction diffused – public burdens lightened – economy seated, as it were, upon a rock – the Gordian knot of the Poor-Laws are not cut, but untied – all by a simple idea in Architecture![37]

The popularity of Bentham's panopticon as a polychrest,[38] a multi-purpose *machine*,[39] architectural machine, or machine-space with utilitarian functions, would probably have been left on the margins of liberal-utilitarian reforming ideas if it was only about the model of a prison or only about a possible application of a simple architectural solution. But the architectural panopticon transformed into panopticism as a social model. Panopticism became a part of a growing disciplinary/normalizing society which no longer rested on the postulates of punctuation or localization of power[40] but on its scatteredness. This was the new postulate which could only provide its existence on a relationship, on reciprocity, on circularity, and on dispersion: on power's performance. It was the "technological invention in the order of power, comparable with the steam engine in the order of production".[41] The Panopticon was a disciplinary dispositive; it was "a way of defining power relations in terms of the everyday life of men"[42] to secure its dispersive omnipresence. For Foucault, panopticism was a crucial transitional model *from negative to positive effects of power*, while Bentham's idea was "archaic in the importance it gives to the gaze;

---

[37] Bentham, *The Panopticon Writings,* 31.

[38] Francis Bacon, *The New Organon* (2008), 180; Jacques-Alain Miller and Richard Miller, "Jeremy Bentham's Panoptic Device," *October* 41 (1987), 8.

[39] The term *machine* stands for *concrete space* or place where different mechanisms of power are functioning. For example, in Foucauldian terms, prisons or hospitals are machines. Charcot's Salpêtrière served as an example in this regard for Foucault, as a "machinery for incitement." Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, vol. I: The Will to Know,* 55.

[40] Deleuze, *Foucault,* 25.

[41] Michel Foucault, "Questions on Geography," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* [1976], ed. Colin Gordon (1980), 71.

[42] *Discipline and Punish,* 205.

but it is very modern in the general importance it assigns to techniques of power" which were "invented to meet the demands of production".[43]

Although it began its life in the middle of the disintegration of old religious and metaphysical matrices, great eradications from ancient forms of addiction, and the disintegration of old ritual practices, the Panopticon retained some of its divine principle: the principle of the all-seeing, surveilling, and all-knowing gaze of God. It was still ruled by the ancient "divine panopticism" expressed in Psalm 139:

> O Lord, you have searched me and known me! You know when I sit down and when I rise up; you discern my thoughts from afar. You search out my path and my lying down and are acquainted with all my ways. Even before a word is on my tongue, behold, O Lord, you know it altogether... ...Where shall I go from your Spirit? Or where shall I flee from your presence? If I ascend to heaven, you are there! If I make my bed in Sheol, you are there!...

The Panopticon is not only a machine for discipline and surveillance: "It could be used as a machine to carry out experiments, to alter behaviour, to train or correct individuals".[44] But research procedures, which were too inquisitorial, would liberate space more and more for investigative analysis. Investigation would be established in opposition to research: "Such forms of analysis gave rise to sociology, psychology, psychopathology, criminology, and psychoanalysis".[45] Punishment and inquisitorial investigation would abandon the body so that a new form of gaze appeared – panopticism – which would establish the regimes of surveillance and disciplining. For "imprisonment does not form part of the European penal system before the great reforms of the years 1780-1820. The jurists of the eighteenth century are unanimous on this point: "Prison is not regarded as a penalty according to our civil law".[46]

Bentham's Panopticon, therefore, reflected a connection of the social strategies and technologies of spatialization with gazes, discourses, knowledge, and power. The Panopticon became a part of the "abstract machine"[47] for the "production" of individuals, their productivity, and their usability. That is why the disciplinary regime, applied to the infected town, represented a situation of note: "An exceptional disciplinary model".[48]

The Panopticon became a pattern of *panopticism* which had diffused all over the social body and across its strategic regions: hospitals, schools, families, prisons, factories, and workshops. The infected town was an old matrix of periodicity, cyclicity, and sudden appearance of the disease and its unclear disappearance. Panopticism was a matrix of the diffuse and constant spatialization of the gaze. That is, the spatialization of discipline, surveillance, and control. And when gaze, knowledge, and power of investigative practices were applied to the population as a morphology of the social body, then the

---

[43] "The Eye of Power," 160-161.

[44] *Discipline and Punish,* 203.

[45] Michel Foucault, "Truth and Juridical Forms" [1973], in *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984: Power,* ed. James D. Faubion (2001), 5.

[46] "The Punitive Society," 23.

[47] *Foucault,* 36.

[48] *Discipline and Punish,* 207.

frequency, normality of its allocation, distribution, stable oscillations, and its regularity and averages (all of this expressed in birth rate, death rate, fertility, and morbidity through life, work, productivity, disease, and death) transformed the panopticon into panopticism.

