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MICHEL FOUCAULT TAUGHT AT the Collège de France from January 1971 until his death in June 1984 (with the exception of 1977 when he took a sabbatical year). The title of his chair was “The History of Systems of Thought.”

On the proposal of Jules Vuillemin, the chair was created on 30 November 1969 by the general assembly of the professors of the Collège de France and replaced that of “The History of Philosophical Thought” held by Jean Hyppolite until his death. The same assembly elected Michel Foucault to the new chair on 12 April 1970. He was 43 years old.

Michel Foucault’s inaugural lecture was delivered on 2 December 1970. Teaching at the Collège de France is governed by particular rules. Professors must provide 26 hours of teaching a year (with the possibility of a maximum of half this total being given in the form of seminars). Each year they must present their original research and this obliges them to change the content of their teaching for each course. Courses and seminars are completely open; no enrolment or qualification is required and the professors do not award any qualifications. In the terminology of the Collège de France, the professors do not have students but only auditors.

Michel Foucault’s courses were held every Wednesday from January to March. The huge audience made up of students, teachers, researchers and the curious, including many who came from outside France, required two amphitheaters of the Collège de France. Foucault often complained about the distance between himself and his “public” and of how few exchanges the course made possible. He would have liked a seminar in which real collective work could take place and made a number of attempts to bring
this about. In the final years he devoted a long period to answering his auditors' questions at the end of each course.

This is how Gérard Petitjean, a journalist from Le Nouvel Observateur, described the atmosphere at Foucault's lectures in 1975:

When Foucault enters the amphitheater, brisk and dynamic like someone who plunges into the water, he steps over bodies to reach his chair, pushes away the cassette recorders so he can put down his papers, removes his jacket, lights a lamp and sets off at full speed. His voice is strong and effective, amplified by loudspeakers that are the only concession to modernism in a hall that is barely lit by light spread from stucco bowls. The hall has three hundred places and there are five hundred people packed together, filling the smallest free space... There is no oratorical effect. It is clear and terribly effective. There is absolutely no concession to improvisation. Foucault has twelve hours each year to explain in a public course the direction taken by his research in the year just ended. So everything is concentrated and he fills the margins like correspondents who have too much to say for the space available to them. At 19.15 Foucault stops. The students rush towards his desk; not to speak to him, but to stop their cassette recorders. There are no questions. In the pushing and shoving Foucault is alone. Foucault remarks: "It should be possible to discuss what I have put forward. Sometimes, when it has not been a good lecture, it would need very little, just one question, to put everything straight. However, this question never comes. The group effect in France makes any genuine discussion impossible. And as there is no feedback, the course is theatricalized. My relationship with the people there is like that of an actor or an acrobat. And when I have finished speaking, a sensation of total solitude..."6

Foucault approached his teaching as a researcher: explorations for a future book as well as the opening up of fields of problematization were formulated as an invitation to possible future researchers. This is why the courses at the Collège de France do not duplicate the published books. They are not sketches for the books even though both books and courses
share certain themes. They have their own status. They arise from a specific discursive regime within the set of Foucault's "philosophical activities." In particular they set out the programme for a genealogy of knowledge/power relations, which are the terms in which he thinks of his work from the beginning of the 1970s, as opposed to the programme of an archeology of discursive formations that previously orientated his work.

The courses also performed a role in contemporary reality. Those who followed his courses were not only held in thrall by the narrative that unfolded week by week and seduced by the rigorous exposition, they also found a perspective on contemporary reality. Michel Foucault's art consisted in using history to cut diagonally through contemporary reality. He could speak of Nietzsche or Aristotle, of expert psychiatric opinion or the Christian pastoral, but those who attended his lectures always took from what he said a perspective on the present and contemporary events. Foucault's specific strength in his courses was the subtle interplay between learned erudition, personal commitment, and work on the event.

With their development and refinement in the 1970s, Foucault's desk was quickly invaded by cassette recorders. The courses—and some seminars—have thus been preserved.

This edition is based on the words delivered in public by Foucault. It gives a transcription of these words that is as literal as possible. We would have liked to present it as such. However, the transition from an oral to a written presentation calls for editorial intervention: At the very least it requires the introduction of punctuation and division into paragraphs. Our principle has been always to remain as close as possible to the course actually delivered.

Summaries and repetitions have been removed whenever it seemed to be absolutely necessary. Interrupted sentences have been restored and faulty constructions corrected. Suspension points indicate that the recording is inaudible. When a sentence is obscure there is a conjectural integration or an addition between square brackets. An asterisk directing the reader to the bottom of the page indicates a significant divergence between the notes used by Foucault and the words actually
uttered. Quotations have been checked and references to the texts used are indicated. The critical apparatus is limited to the elucidation of obscure points, the explanation of some allusions and the clarification of critical points. To make the lectures easier to read, each lecture is preceded by a brief summary that indicates its principal articulations.

The text of the course is followed by the summary published by the Annuaire du Collège de France. Foucault usually wrote these in June, some time after the end of the course. It was an opportunity for him to pick out retrospectively the intention and objectives of the course. It constitutes the best introduction to the course.

Each volume ends with a “context” for which the course editors are responsible. It seeks to provide the reader with elements of the biographical, ideological, and political context, situating the course within the published work and providing indications concerning its place within the corpus used in order to facilitate understanding and to avoid misinterpretations that might arise from a neglect of the circumstances in which each course was developed and delivered.

Psychiatric Power, the course delivered in 1973 and 1974, is edited by Jacques Lagrange.

A new aspect of Michel Foucault’s “œuvre” is published with this edition of the Collège de France courses.

Strictly speaking it is not a matter of unpublished work, since this edition reproduces words uttered publicly by Foucault, excluding the often highly developed written material he used to support his lectures. Daniel Defert possesses Michel Foucault’s notes and he is to be warmly thanked for allowing the editors to consult them.