Discipline became a strategic resource of productivity in society; in other words, power with positive social effects. Disciplining and surveilling prison practices not only developed independently or separately; they mixed with medicine and with sciences of investigation: sociology, psychology, statistics, criminology, penology, and pedagogy through a wide biopolitical diagram. No longer a contagious town, for "[d]uring the eighteenth century the idea of the pathogenic city inspires a whole mythology and very real states of popular panic".[49] In order not to apply incidental disciplinary measures, it became better to constantly control and surveil potentially pathogenic spaces in which the population is distributed with the use of medicalized mechanisms. Because "medicine, as a science of the normality of bodies, found a place at the center of penal practice (the penalty must have healing as its purpose)".[50] Hygiene as a preventive measure became "a regime of health for populations".[51]

However, this was not a matter of only the investigative sciences; this was also a matter of architecture and urbanism – a matter of the relationship towards *space*: "Architecture begins at the end of the eighteenth century to become involved in problems of population, health and the urban question".[52] The turning century had proven its inverted strength again:

> On the other hand, what we now see is [not] the idea of a power that takes the form of an exhaustive surveillance of individuals so that they are all constantly under the eyes of the sovereign in everything they do, but the set of mechanisms that, for the government and those who govern, attach pertinence to quite specific phenomena that are not exactly individual phenomena, even if individuals do appear in a way, and there are specific processes of individualization... The relation between the individual and the collective, between the totality of the social body and its elementary fragments, is made to function in a completely different way; it will function differently in what we call population. The government of populations is, I think, completely different from the exercise of sovereignty over the fine grain of individual behaviors.[53]

Panopticism as a disciplinary diagram made of *micro-mechanisms of power*,[54] like a polyvalent machine of surveillance and productivity, becomes a general dispositive of a normalizing

---

[49] Michel Foucault, "The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century" [1976], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon (1980), 175.

[50] "The Punitive Society," 35.

[51] Foucault, "The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century," 175.

[52] "The Eye of Power," 148.

[53] Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978* [2004] (2007), 66.

[54] *Discipline and Punish,* 205. Deleuze in *Foucault* [1986] (2006) noticed that the moment Foucault introduced the concept of the *disciplinary diagram* (in the idea of panopticism), it was finally more clearly defined. Furthermore, it was liberated from the concreteness of its architectural forms and thus became a general

society, and it has been developing since the 18th century. In his lectures on *Security, Territory, Population,* Foucault would go one step further because the totality of surveilling and disciplining practices, the totality of investigative discourses in institutional spaces, seems too Hobbesian, too sovereign – a regime of power not synaptic enough;[55] a regime of power not diffuse enough.

If Bentham's Panopticon is more important for our society than Hegel and Kant[56] because the social space is not ruled by any abstract spirit which would express its freedom in the state, law, and their mechanisms, and because it is not a space of transcendental morality, then the idea of panopticism is more important for understanding the genealogy of normalizing society than Hobbes: "Think of the scheme of Leviathan: insofar as he is a fabricated man, Leviathan is no other than the amalgamation of a certain number of separate individualities, who find themselves reunited by the complex of elements that go to compose the State; but at the heart of the State, or rather, at its head, there exists something which constitutes it as such, and this is sovereignty, which Hobbes says is precisely the spirit of Leviathan".[57]

The moment when disciplining and surveilling regimes, scattered all over the social body, were caught in the network of an old matrix of institutional order, sovereignty was "recycled", and we could "move further apart" from Foucault's statement "Le pouvoir, ça n'existe pas",[58] which seems confusing at a first glance. Yes – power did not exist collected in one point from which it emerged as monopolized, hardened, previously recognized, Hobbesian, Rousseauian, as well as Webberian and Marxist. It existed only and exclusively as a *relationship* – as a performance and relational category – as a relation of *ordered scatteredness*, not of strict hierarchical collectedness. As Foucault demonstrated: *it had to be applied to function*.

For Foucault, power was not the authority which was used as an institutionalized and formal state mechanism to legitimately subdue a great number of people. Power was a multiplicity of relations of strength: "The omnipresence of power: not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere".[59]

(disciplinary) map applicable to all social fields (34). Deleuze further explains the diagram (the "abstract machine") as "a display of the relations between forces which constitute power" (2006), 36. When Foucault used the term *mechanism,* he had in mind micro-relations of power standing opposite the macro juridical systems or procedures. Hence, society can be thought of as being made up of dispositives that function like machines with a series of smaller mechanisms. For example, see: Michel Foucault, "Two Lectures" [1977], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (1980), 101.

[55] Michel Foucault, "Prison Talk" [1975], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon (1980), 39.

[56] Foucault, "Truth and Juridical Forms," 58.

[57] Foucault, "Two Lectures," 97-98.

[58] Michel Foucault, "Le jeu de Michel Foucault" [1977], in *Dits et écrits 1970-1975, Tome III,* ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald (1994), 302.

[59] *The History of Sexuality, Vol.* I, 93.

And when, in the Benthamian Panopticon, power started being collected through the optics of central surveillance, in one central point from which it originated, it already became anachronous, leading to the seeking of an exit.

> The idea of the panopticon is a modern idea in one sense, but we can also say that it is completely archaic, since the panoptic mechanism basically involves putting someone in the center – an eye, a gaze, a principle of surveillance – who will be able to make its sovereignty function over all the individuals [placed] within this machine of power. To that extent we can say that the panopticon is the oldest dream of the oldest sovereign.[60]

Does this last sentence of Foucault's not repeat the idea of the "panoptical" Psalm 139? This is a crucial point not only in Foucault's interpretation of the Panopticon but in which we can construct an answer to the accumulated criticism of his concept of panopticism. Was this really the end of a disciplinary society and a transition towards the society of control, as Deleuze wrote?[61] Was it really the end of a model of the society, starting from the 18th century, in which the subject was produced: "Subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge"?[62] It seems that Dreyfus and Rabinow were right: "There is no pre- and post-archaeology or genealogy in Foucault".[63] On the boundary between this non-existent pre/post border, in *Security, Territory, Population,* Foucault would recognize the anachronism of the Panopticon. If the central point of the Panopticon was still about a "dream of sovereign power", then how was it possible to remove that form of power which served as a social pattern for the benefit of all non-sovereign diffuse powers, their non-sovereign performances, and functions?