This edition of the Collège de France courses was authorized by Michel Foucault’s heirs who wanted to be able to satisfy the strong demand for their publication, in France as elsewhere, and to do this under indisputably responsible conditions. The editors have tried to be equal to the degree of confidence placed in them.

François Ewald and Alessandro Fontana


3. This was Foucault's practice until the start of the 1980s.

4. Within the framework of the Collège de France.


8. We have made use of the recordings made by Gilbert Burlet and Jacques Lagrange in particular. These are deposited in the Collège de France and the Institut Mémoires de l'Édition Contemporaine.

9. At the end of the book, the criteria and solutions adopted by the editors of this year's course are set out in the "Course context."
MICHEL FOUCAULT'S CENTRAL CONTRIBUTION to political philosophy was his progressive development and refinement of a new conception of power, one that put into question the two reigning conceptions of power, the juridical conception found in classical liberal theories and the Marxist conception organized around the notions of State apparatus, dominant class, mechanisms of conservation, and juridical superstructure. If the first volume of his history of sexuality, La Volonté de savoir (1976), is a culminating point of this dimension of Foucault's work, his courses throughout the 1970s return again and again to the problem of how to analyze power, continually adding historical and philosophical details that help us to see the full import and implications of his analytics of power. At the beginning of the chapter "Méthode" in La Volonté de savoir Foucault warns his readers against several misunderstandings that may be occasioned by the use of the word "power," misunderstandings concerning the identity, the form, and the unity of power. Power should not be identified, according to Foucault, with the set of institutions and apparatuses in the State; it does not have the form of rules or law; finally, it does not have the global unity of a general system of domination whose effects would pass through the entire social body. Neither state institutions, nor law, nor general effects of domination constitute the basic elements of an adequate analysis of how power works in modern societies. Without having yet developed all of the tools of his own analysis, Psychiatric Power already exhibits Foucault's awareness of the shortcomings of available conceptions of power, and nowhere more clearly than in his own critique of notions implicit or explicit in
his *Histoire de la folie*. Foucault's dissatisfaction with his previous analysis of asylum power centers around two basic features of the analysis in *Histoire de la folie*: first, the privileged role he gave to the "perception of madness" instead of starting, as he does in *Psychiatric Power*, from an apparatus of power itself; second, the use of notions that now seem to him to be "rusty locks with which we cannot get very far" and that therefore compromise his analysis of power as it is articulated in *Histoire de la folie.*

As regards this second point, Foucault's critique of his own use of the notions of violence, of institution, and of the family can be seen in retrospect to be an important part of his development of that alternative model of power that will be at the center of *Surveiller et punir* and *La Volonté de savoir*. In effect, Foucault's criticisms here take aim precisely at assumptions concerning the identity, the form, and the unity of power. Rather than thinking of power as the exercise of unbridled violence, one should think of it as the "physical exercise of an unbalanced force" (in the sense of an unequal, non-symmetrical force), but a force that acts within "a rational, calculated, and controlled game of the exercise of power." Instead of conceptualizing psychiatric power in terms of institutions, with their regularities and rules, one has to understand psychiatric practice in terms of "imbalances of power" with the tactical uses of "networks, currents, relays, points of support, differences of potential" that characterize a form of power. Finally, in order to understand the functioning of asylum power, one cannot invoke the paradigm of the family, as if psychiatric power "does no more than reproduce the family to the advantage of, or on the demand of, a form of State control organized by a State apparatus"; there is no foundational model that can be projected onto all levels of society, but rather different strategies that allow relations of power to take on a certain coherence. In *La Volonté de savoir*, with more conceptual precision, Foucault explicitly understands power in terms of a multiplicity of relations of force, of incessant tactical struggles and confrontations that affect the distribution and arrangement of these relations of force, and of the strategies in which these relations of force take effect, with their more general lines of integration, their patterns and crystallizations. And the nominalism advocated in *La Volonté de savoir* is present in practice in *Psychiatric*
Power: power is “the name that one gives to a complex strategic situation in a given society.”

The stakes of this nominalism are evident in one of the first theoretical claims about power that Foucault makes in *Psychiatric Power*, a claim that, despite its apparent simplicity, already requires an entire reelaboration of our conception of power:

... power is never something that someone possesses, any more than it is something that emanates from someone. Power does not belong to anyone or even to a group; there is only power because there is dispersion, relays, networks, reciprocal supports, differences of potential, discrepancies, etcetera. It is in this system of differences, which have to be analyzed, that power can begin to function.

This claim is the basis of Foucault's later insistence on “the strictly relational character of relationships of power” (and of relationships of resistance), the fact that power “is produced at every moment, in every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another.” Foucault was never interested in providing a metaphysics of Power; his aim was an analysis of the techniques and technologies of power, where power is understood as relational, multiple, heterogeneous, and, of course, productive. Foucault went so far as once to proclaim, “power, it does not exist” so as to emphasize that, from his perspective, it is always bundles of relations, modifiable relations of force, never power in itself, that is to be studied—that is to say, to render the exercise of power intelligible, one should take up the point of view of “the moving base of relations of force that, by their inequality, continually lead to states of power, but always local and unstable.” As late as 1984, when the focus of his interests had already shifted, he stressed this point yet again: “I hardly employ the word power, and if I occasionally do, it is always as a shorthand with respect to the expression that I always use: relations of power.”

I believe that it is precisely this relational conception of power, with all of its accompanying instruments of analysis, that allows Foucault to give his extraordinary historical reinterpretation of the problem of
hysteria at the conclusion of *Psychiatric Power*. When in the final part of his lecture of 6 February Foucault takes up Charcot’s treatment of hysterics and what he names “the great maneuvers of hysteria,” he announces the angle of analysis he will adopt: “I will not try to analyze this in terms of the history of hysterics any more than in terms of psychiatric knowledge of hysterics, but rather in terms of battle, confrontation, reciprocal encirclement, of the laying of mirror traps [by which Foucault means traps that reflect one another], of investment and counter investment, of struggle for control between doctors and hysterics.”