CRITICISM AND LEGACY

What we owe to Foucault is a much deeper insight behind architecture, behind prisons, behind schools, and behind hospitals. In his analyses, spaces and places as material and physical entities are no longer observed outside or beyond social practices that generate them. In other words: "What Foucault offered to historians, he offered just as much to geographers"[64] and sociologists. Sociologists owe to Foucault the crucial relocation of the focus from the Panopticon to panopticism; from the architecture of the object to the architectonics of society; from technology over an individual body to the social technology of multitude; and from the prison to the total change not only of penal politics but also of political, social, and economic relations. The Panopticon was not a prison. It was a

---

[60] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population,* 66.
[61] Gilles Deleuze, "Postscript on the Societies of Control" [1990], *October* 59 (1992).
[62] Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power" [1982], in *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, Power,* ed. James D. Faubion (2001), 331.
[63] Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, eds., *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (1983), 104.
[64] Claude Raffestin, "Could Foucault have revolutionized geography?," in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography,* ed. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden (2007), 129.

principle and an idea that was applied in the practice of panopticism. It was also a principle of a polyvalent, modular mechanism of social technology which intimated radical interruptions and the erosion of sovereign forms of power and authority.

These transformations of power also meant the introduction of the *normalizing procedures* that actually changed the way power is exercised. Foucault recognized that in the genealogy of disciplinary/normalizing society, two types of mechanisms and two types of discourse, "absolutely heterogeneous", were important. On the one side, there is "the organization of right around sovereignty", and on the other, "the mechanics of the coercions exercised by disciplines".[65] These two social dispositives explain what he called a "normalizing society" because disciplinary normalizations were practices "in conflict" with the juridical system of sovereignty. Furthermore, Foucault recognized that precisely the expansion of medicine, the general medicalization of behavior, and the "politics of health" in the 18th century – modes of conduct, discourses, desires, and so on – were "the heterogeneous layers" where discipline and sovereignty would meet.[66] And in more general terms, one crucial element emerges that "will circulate between the disciplinary and the regulatory, which will also be applied to body and population alike", and "which will make it possible to control both the disciplinary order of the body and the aleatory events that occur in the biological multiplicity".[67] That element that "circulates between the two" is the *norm.* It is something "that can be applied to both a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize".[68]

In the normalizing society, both the norms of discipline and the norms of regulation intersect. And the interplay of these social technologies of power, discipline, and regulation covered "the whole surface that lies between the organic and the biological, between body and population".[69]

Furthermore, in the recognition of the spatial transformations and genealogical lines towards the normalizing society, Foucault needed another scene as a point of interruption. For him, this was an infected, contagious town. This was an inversion in the analytics of space as well as in the practices of spatialization. This was about the models of establishing *control over space*. Hence, this was about how "a strict spatial partitioning"[70] in society was established. First, Foucault recognized two large models: treating lepers and treating the contagious – two models which referred to space differently.

Despite differences, Bentham's Panopticon would, however, reflect the compound of these two patterns at the level of architecture. It would not completely abolish the old pattern of separation and ritual excommunication, as it would not completely abolish the patterns of the analytics of space of a contagious town. They would still be in the background when, at the end of the 18th century, "it becomes a question of using the disposition of space for economico-political ends".[71] Yet, the contagious town produced a

---

[65] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* 38.

[66] *Society Must Be Defended,* 39.

[67] *Society Must Be Defended,* 252.

[68] *Society Must Be Defended,* 253.

[69] *Society Must Be Defended,* 253.

[70] *Discipline and Punish,* 195.

[71] "The Eye of Power," 148.

different spatialization, a different cartography: "The map as instrument of power/knowledge"[72] in relation to leprosy as well as in relation to spaces of public execution and in relation to panoptical spaces. This was not a spatialization of binary divisions (of lepers). This was a question of spatially multiplying discipline, for "the first is that of a pure community, the second that of a disciplined society […]. Underlying disciplinary projects, the image of the plague stands for all forms of confusion and disorder; just as the image of the leper, cut off from all human contact, underlies projects of exclusion".[73] Norris summarises these two different social models of control: "Power over the plague victims is exercised by 'differentiation', 'segmentation', and 'training'. In contrast, power over the leper is managed by enforced 'segregation', 'separation', 'confinement', and 'exile'.[74]

But discipline was precisely the crucial spatial dispositive; a measure of order introduced in the space of commotion. This would no longer be a "Decameronian" dramaturgy of abolishing borders, suspending morality, and revoking surveillance in order to liberate the final moments of pleasure in life which were surrounded by disease and death. Opposite to this, Boccacio's dramaturgy, the reality of a surrounded town, was a disciplinary regime of order which multiplied and fragmented space. This was the analytics of quarantine spatialization. Through the application of a disciplinary spatial regime, the usual dynamics of town life – a multitude of encounters and coincidences, the pulsing and fluid rhythm of daily life – would be replaced by statics. Space would turn to a multitude of divided and controlled places and surveilling spots:

> 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 periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical 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 the disciplinary mechanism.[75]

Whilst "the leper gave rise to rituals of exclusion… the plague gave rise to disciplinary diagrams".[76] These *schémas disciplinaires* "require a strict spatial partitioning, careful surveillance, detailed inspection and order".[77] This was about a disciplinary project which multiplied spatialization: an area was divided into the infected and uninfected, as were towns. Parts of the town tissue were sick, others were not. It was not known where disease/death would manifest nor when it would mysteriously disappear – when it would

---

[72] Foucault, "Questions on Geography," 74.

[73] *Discipline and Punish,* 198-199.

[74] Clive Norris, "From Personal to Digital: CCTV, the Panopticon and the Technological Mediation of Suspicious and Social Control," in *Surveillance as Social Sorting,* ed. David Lyon, (2003), 250; Monika Myers and Michael Wilson, "Leprosy and the Plague: State Surveillance of Low-Income Fathers," *Surveillance & Society* 12:1 (2014), 126.

[75] *Discipline and Punish,* 197.

[76] *Discipline and Punish,* 231.

[77] Stuart Elden, "Plague, Panopticon, Police," *Surveillance & Society* 1:3 (2003), 243.

abandon the multiplied spatializations of regions and towns; streets, squares, and houses; rooms, beds, and bodies. Spatialization then gained a form of micro-regionalization – because the function of the diagram was not only to distribute spatially and locate but also to make visible; the diagram was, just like in a panoptical prison, "a strategy of exposure"[78] to the gaze.

Foucault was aware of the existence of a certain archaism in the panoptical type of prison, i.e., anachronisms which returned his synaptic idea of power, discipline, and surveillance to the concept of sovereignty. Perhaps, "the panopticon itself was tied just to a particular time and place of state development".[79] However, there was a certain point of interruption and transformation of the panoptical principle which Foucault had not noticed. It seems that Bruno Latour more recently recognized this: "It is the entire topography of the social world that is being modified… a new topographical relationship becomes visible between the former micro and the former macro. The macro is neither 'above' nor 'below' the interactions".[80] In opposition to the ideal utopian Bentham-Foucault Panopticon, Latour offered real places that were transferrable: "Oligoptica are just those sites since they do exactly the opposite of panoptica".[81] Here a utopian "megalomania" of a "dominant gaze" was replaced by *real gazes of the many.* Opposite the absolute gaze which originated in the panoptical surveilling tower, many individual and "narrow" gazes emerged. Today, it seems like we can all surveil something. Today, we have "participatory surveillance"[82] and the new forms of surveillance capitalism.[83] We have moved, as Mathiesen[84] has suggested, from panopticism to synopticism: "It may stand for the *opposite* of the situation where the few see the many. In a two-way and significant double sense of the word we thus live in a *viewer society*". Therefore, the utopian sketch was anachronous in comparison with the reality of a multitude of narrow gazes which originated in a multitude of points.

Zigmunt Bauman's criticism of the Panopticon and panopticism was also based on the anachronism of the model. Namely, "the collapse of the 'panoptic' model"[85] of surveillance and discipline in his opinion was a consequence of radical changes in the relations of production and consumption because contemporary postmodern societies, or the societies of *Liquid Modernity,*[86] were not based on the strategies of mass production and disciplined industrial work: "The end of Panopticon augurs the end of the era of mutual engagement: between the supervisors and the supervised, capital and labour, leaders and

---

[78] William Bogard, *The Simulation of Surveillance: Hypercontrol in Telematic Societies* (1996), 19.

[79] Michael R. Dove, "The panoptic gaze in a non-western setting: self-surveillance on Merapi volcano, Central Java," *Religion* 40 (2010).

[80] Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (2005), 176-177.

[81] Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, 181.

[82] Anders Albrechtslund, "Online social networking as Participatory Surveillance," *First Monday* 13:3 (2008).

[83] Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (2019).

[84] Thomas Mathiesen, "The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' revisited," *Theoretical Criminology: An International Journal* 1:2 (1997), 219.

[85] Zygmunt Bauman, "On Postmodern Uses of Sex," *Theory, Culture & Society* 15:3-4 (1998), 22.

[86] Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (2006).

their followers, armies at war".[87] Factories and barracks, industrial workers and soldiers, so often used as examples in Foucault's work, were now, as Bauman noticed – the past. The police type of surveillance today is replaced by seduction and indoctrination with advertising: "Spectacles take the place of surveillance without losing any of the disciplining power of their predecessor".[88] Foucault's concept of discipline, surveillance, and power was based on the type of society which no longer existed in contemporary post-industrial societies.[89] In other words, here the "productive type" of normalizing society, which Foucault based his idea of panopticism on, was opposed to consumer society. And while Benthamian utilitarianism was directed towards production, post-panoptic society is directed towards consumerism.[90]

Gilles Deleuze's criticism also followed anachronous points in Foucault's concept of the normalizing type of society. Although he emphasized that Foucault had known how transitory this model of society had been,[91] and that scattered power would be collected under some sovereign models, Deleuze, in his criticism, still moved in the direction of the alternation of the old disciplinary model of society, with all its technologies of the production of power, order, structures, discourse, subjects, and the growth of societies of control: "The disciplines underwent a crisis to the benefit of new forces that were gradually instituted and which accelerated after World War II: a disciplinary society was what we already no longer were, what we had ceased to be".[92]