All of the terms in this description answer to his new analytics of power, with its “pseudo-military vocabulary,” that will provide the framework for his examination of a wide variety of historical phenomena during the 1970s. And when he sets aside the idea of an epidemic of hysteria (a scientific-epistemological notion) in favor of an analysis focused on “the maelstrom of this battle” (*le tourbillon de cette bataille*) that surrounds hysterical symptoms, one cannot help but hear an anticipation of the last line of *Surveiller et punir* where Foucault tells us that in those apparatuses of normalization that are intended “to provide relief, to cure, to help” one should hear “the rumbling of battle” (*le grondement de la bataille*). It is this rumbling, this maelstrom of battle that Foucault’s perspective renders visible, a struggle that is effaced in a purely epistemological analysis and that is left out of sight within a theory of power built on a juridical and negative vocabulary. (Hence the way in which the “repressive hypothesis” renders imperceptible the multiplicity of possible points of resistance.) To take just one example, Foucault’s analytics restores this relational dimension of battle to the great problem of simulation that was so crucial to the history of psychiatry; it enables him to treat simulation not as a theoretical problem, but as a process by which the mad actually responded to psychiatric power, a kind of “anti-power,” that is a modification of the relations of force, in the face of the mechanisms of psychiatric power—thus the appearance of simulation not as a pathological phenomenon, but as a phenomenon of struggle. As a result, from this point of view, hysterical simulation becomes “the militant underside [the militant reverse side] of psychiatric power” and hysterics can be seen as “the true militants of antipsychiatry.” Moreover, the elaboration of this microphysics of power does not require
Foucault to ignore the epistemological dimensions of the history of psychiatry, the discursive practices of psychiatric knowledge. On the contrary, it allows him to place these practices within a political history of truth, to reconnect these practices to the functioning of an apparatus of power, to link them to a level "that would allow discursive practice to be grasped at precisely the point where it is formed."

Psychiatric Power can be read as a kind of experiment in method, one that responds in historical detail to a set of questions that permeated the genealogical period of Foucault's work:

... to what extent can an apparatus of power produce statements, discourses and, consequently, all the forms of representation that may then [...] derive from it ... How can this deployment of power, these tactics and strategies of power, give rise to assertions, negations, experiments (experiences), and theories, in short to a game of truth?

At the very end of his course, when Foucault returns to the relations of power between hysteric and doctor, to hysterical resistance to medical power, the scene of sexuality is center stage. But the introduction of sexuality into this scenario does not derive from the "power" of the doctors, but rather from the hysterics themselves, as their putting into play of a point of resistance within the strategic field of existing relations of power. As a counter-attack to the medical need to find an etiology for hysteria that will give its symptoms a pathological status, and more specifically (given the distributions of power-knowledge that surround the hysterical body) to find a trauma that will function as a "kind of invisible and pathological lesion which makes all of this a well and truly morbid whole," the hysteric will respond with the counter-manuver of a recounting of her sexual life, with all of its possible traumatism, thereby effecting a redistribution of force relations and a new configuration of power.

...what will the patients do with this injunction to find the trauma that persists in the symptoms? Into the breach opened by this injunction they will push their life, their real, everyday life,
that is to say their sexual life. It is precisely this sexual life that they will recount, that they will connect up with the hospital and endlessly reactualize in the hospital.\textsuperscript{20}

And Foucault draws the following remarkable conclusion, which needs to be underlined and related, after the fact, to the context of his later history of sexuality:

It seems to me that this kind of bacchanal, this sexual pantomime, is not the as yet undeciphered residue of the hysterical syndrome. My impression is that this sexual bacchanal should be taken as the counter-maneuver by which the hysterics responded to the ascription of trauma: You want to find the cause of my symptoms, the cause that will enable you to pathologize them and enable you to function as a doctor; you want this trauma, well, you will get all my life, and you won't be able to avoid hearing me recount my life and, at the same time, seeing me mime my life anew and endlessly reactualize it in my attacks!

So this sexuality is not an indecipherable remainder but the hysteric's victory cry, the last maneuver by which they finally get the better of the neurologists and silence them: If you want symptoms too, something functional; if you want to make your hypnosis natural and each of your injunctions to cause the kind of symptoms you can take as natural; if you want to use me to denounce the simulators, well then, you really will have to hear what I want to say and see what I want to do!\textsuperscript{21}

This victory cry of the hysteric, although a genuine cry of victory, is not a definitive cry. Like all triumphs within the field of mobile and reversible power relations, one can be sure that it will be met by further tactical interventions, actions intended to modify the new disposition of force relations, rearranging yet again the existing relations of power. If it is the hysteric herself who, from within the field of power relations, imposes the sexual body on the neurologists and doctors, these latter, according to Foucault, could respond with one of two possible attitudes. They could either make use of these sexual connotations to discredit
hysteria as a genuine illness, as did Babinski, or they could attempt to circumvent this new hysterical maneuver by surrounding it once more medically—"this new investment will be the medical, psychiatric, and psychoanalytic take over of sexuality." History has taught us that the second response would be the triumphant one. And the first volume of Foucault's history of sexuality picks up the battle where Psychiatric Power left off, with the codification of *scientia sexualis* and the solidification of the apparatus of sexuality, with a new medical victory cry in favor of sexuality. Indeed, the "hysterisation" of women's bodies is one of the four great strategic ensembles with respect to sex that Foucault singles out as having attained an historically noteworthy "efficacy" in the order of power and "productivity" in the order of knowledge. The effects of an initially disruptive recounting of her sexual life by the hysteric will be reorganized by means of the constitution of a scientific modality of confession; the traumas of sexuality will become integrated into those procedures of individualization that produce our subjection. If Charcot could not see or speak of this sexuality, the later history of psychiatry would find it everywhere, would insist on putting sex into discourse, would enjoin its patients to speak of their sexuality. When the science of the subject began to revolve around the question of sex, the hysteric's victory was effectively countered by new tactics and strategies of power, and the reactualization of one's sexual life was divested of its potential of resistance and became a practice now crucial to the functioning of psychiatric power. That is why Foucault's historico-political project will be "to define the strategies of power which are immanent to this will to know" that continues to encircle sexuality.