Whereas Foucault saw strategic mechanisms for the establishment of a new institutional order and institutional consolidation after the disintegration of the medieval historical matrices in the production technologies of the disciplinary model of society, Deleuze noticed the very opposite processes at the end of the 18th century:

> We are in a generalized crisis in relation to all the environments of enclosure – prison, hospital, factory, school, family... But everyone knows that these institutions are finished, whatever the length of their expiration periods… These are the societies of control, which are in the process of replacing the disciplinary societies.[93]

What Deleuze emphasized as a turning point is *modulation* in societies of control in opposition to the *stabilization* of disciplinary societies, because: "The disciplinary societies have two poles: the signature that designates the individual, and the number or administrative numeration that indicates his or her position within a mass... In the societies of control, on the other hand, what is important is no longer either a signature or a number, but a code: the code is a *password*".[94] Deleuze's diagram of modulation announced the erosion of the

---

[87] Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, 11.

[88] *Liquid Modernity*, 86.

[89] Michalis Lianos, "Social Control after Foucault," *Surveillance & Society* 1:3 (2003), 413.

[90] Roy Boyne, "Post-Panopticism," *Economy and Society* 29:2 (2000).

[91] Deleuze, "Postscript on the Societies of Control," 3.

[92] "Postscript on the Societies of Control," 3; Bart Simon, "The Return of Panopticism: Supervision, Subjection and the New Surveillance," *Surveillance & Society* 3:1 (2005).

[93] "Postscript on the Societies of Control," 3-4.

[94] "Postscript on the Societies of Control," 5.

disciplinary diagram in which the position, a place in any disciplinary module – prison, hospital, factory, or school – had to be assumed always all over again. The diagram of modulation offered something else: the metastability of the condition of the societies of control where nothing that had been started ended.[95] The stronghold of Deleuze's position was the understanding that a new type of society – the society of consumption and control – was characterized by a diagram of power that differed from the one on which Foucault built his panopticism in the societies of production.

However, the question remained as to what the transition from panopticism to post-panopticism actually meant. Did this transition contain discontinuity or was it just a transformation? In other words, did the transition of the panoptical gaze and the dispositives of power into a new post-panoptical gaze and a new geography of scatteredness signify the multiplication of an "old" model and its translation but now as the simulation of the whole, which no longer existed? Was it a new "game of the whole" whose diagram indicated its fractal structure?

The problem of the transition from panopticism as "an old matrix" of disciplinary societies into post-panopticism signifies an attempt to understand the new modulation of space in contemporary societies as well as an attempt to understand a much deeper and wider matrix of the interrelationships of knowledge, power, and space which occur in contemporary societies. The capitalist society has demonstrated its modular strength many times in its history. Internal historical contradictions, the "elimination of spatial barriers and the struggle to annihilate space by time",[96] were manifested in the withdrawal of new borders, which produced new barriers and new spaces. In that sense, capitalism not only managed to reshape the existing, previously socially, economically, and politically produced spaces but also conquered new socially unformed space,[97] which did not contain only borders, zones, lands, defined places, or hierarchies.

The identification of the transformation of the structural category of space and its contemporary modulations, its research through the principle of the gaze as something dynamic as an element of the trihedral knowledge/power/space, implied the presupposition that modulations and regimes (as visible and articulable) were the amplitudes of the same diagram, just like production and consumption, discipline and control. The diagram of control was just an "abstract sketch" that indicated how social production and the organization of space were connected with the implementation of discipline, control, and surveillance. Because, as both Foucault and Deleuze understood, the crucial characteristic of the diagram was the organization of functions – it was "a functioning, abstracted from any obstacle [. . .] or friction [and which] must be detached from any specific use".[98] Since each diagram was a "spatial-temporal multitude", it had many functions: there were as many of them as there were social fields in history. Therefore, "the *diagram* is no longer

---

[95] "Postscript on the Societies of Control," 5.

[96] David Harvey, "Between Space and Time: Reflections on the Geographical Imagination," *Annales of the Association of American Geographers* 80:3 (1990), 425.

[97] Harvey, "Between Space and Time: Reflections on the Geographical Imagination," 425.

[98] *Foucault, 34.*

an auditory or visual archive but a map, a cartography that is coextensive with the whole social field".[99]

However, because of the immanent ability to separate and disconnect spatial wholes with the aim of disciplining various practices, the Benthamian model of the Panopticon would not remain a static model. As an articulated whole and discursive technology of social surveillance, it became a dynamic model which, in the contemporary societies of control, was transformed into a model which identified the dissolution of the gaze.

Post-panopticism, therefore, is no longer a domination over spaces and bodies distributed *in* space but rather represents a modular diagram of *dissoluted* space; a new geography of the scatteredness of power which overcame territorial "limitations". That is why we can say that the new modular diagram of power today is a deterritorializing concept: a concept which includes productivity and the dynamics of space; fluid and "polished" spaces as temporary stabilizations which contain the potential for new points of relocation.

That is why the gaze as a system and practice of power became "nomadic": it no longer demanded the relocation of the body as a gaze of panopticism, because it can "dissipate" across it regardless of where the body is situated. In a new, *digital diagram*, just like in any other diagram, infra-sociality and power are always in the making.