It is in this light that we should read the last sentence of *Psychiatric Power*, a phrase that might have seemed enigmatic when pronounced by Foucault on 6 February 1974, but whose force is quite clear in the context of *La Volonté de savoir*:

By breaking down the door of the asylum, by ceasing to be mad so as to become patients, by finally getting through to a true doctor, that is to say the neurologist, and by providing him with genuine functional symptoms, *the hysteric*, to their greater pleasure, but doubtless to our greater misfortune, gave rise to a medicine of sexuality.
This final diagnosis, namely that the great pleasure of the hysteric’s victory became the great misfortune of our subjection to the apparatus of sexuality, focuses our attention on that moving stratum of force relations that underlies the instability, the transformability, of relations of power/resistance. If today the sexual body is no longer primarily the hysterical body, but rather, let us say, the perverse body, it remains up to us to learn to hear anew the rumbling of the current battle. Only in this way will we be able “to determine what is the principal danger” and “to render problematic everything that is habitual”—thus we will be able to put into movement the points of support for our counter-attack against the apparatus of sexuality.27
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IN HIS DESCRIPTION OF the historical figure of "psychiatric power" Foucault frequently uses the term *dispositif*, referring to "disciplinary dispositifs" and the "asylum dispositif" etcetera. There does not seem to be a satisfactory English equivalent for the particular way in which Foucault uses this term to designate a configuration or arrangement of elements and forces, practices and discourses, power and knowledge, that is both strategic and technical. On the one hand, in relation to "psychiatric power" the term picks out a sort of strategic game plan for the staging of real "battles" and "confrontations" that involve specific "tactics," "manipulations," "maneuvers," and the overall "tactical disposition" or "deployment" of elements and forces in an organized "battlefield" space. On the other hand, it also refers to a more or less stable "system" of "techniques," "mechanisms," and "devices"; "a sort of apparatus or machinery." I am not entirely happy with some of the existing translations—"deployment," "set up," and even, in the case of Louis Althusser's use of the same term, "dispositive"—and have chosen to translate the word throughout as "apparatus." This has its own drawbacks, the major one being that the same word translates "appareil" and perhaps risks confusion with, for example, the notion of "State apparatuses" (*appareils d'État*), from which Foucault clearly wants to distinguish his own analysis. However, it should be said that on occasions Foucault himself uses *appareil* in a way that is difficult to distinguish from his use of *dispositif*. Wherever both words are used in close proximity to each other, or where it seems important to distinguish which word Foucault is using, the English is followed by the French word in brackets. Hopefully, the
analyses in which it is embedded will make Foucault’s use of the term sufficiently clear.

I have not used existing English translations of authors quoted by Foucault in the lectures, but references to such translations can be found in the notes.
The space of the asylum and disciplinary order. ~ Therapeutic process and "moral treatment." ~ Scenes of curing. ~ Changes made by the course from the approach of Histoire de la folie:
1. From an analysis of "representations" to an "analytics of power";
2. From "violence" to the "microphysics of power"; 3. From "institutional regularities" to the "arrangements" of power.

THE TOPIC I PROPOSE to present this year, psychiatric power, is slightly, but not completely, different from the topics I have spoken to you about over the last two years.

I will begin by trying to describe a kind of fictional scene in the following familiar, recognizable setting:

"I would like these homes to be built in sacred forests, in steep and isolated spots, in the midst of great disorder, like at the Grande-Chartreuse, etcetera. Also, before the newcomer arrives at his destination, it would be a good idea if he were to be brought down by machines, be taken through ever new and more amazing places, and if the officials of these places were to wear distinctive costumes. The romantic is suitable here, and I have often said to myself that we could make use of those old castles built over caverns that pass through a hill and open out onto a pleasant little valley... Phantasmagoria and other resources of physics, music, water, flashes of lightning, thunder, etcetera would be
used in turn and, very likely, not without some success on the common man.”

This is not the castle of *Cent vingtièmes*. It is a castle in which many more, an almost infinite number of days will be passed; it is Fodéré’s description, in 1817, of an ideal asylum. What will take place in this setting? Well, of course, order reigns, the law, and power reigns. Here, in this castle protected by this romantic, alpine setting, which is only accessible by means of complicated machines, and whose very appearance must amaze the common man, an order reigns in the simple sense of a never ending, permanent regulation of time, activities, and actions; an order which surrounds, penetrates, and works on bodies, applies itself to their surfaces, but which equally imprints itself on the nerves and what someone called “the soft fibers of the brain.” An order, therefore, for which bodies are only surfaces to be penetrated and volumes to be worked on, an order which is like a great nervure of prescriptions, such that bodies are invaded and run through by order.

“One should not be greatly surprised,” Pinel writes, “at the great importance I attach to maintaining calm and order in a home for the insane, and to the physical and moral qualities that such supervision requires, since this is one of the fundamental bases of the treatment of mania, and without it we will obtain neither exact observations nor a permanent cure, however we insist on the most highly praised medicaments.”

That is to say, you can see that a certain degree of order, a degree discipline, and regularity, reaching inside the body, are necessary for two things.

On the one hand, they are necessary for the very constitution of medical knowledge, since exact observation is not possible without this discipline, without this order, without this prescriptive schema of regularities. The condition of the medical gaze (*regard médicale*), of its neutrality, and the possibility of it gaining access to the object, in short, the effective condition of possibility of the relationship of objectivity, which is constitutive of medical knowledge and the criterion of its validity, is a relationship of order, a distribution of time, space, and
individuals. In actual fact, and I will come back to this elsewhere, we cannot even say of "individuals"; let's just say a certain distribution of bodies, actions, behavior, and of discourses. It is in this well-ordered dispersion that we find the field on the basis of which something like the relationship of the medical gaze to its object, the relationship of objectivity, is possible—a relationship which appears as the effect of the first dispersion constituted by the disciplinary order. Secondly, this disciplinary order, which appears in Pinel's text as the condition for exact observation, is at the same time the condition for permanent cure. That is to say, the therapeutic process itself, the transformation on the basis of which someone who is considered to be ill ceases to be so, can only be produced within this regulated distribution of power. The condition, therefore, of the relationship to the object and of the objectivity of medical knowledge, and the condition of the therapeutic process, are the same: disciplinary order. But this kind of immanent order, which covers the entire space of the asylum, is in reality thoroughly permeated and entirely sustained by a dissymmetry that attaches it imperiously to a single authority which is both internal to the asylum and the point from which the disciplinary distribution and dispersion of time, bodies, actions, and behavior, is determined. This authority within the asylum is, at the same time, endowed with unlimited power, which nothing must or can resist. This inaccessible authority without symmetry or reciprocity, which thus functions as the source of power, as the factor of the order's essential dissymmetry, and which determines that this order always derives from a non reciprocal relationship of power, is obviously medical authority, which, as you will see, functions as power well before it functions as knowledge.

Because, what is the doctor? Well, there he is, the one who appears when the patient has been brought to the asylum by these surprising machines I was just talking about. I know that this is all a fictional description, in the sense that I have not constructed it on the basis of texts coming from a single psychiatrist; if I had used only the texts of a single psychiatrist, the demonstration would not be valid. I have used Fodéré's *Traité du délire*, Pinel's *Traité médico-philosophique* on mania, Esquirol's collected articles in *Des maladies mentales*, and Haslam.

So, how then does this authority without symmetry or limit, which permeates and drives the universal order of the asylum, appear? This is
how it appears in Fodéré’s text, *Traité du délire* from 1817, that is at that great, prolific moment in the proto-history of eighteenth century psychiatry—Esquirol’s great text appears in 1818—the moment when psychiatric knowledge is both inserted within the medical field and assumes its autonomy as a specialty. “Generally speaking, perhaps one of the first conditions of success in our profession is a fine, that is to say noble and manly physique; it is especially indispensable for impressing the mad. Dark hair, or hair whitened by age, lively eyes, a proud bearing, limbs and chest announcing strength and health, prominent features, and a strong and expressive voice are the forms that generally have a great effect on individuals who think they are superior to everyone else. The mind undoubtedly regulates the body, but this is not apparent to begin with and external forms are needed to lead the multitude.”

So, as you can see, the figure himself must function at first sight. But, in this first sight, which is the basis on which the psychiatric relationship is built, the doctor is essentially a body, and more exactly he is a quite particular physique, a characterization, a morphology, in which there are the full muscles, the broad chest, the color of the hair, and so on. And this physical presence, with these qualities, which functions as the clause of absolute dissymmetry in the regular order of the asylum, is what determines that the asylum is not, as the psycho-sociologists would say, a rule governed institution; in reality it is a field polarized in terms of an essential dissymmetry of power, which thus assumes its form, its figure, and its physical inscription in the doctor’s body itself.

But, of course, the doctor’s power is not the only power exercised, for in the asylum, as everywhere else, power is never something that someone possesses, any more than it is something that emanates from someone. Power does not belong to anyone or even to a group; there is only power because there is dispersion, relays, networks, reciprocal supports, differences of potential, discrepancies, etcetera. It is in this system of differences, which have to be analyzed, that power can start to function.

There is, then, a whole series of relays around the doctor, the main ones being the following. First of all there are the supervisors, to whom Fodéré reserves the task of informing on the patients, of being the unarmed, inexpert gaze, the kind of optical canal through which the learned gaze, that is to say the objective gaze of the psychiatrist himself,
will be exercised. This relayed gaze, ensured by the supervisors, must also take in the servants, that is to say those who hold the last link in the chain of authority. The supervisor, therefore, is both the master of the last masters and the one whose discourse, gaze, observations and reports must make possible the constitution of medical knowledge.

What are supervisors? What must they be? "In a supervisor of the insane it is necessary to look for a well proportioned physical stature, strong and vigorous muscles, a proud and intrepid bearing for certain occasions, a voice with a striking tone when needed. In addition, he must have the strictest integrity, pure moral standards, and a firmness compatible with gentle and persuasive forms (...) and he must be absolutely obedient to the doctor's orders."99

The final stage—I skip some of the relays—is constituted by the servants, who hold a very odd power. Actually, the servant is the last relay of the network, of this difference in potential that permeates the asylum on the basis of the doctor's power; he is therefore the power below. But he is not just below because he is at the bottom of the hierarchy; he is also below because he must be below the patient. It is not so much the supervisors above him that he must serve, but the patients themselves; but in this position he must really only pretend to serve them. The servants apparently obey the patients' orders and give them material assistance, but they do so in such a way that, on the one hand, the patients' behavior can be observed from behind, underhand, at the level of the orders they may give, instead of being observed from above, as by the supervisors and the doctor. In a way, the servants will thus set up the patients, and observe them at the level of their daily life and from the side of their exercise of will and their desires; and they will report anything worth noting to the supervisor, who will report it to the doctor. At the same time, when the patient gives orders that must not be carried out, the servant's task—while feigning to be at the patient's service, to obey him and so seeming not to have an autonomous will—must be to not do what the patient requests, and to appeal to the great anonymous authority of the rules or to the doctor's particular will. As a result, the patient who is set up by the servant's observation will find himself out-flanked by the doctor's will that he rediscovers when he gives the servant orders, and the patient's encirclement by the doctor's will or by the general regulation of the asylum will be ensured through this pretence of service.
Here is the description of the servants in this scenario:

"§ 398. The servants or warders selected must be big, strong, honest, intelligent, and clean, both personally and in their habits. In order to handle the extreme sensitivity of some of the insane, especially on points of honor, it would almost always be better for the servants to seem to them to be their domestic servants rather than their warders (...). However, since they must not obey the mad, and often are even forced to suppress them, to reconcile the idea of being a servant with a refusal to obey, and to avoid any discord, the supervisor’s task will be to insinuate cleverly to the patients that those serving them have been given certain instructions and orders by the doctor, which they cannot exceed without being given direct permission."¹⁰

So, you have this system of power functioning within the asylum and distorting the general regulative system, a system of power which is secured by a multiplicity, a dispersion, a system of differences and hierarchies, but even more precisely by what could be called a tactical arrangement in which different individuals occupy a definite place and ensure a number of precise functions. You have therefore a tactical functioning of power or, rather, it is this tactical arrangement that enables power to be exercised.

If you go back to what Pinel himself said about the possibility of observation in an asylum, you can see that this observation, which ensures the objectivity and truth of psychiatric discourse, is only possible through a relatively complex tactical arrangement; I say “relatively complex,” because what I have just said is still very schematic. But, in fact, if there really is this tactical deployment and so many precautions have to be taken to arrive at something that is, after all, as simple as observation, it is probably because within the asylums field of regulations there is something, a force, that is dangerous. For power to be deployed with all this cunning, or rather, for the asylum’s regulated universe to be so obsessed with these kind of relays of power, which falsify and distort this universe, then it is highly likely that at the very heart of this space there is a threatening power to be mastered or defeated.

In other words, if we end up with this kind of tactical arrangement, it is because before the problem being one of knowledge, or rather, for the problem to be able to be one of knowledge, of the truth of the
illness, and of its cure, it must first of all be one of victory. So what is organized in the asylum is actually a battlefield.

Obviously it is the mad person who is to be brought under control. I have just quoted the odd definition of the mad person given by Fodéré, who said that he is someone who thinks he is "superior to everyone else." In actual fact, this really is how the madman makes his appearance in psychiatric discourse and practice at the start of the nineteenth century, and it is there that we find the great turning point, the great division that I have already spoken about, which is the disappearance of the criterion of error in the definition of madness or in the ascription of madness.

Broadly speaking, until the end of the eighteenth century—and even in police reports, lettres de cachet, interrogations, etcetera, concerning individuals in places like Bicêtre and Charenton—to say that someone was mad, to ascribe madness to him, was always to say that he was mistaken, and to say in what respect, on what point, in what way, and within what limits he was mistaken; madness was basically characterized by its system of belief. Now, very suddenly, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a criterion appears for recognizing and ascribing madness which is absolutely different and which is—I was going to say, the will, but that is not exactly right—in fact, at the start of the nineteenth century, we can say that what characterizes the madman, that by which one ascribes madness to him, is the insurrection of a force, of a furiously raging, uncontrolled and possibly uncontrollable force within him, which takes four major forms according to the domain it affects and the field in which it wreaks its devastation.

There is the pure force of the individual who traditionally is said to be "raving" (furieux).

There is the force inasmuch as it affects the instincts and passions, the force of unbridled instincts and unlimited passions. This will characterize a madness that, precisely, is not one of error, which does not include illusion of the senses, false belief, or hallucination, and which is called mania without delirium.

Third, there is a sort of madness that affects ideas themselves, disrupts them, makes them incoherent, and brings them into conflict with each other. This is called mania.

Finally, there is the force of madness that no longer affects the general domain of ideas, disrupting them all and bringing them into conflict
with each other, but which affects one particular idea that is thus indefi-
initely strengthened and stubbornly lodged in the patient’s behavior,
discourse, and mind. This is called either melancholy or monomania.

And the first major distribution of this asylum practice at the beginning
of the nineteenth century exactly retranscribes what is taking place
within the asylum itself, that is to say, the fact that it is no longer a ques-
tion of recognizing the madman’s error, but of situating very precisely
the point where the wild force of the madness unleashes its insurrection:
What is the point, what is the domain, with regard to which the force
will explode and make its appearance, completely disrupting the
individual’s behavior?

Consequently, the tactic of the asylum in general and, more particu-
larly, the individual tactic applied by the doctor to this or that patient
within the general framework of this system of power, will and must be
adjusted to the characterization, to the localization, to the domain of
application of this explosion and raging outburst of force. So that if the
great, unbridled force of madness really is the target of the asylum
tactics, if it really is the adversary of these tactics, what else can cure be
but the submission of this force? And so we find in Pinel this very sim-
ple but, I think, fundamental definition of psychiatric therapeutics, a
definition that, notwithstanding its crudity and barbaric character, is
not found prior to this period. The therapeutics of madness is “the art
of, as it were, subjugating and taming the lunatic by making him strictly
dependent on a man who, by his physical and moral qualities, is able to
exercise an irresistible influence on him and alter the vicious chain of his
ideas.”

I have the impression that this definition given by Pinel of the
therapeutic process cuts across all that I have been saying to you. First of
all, with regard to the principle of the patient’s strict dependence in
relation to a certain power: This power can be embodied in one and only
one man who exercises it not so much in terms of and on the basis of a
knowledge, as in terms of the physical and moral qualities that enable
him to exercise an influence that can have no limit, an irresistible influence.
And it is starting from this that it becomes possible to change
the vicious chain of ideas; it is on the basis of this moral orthopedics, if you
like, that cure is possible. And finally, that is why, in this proto-psychiatric
practice, the basic therapeutic action takes the form of scenes and a battle.