CONCLUSIONS

No epoch can exist or be articulated prior to the articulable and visible: "An 'age' does not pre-exist the statements which express it, nor the visibilities which fill it".[100] According to Deleuze, these are two essential aspects because each historical formation "implies a distribution of the visible and the articulable which acts upon itself".[101] The aim of a genealogical analytics is to enable the identification of connections and differences between the visible and the articulable which are established in new realities, in new practices. Furthermore, the task is to map the contours of new diagrams of control as new relations of the forces of the visible and articulable; a new model of the truth in which history is produced through the disintegration of previous realities and through the creation of new realities and new models.

While Foucault recognized the asylum as a model "in the age of classicism", a new way of seeing and displaying madness, a new gaze on insanity, like the prison, through the model of the Panopticon, he also recognized the new gaze on the social body – panopticism.[102]

Full visibility or the gaze of an epoch becomes a systematized and rounded whole only when the positivities of knowledge and power, i.e., their "empiricity", are sedimented in the archive. The mapping of the relationship of the visible and the articulable as a sketch of the new "game" where history was produced through the disintegration of previous

---

[99] *Foucault*, 34.
[100] *Foucault*, 48.
[101] *Foucault*, 48.
[102] *Foucault*, 48.

realities and the creation of new ones is not possible to recognize without Foucauldian genealogies.

The diagram of power of modern normalizing societies and strategies, in which "the authority uses the surrounding of social fields", was analyzed by Foucault through the model of the Panopticon, which introduced a power/gaze, but also through the model of plague, "which cordons off the stricken town and regulates the smallest detail".[103] In opposition to the rituality of the exclusion of leprosy, this was also the *disciplinary project*,[104] which multiplied spatialization: the region was divided into the infected and uninfected, as were towns. This was about a *new multiplication of spatialization* where, in one corner, discourse was growing as power/knowledge and, in the other, the gaze and optics of panopticism.

Because they are different but not incompatible projects, these two large patterns of spatialization – separation and disciplining surveillance – were not separate models for quite some time. They would only begin to blend into the normalizing society during the 19th century.

It should also be noted that an important and insufficiently problematized aspect of Foucault's legacy that we did not tackle in the problematization of the gaze was his understanding of truth – or the relation between gaze and truth. This is because all that "light", surveillance, and control, and all those spaces and panoptical principles, these served in the function of truth. The institutionalization of the gaze was just a side effect in the search for truth, which should be practical, utilitarian, and embedded in knowledge and "supported" by power. Panopticism and the control of the behavior of men as *a dispositive* did not require expression, statements, and discourse.

Foucault had more interest in genealogies than in institutions.[105] In our belief, the concepts of gaze and norm which result from this interest and his research are not only the key concepts but also represent his central contribution to sociology. Along the way, he also traced the genealogies of the abnormal: pathologies and exclusions. Of no less importance is this light on the whole (other) space out of the social margin which showed sociologists how something that is socially peripheral could be symbolically and normatively central.

Power technologies of discipline and regulation from the 18th century were also a part of the rise of a social class – the bourgeoisie:

> Historically, the process by which the bourgeoisie became in the course of the eighteenth century the politically dominant class was masked by the establishment of an explicit, coded and formally egalitarian juridical framework, made possible by the organization of a parliamentary, representative regime. But the development and generalization of disciplinary mechanisms constituted the other, dark

---

[103] *Foucault*, 34.

[104] *Discipline and Punish,* 198.

[105] "Now I no longer think that the institution is very satisfactory notion. It seems to me that it harbors a number of dangers, because as soon as we talk about institutions we are basically talking about both individuals and the group, we take the individual, the group, and the rules which govern them as given, and as a result we can throw in all the psychological or sociological discourses." Foucault, *Psychiatric Power,* 15.

side of these processes. The general juridical form that guaranteed a system of rights that were egalitarian in principle was supported by these tiny, everyday, physical mechanisms, by all those systems of micro-power that are essentially non-egalitarian and asymmetrical that we call the disciplines. And although, in a formal way, the representative regime makes it possible, directly or indirectly, with or without relays, for the will of all to form the fundamental authority of sovereignty, the disciplines provide, at the base, a guarantee of the submission of forces and bodies.[106]

Furthermore, all these *productive elements* were part of the structures of the rising type of society – at its *core* normalizing, and at the surface *capitalistic.* It paved the way for new discourses, knowledges, and legitimations to emerge as well, such as expert (medical) knowledge but also human and social science knowledge.

Disciplinary mechanisms go back a long way:[107] from the center of the dispositive of sovereignty. Gaze comes from the dispositive of the same discourses and power/knowledge through which we are now trying to go "behind" Foucault.

There are numerous contemporary studies that rely on Foucault. It would be hard to describe the topics or fields in philosophy and social sciences *where* his influence or legacy is recognized the most. It could also be noted that panopticism has also invoked certain criticisms.[108] Furthermore, some interpreters and commentators of Foucault's work have associated him and his *oeuvre* with certain types of dogmatism, even the "irrationalist hostility to science".[109] There are also numerous studies that apply or extend the concepts of gaze, panopticism, and normalization in novel ways, especially in the field of *surveillance studies.* Problems and topics include the dimensions of gaze and panopticism in studies of urban environment, informatic practices, the medical gaze, psychiatry and public health, biopolitics, homeless people, public spaces and CCTV technology, self-tracking, digital media, and so on.[110]

Concepts of gaze and norm remain relevant for future sociological research as well. One could possibly argue that their relevance and plausibility stems from the fact that the problem of power dynamics and control mechanisms in societies change but remain a

---

[106] *Discipline and Punish*, 222.

[107] *Psychiatric Power*, 63.

[108] Such as that it "does not provide a master key to understand digital technologies of power". Petra Gehring, "The Inverted Eye. Panopticon and Panopticism, Revisited," *Foucault Studies* 23 (2017).

[109] Siniša Malešević, "Are We All Foucauldians Now? 'Culture Wars' and the Poststructuralist Legacy," *Critical Review – A Journal of Politics and Society* 34:3-4 (2022).

[110] See, for example: Iafet Leonardi Bricalli, "The Paradoxes in the Use of the Panopticon as a Theoretical Reference in Urban Video-surveillance Studies: A Case Study of a CCTV System of a Brazilian City," *Foucault Studies* 27 (2019); Martin French, "Gaps in the gaze: Informatic practice and the work of public health surveillance," *Surveillance & Society* 12:2 (2014); Susanne Bauer and Jan Eric Olsén, "Observing the Others, Watching Over Oneself: Themes of medical surveillance in post-panoptic society," *Surveillance & Society* 6:2 (2009); Rodney Fopp, "Increasing the Potential for Gaze, Surveillance and Normalisation: the transformation of an Australian policy for people who are homeless," *Surveillance & Society* 1:1 (2002); Ivan Manokha, "Surveillance, Panopticism, and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age," *Surveillance & Society* 16:2 (2018); Peter Lindner, "Molecular Politics, Wearables, and the *Aretaic* Shift in Biopolitical Governance," *Theory, Culture & Society* 37:3 (2020).

relevant and constant issue for sociologists in different ways. Their relevance is also recognizable in the examination of how individuals regulate their behavior *in response* to power. Furthermore, "new games" of visibility and invisibility always emerge and are today more and more induced by the development of digital technologies and media. At the same time, these are questions of how (social) norms are transformed and shaped by power and social mechanisms of control.

Perhaps contemporary studies of gaze and norm are just an attempt to go behind the history which "imprisoned us" – or to go behind all the practices of power, surveillance, and normalization whose transformations Foucault would have a lot to say about today.

References

Albrechtslund, Anders, "Online social networking as Participatory Surveillance," *First Monday* 13:3 (2008). https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v13i3.2142

Bacon, Francis, *The New Organon*. Gloucester: Dodo Press, 2008.

Bauer, Susanne, and Jan Eric Olsén, "Observing the Others, Watching Over Oneself: Themes of medical surveillance in post-panoptic society," *Surveillance & Society* 6:2 (2009), 116-127. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v6i2.3252

Bauman, Zygmunt, "On Postmodern Uses of Sex," *Theory, Culture & Society* 15:3-4 (1998), 19-33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276498015003002

Bauman, Zygmunt, *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.

Bentham, Jeremy, *The Panopticon Writings.* London: Verso, 1995.

Bogard, William, *The Simulation of Surveillance: Hypercontrol in Telematic Societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Boyne, Roy, "Post-Panopticism," *Economy and Society* 29:2 (2000), 285-307. https://doi.org/10.1080/030851400360505

Bricalli, Iafet Leonardi, "The Paradoxes in the Use of the Panopticon as a Theoretical Reference in Urban Video-surveillance Studies: A Case Study of a CCTV System of a Brazilian City," *Foucault Studies* 27 (2019), 144-161. https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v27i27.5895

Burchell, Graham, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality – with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Deleuze, Gilles, "Postscript on the Societies of Control" [1990], *October* 59 (1992), 3-7.

Deleuze, Gilles, *Foucault* [1986]. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

Dove, Michael R., "The panoptic gaze in a non-western setting: self-surveillance on Merapi volcano, Central Java," *Religion* 40 (2010), 121-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.religion.2009.12.007

Dreyfus, Hubert, and Paul Rabinow, eds., *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Duby, Georges, *The Age of the Cathedrals: Art and Society, 980-1420* [1976]. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Elden, Stuart, "Plague, Panopticon, Police," *Surveillance & Society* 1:3 (2003), 240-253. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v1i3.3339

Fopp, Rodney, "Increasing the Potential for Gaze, Surveillance and Normalisation: the transformation of an Australian policy for people who are homeless," *Surveillance & Society* 1:1 (2002), 48-65. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v1i1.3393

Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I: The Will to Know* [1976]. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Foucault, Michel, "Prison Talk" [1975], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, 37-55. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, "Questions on Geography" [1976], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, 63-78. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, "Two Lectures" [1977], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, 78-109. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, "The Eye of Power" [1977], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, 146-166. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, "The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century" [1976], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, 166-183. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, "The History of Sexuality" [1977], in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972/1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, 183-194. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" [1971], in *The Foucault Reader,* ed. Paul Rabinow, 76-101. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Foucault, Michel, "Of Other Spaces" [1984], *Diacritics* 16:1 (1986), 22-27. https://doi.org/10.2307/464648

Foucault, Michel, "On Power" [1978], in *Politics, Philosophy, Culture,* ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, 96-110. London: Routledge, 1988.

Foucault, Michel, "Théories et institutions pénales" [1972], in *Dits et écrits 1970-1975, Tome II,* eds. Daniel Defert and François Ewald, 389-393. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

Foucault, Michel, "Le jeu de Michel Foucault" [1977], in *Dits et écrits 1970-1975, Tome III*, ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald, 298-330. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* [1975]. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Foucault, Michel, "The Punitive Society" [1994], in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth – The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 1,* ed. Paul Rabinow, 23-39. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Foucault, Michel, "Truth and Juridical Forms" [1973] in *The Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984: Power,* ed. James D. Faubion, 1-90. New York: The New Press, 2001.