Two types of intervention are very clearly distinguished in the psychiatry of this period. During the first third of the nineteenth century, one of these is regularly and continually discredited: specifically medical, or medicinal, practice. The other, first defined by the English, by Haslam in particular, and then very quickly taken up in France, is the development of the practice called “moral treatment.”

This moral treatment is not at all, as one might think, a sort of long-term process whose first and last function would be to bring to light the truth of the madness, to be able to observe it, describe it, diagnose it, and, on that basis, to define the therapy. The therapeutic process formulated between 1810 and 1830 is a scene, a scene of confrontation. This scene of confrontation may present two aspects. The first is, if you like, incomplete, and is like a process of wearing down, of testing, which is not carried out by the doctor—for the doctor himself must obviously be sovereign—but by the supervisor.

Here is an example of this first outline of the great scene, given by Pinel in his *Traité médico-philosophique*.

Faced with a raving lunatic, the supervisor “advances towards the lunatic with an intrepid air, but slowly and gradually, and to avoid exasperating him he does not carry any kind of weapon. As he advances he speaks to him in the firmest, most threatening tone and, with calm warnings, continues to fix the lunatic’s attention on himself so as to hide what is going on around him. He gives precise and imperious orders to obey and to surrender. Somewhat disconcerted by the supervisor’s overbearing manner, the lunatic loses every other object from view and, at a signal, is suddenly surrounded by assistants, whom he had not noticed slowly advancing on him. Each grabs hold of one of the lunatic’s limbs, one an arm, the other a thigh or a leg.”

Pinel gives further advice on the use of certain instruments, like the “semicircular piece of iron” fixed to the end of a pole, for example. When the lunatic’s attention is captured by the supervisor’s haughty demeanor and is fixed on him so that he is unaware of anyone else approaching him, this kind of lance with a semicircular end is used to pin him to the wall and overpower him. This is, if you like, the
imperfect scene, the one reserved for the supervisor, and which consists in breaking the wild force of the lunatic with this kind of cunning and sudden violence.

However, it is obvious that this is not the major scene of the cure. The cure scene is complex. Here is a famous example from Pinel’s *Traité médico-philosophique*. It involves a young man “dominated by religious prejudices” who thought that for his salvation he had “to imitate the abstinence and mortifications of the old anchorites,” that is to say, to refuse not only all the pleasures of the flesh, of course, but also all food. And then one day, with more than his usual firmness, he refuses a soup he is served. “In the evening, citizen Pussin appears at the door of his chamber in a frightening get up [in the sense of classical theater, of course; M.F.], with fiery eyes and a striking voice, and accompanied by a group of assistants close by who are armed with strong chains that they shake noisily. The soup is placed by the lunatic who is given the most precise instruction to take it during the night if he does not wish to incur the most cruel treatment. They withdraw and leave him in the most painful state, wavering between the idea of the threatened punishment and the terrifying perspective of the other life. After an inner struggle of several hours, the first idea wins out and he decides to take his food. He is then subjected to a suitable diet for his recovery; sleep and strength return by degrees, as also the use of reason, and in this way he avoids a certain death. During his convalescence he often confessed to me the cruel agitation and confusion he suffered during the night of his ordeal.”

We have here, I think, a scene that is very important in its general morphology.

First, you can see that the therapeutic operation does not take place by way of the doctor’s recognition of the causes of the illness. The doctor does not require any work of diagnosis or nosography, any discourse of truth, for the success of his operation.

Second, it is an important operation because in this and similar cases, as you see, there is no application of a technical medical formula to something seen as a pathological process of behavior. What is involved is the confrontation of two wills, that of the doctor and those who represent him on the one hand, and then that of the patient. What is established, therefore, is a battle, a relationship of force.
Third, the primary effect of this relationship of force is to provoke a second relationship of force, within the patient as it were, since it involves provoking a conflict between the fixed idea to which the patient is attached and the fear of punishment: one struggle provokes another. And, when the scene succeeds, there must be a victory in both struggles, the victory of one idea over another, which must be at the same time the victory of the doctor’s will over the patient’s will.

Fourth, what is important in this scene is that there is indeed a moment when the truth comes out. This is when the patient recognizes that his belief in the necessity of fasting to ensure his salvation was erroneous and delirious, when he recognizes what has taken place, when he confesses his experience of wavering, hesitations, and torments, etcetera. In short, in this scene in which, hitherto, the truth was not involved, it is the patient’s own account that constitutes the moment when the truth blazes forth.

Finally, the process of the cure is effectuated, accomplished, and sealed when truth has been acquired through confession in this way, in the effective moment of confession, and not by piecing together a medical knowledge.

So there is a distribution of force, power, the event, and truth here, which is unlike anything in what could be called the medical model being constructed in clinical medicine in the same period. We can say that the clinical medicine of this time put together an epistemological model of medical truth, observation, and objectivity that will make possible the real insertion of medicine within a domain of scientific discourse where, with its own modalities, it will join physiology and biology, etcetera. In the period 1800 to 1830 I think something takes place that is quite different from what is usually thought to have occurred. It seems to me that what happened in these thirty years is usually interpreted as the moment when psychiatry was finally inserted within a medical practice and knowledge to which previously it had been relatively foreign. It is usually thought that at that moment psychiatry appeared for the first time as a specialty within the medical domain.

Leaving aside for the moment the problem of why in fact such a practice could be seen as a medical practice, and why the people who carried
out these operations had to be doctors, it seems to me that, in its morphology, in its general deployment, the medical operation of the cure performed by those whom we think of as the founders of psychiatry has practically nothing to do with what was then becoming the experience, observation, diagnostic activity, and therapeutic process of medicine. At this level of the cure, of this event, the psychiatric scene and procedure are, I believe, from that moment, absolutely irreducible to what was taking place in medicine in the same period.