Foucault, Michel, "The Subject and Power" [1982], in *Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984*: *Power,* ed. James D. Faubion, 326-348. New York: The New Press, 2001.

Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things* [1966]. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Foucault, Michel, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976* [1961]. New York: Picador, 2003.

Foucault, Michel, *History of Madness* [1961]. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Foucault, Michel, *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976* [2003]. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Foucault, Michel, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978* [2004]. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Foucault, Michel, *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Foucault, Michel, "Course Summary," in *Penal Theories and Institutions: Lectures at the Collège de France 1971-1972*, ed. Bernard Harcourt, 229-233. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

French, Martin, "Gaps in the gaze: Informatic practice and the work of public health surveillance," *Surveillance & Society* 12:2 (2014), 226-243.

Gehring, Petra, "The Inverted Eye. Panopticon and Panopticism, Revisited," *Foucault Studies* 23 (2017), 46–62. https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i0.5341

Harvey, David, "Between Space and Time: Reflections on the Geographical Imagination," *Annales of the Association of American Geographers* 80:3 (1990), 418-434.

Itzkin, Elissa S., "Bentham's Chrestomathia: Utilitarian Legacy to English Education," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39:2 (1978), 303-316. https://doi.org/10.2307/2708782

Johnson, Peter, "Foucault's Spatial Combat," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26:4 (2008), 611-626. https://doi.org/10.1068/d3007

Klauser, Francisco, Till Paasche, and Ola Söderström, "Michel Foucault and the smart city: Power Dynamics Inherent in Contemporary Governing Through Code," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32:5 (2014), 869-885. https://doi.org/10.1068/d13041p

Latour, Bruno, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Lianos, Michalis, "Social Control after Foucault," *Surveillance & Society* 1:3 (2003), 412-430.

Lindner, Peter, "Molecular Politics, Wearables, and the Aretaic Shift in Biopolitical Governance," *Theory, Culture & Society* 37:3 (2020), 71-96. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419894053

Malešević, Siniša, "Are We All Foucauldians Now? 'Culture Wars' and the Poststructuralist Legacy," *Critical Review – A Journal of Politics and Society* 34:3-4 (2022), 404-424. https://doi.org/10.1080/08913811.2022.2122171

Manokha, Ivan, "Surveillance, Panopticism, and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age," *Surveillance & Society* 16:2 (2018), 219-237. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v16i2.8346

Marinković, Dušan, and Dušan Ristić, "Foucault's 'Hall of Mirrors': an investigation into geo-epistemology," *Geografiska Annaler: Series B Human Geography* 98:2 (2016), 83-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/geob.12092

Mathiesen, Thomas, "The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' revisited," *Theoretical Criminology* 1:2 (1997), 215-232. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003

Miller, Jacques-Alain, and Richard Miller, "Jeremy Bentham's Panoptic Device," *October* 41 (1987), 3-29. https://doi.org/10.2307/778327

Myers, Monica, and Michael Wilson, "Leprosy and the Plague: State Surveillance of Low-Income Fathers," *Surveillance & Society* 12:1 (2014), 124-139.

Norris, Clive "From Personal to Digital: CCTV, the Panopticon and the Technological Mediation of Suspicious and Social Control," in *Surveillance as Social Sorting*, ed. David Lyon, 249-282. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Raffestin, Claude, "Could Foucault have revolutionized geography?" in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography,* ed. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden, 129-141. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Ristić, Dušan, and Dušan Marinković, "The Foucault Effect in the Sociology of Knowledge," *Philosophy & Society* 34:1 (2023), 153-169. https://doi.org/10.2298/FID2301153R

Schofield, Philip, *Bentham: A Guide for the Perplexed.* London and New York: Continuum, 2009.

Simon, Bart, "The Return of Panopticism: Supervision, Subjection and the New Surveillance," *Surveillance & Society* 3:1 (2005), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v3i1.3317

Zuboff, Shoshana, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. London: Profile Books, 2019.

Author info
Dušan Marinković
dusan.marinkovic@ff.uns.ac.rs
Full Professor
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy
University of Novi Sad
Serbia

Dušan Ristić
risticd@ff.uns.ac.rs
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy
University of Novi Sad
Serbia

Dušan Marinković (b. 1968) is a Full Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Serbia. He is Editor in Chief of Mediterran Publishing. His main fields of interest are sociological theory, sociology of knowledge and sociology of ideology. He is the author and co-author of the books: *Construction of Social Reality in Sociology and Ideology*, *Reflexive Sociology of Alvin W. Gouldner*, *Outline for the Sociology of*

Ideology, Essays on Regional Identity, Essays in Geo-epistemology. His other fields of interest are the transformation of the public sphere and the relations between heterotopias, space and power.

Dušan Ristić (b. 1980) is currently a *Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions* post-doctoral fellow at the Austrian Centre for Digital Humanities at the University of Graz. He also holds an associate professorship at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad in Serbia. His current research intersects datafication, digital culture, heritage and discourse analysis, but also the innovative ways of using digital methods in social sciences. He is the author and co-author of the books: *Outline for the Sociology of Ideology, Essays on Regional Identity, Boundaries of Discourse, Essays in Geo-epistemology*.