It is this heterogeneity then that will mark the history of psychiatry at the very moment at which it is founded within a system of institutions that nevertheless connect it to medicine. For all of this, this staging, the organization of the asylum space, the activating and unfolding of these scenes, are only possible, accepted and institutionalized within establishments that are being given a medical status at this time, and by people who are medically qualified.

We have here, if you like, a first set of problems. This is the point of departure for what I would like to study a little this year. Actually, it is roughly the point reached by my earlier work, *Histoire de la folie*, or, at any rate, the point where it broke off.¹⁰ I would like to take things up again at this point, except with some differences. It seems to me that in that work, which I take as a reference point because it is a kind of "background"* for me, for the work I am doing now, there were a number of things that were entirely open to criticism, especially in the final chapter in which I ended up precisely at asylum power.

First of all, I think it was still an analysis of representations. It seems to me that, above all, I was trying to study the image of madness produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the fear it aroused, and the knowledge formed with reference to it, either traditionally, or according to botanical, naturalistic, and medical models, etcetera. It was this core of representations, of both traditional and non-traditional images, fantasies, and knowledge, this kind of core of representations

* English in original; G.B.
that I situated as the point of departure, as the site of origin of the practices concerning madness that managed to establish themselves in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In short, I accorded a privileged role to what could be called the perception of madness.\textsuperscript{17}

Here, in this second volume, I would like to see if it is possible to make a radically different analysis and if, instead of starting from the analysis of this kind of representational core, which inevitably refers to a history of mentalities, of thought, we could start from an apparatus (\textit{dispositif}) of power. That is to say, to what extent can an apparatus of power produce statements, discourses and, consequently, all the forms of representation that may then [...]derive from it.

The apparatus of power as a productive instance of discursive practice. In this respect, in comparison with what I call archeology, the discursive analysis of power would operate at a level—I am not very happy with the word “fundamental”—let’s say at a level that would enable discursive practice to be grasped at precisely the point where it is formed. To what should we refer this formation of discursive practice, where should we look for it?

If we look for the relationship between discursive practice and, let’s say, economic structures, relations of production, I do not think we can avoid recourse to something like representation, the subject, and so on, appealing to a ready made psychology and philosophy. The problem for me is this: Basically, are not apparatuses of power, with all that remains enigmatic and still to be explored in this word “power,” precisely the point from which it should be possible to locate the formation of discursive practices. How can this deployment of power, these tactics and strategies of power, give rise to assertions, negations, experiments, and theories, in short to a game of truth? Apparatus of power and game of truth, apparatus of power and discourse of truth: This is what I would like to examine a little this year, starting from the point I have referred to, that is to say, psychiatry and madness.

The second criticism I have of that final chapter is that I appealed—but, after all, I cannot say I did so very consciously, because I was very ignorant of antipsychiatry and especially of the psycho-sociology of the
time—I appealed, implicitly or explicitly, to three notions that seem to me to be rusty locks with which we cannot get very far.

First, the notion of violence. What actually struck me when I was reading Pinel, Esquirol, and others, is that contrary to what the hagiographies say, Pinel, Esquirol, and the others appealed strongly to physical force, and consequently it seemed to me that one could not ascribe Pinel's reform to a humanism, because his entire practice was still permeated by something like violence.

Now, if it is true that we cannot in fact ascribe Pinel's reform to humanism, I do not think this is because he resorted to violence. When in fact we speak of violence, and this is what bothers me about the notion, we always have in mind a kind of connotation of physical power, of an unregulated, passionate power, an unbridled power, if I can put it like that. This notion seems to me to be dangerous because, on the one hand, picking out a power that is physical, unregulated, etcetera, allows one to think that good power, or just simply power, power not permeated by violence, is not physical power. It seems to me rather that what is essential in all power is that ultimately its point of application is always the body. All power is physical, and there is a direct connection between the body and political power.

Then again, violence does not seem to me to be a very satisfactory notion, because it allows one to think that the physical exercise of an unbalanced force is not part of a rational, calculated, and controlled game of the exercise of power. Now the examples I have just given clearly prove that power as it is exercised in the asylum is a meticulous, calculated power, the tactics and strategies of which are absolutely definite; and, at the very heart of these strategies, we see quite precisely the place and role of violence, if we call violence the physical exercise of a completely unbalanced force. Taken in its final ramifications, at its capillary level, where it affects the individual himself, this power is physical and, thereby, it is violent, in the sense that it is absolutely irregular, not in the sense that it is unbridled, but in the sense, rather, that it is commanded by all the dispositions of a kind of microphysics of bodies.

The second notion to which I referred, and, I think, not very satisfactorily, is that of the institution. It seemed to me that we could say that from the beginning of the nineteenth century psychiatric knowledge took
the forms and dimensions we know in close connection with what could be called the institutionalization of psychiatry; even more precisely, it took these forms and dimensions in connection with a number of institutions of which the asylum was the most important. 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.*

In actual fact, we should show, rather, that what is essential is not the institution with its regularity, with its rules, but precisely the imbalances of power that I have tried to show both distort the asylum’s regularity and, at the same time, make it function. What is important therefore is not institutional regularities, but much more the practical dispositions of power, the characteristic networks, currents, relays, points of support, and differences of potential that characterize a form of power, which are, I think, constitutive of, precisely, both the individual and the group.

It seems to me that that insofar as power is a procedure of individualization, the individual is only the effect of power. And it is on the basis of this network of power, functioning in its differences of potential, in its discrepancies, that something like the individual, the group, the community, and the institution appear. In other words, before tackling institutions, we have to deal with the relations of force in these tactical arrangements that permeate institutions.

Finally, the third notion I referred to in order to explain the functioning of the asylum at the start of nineteenth century is the family, and I tried to show roughly how the violence of Pinel [or] Esquirol was their introduction of the family model into the asylum institution.20 Now I do not think that “violence” is the right word, or that we should situate our analysis at the level of the “institution,” and I do not think that we should talk of the family. At any rate, re-reading Pinel, Esquirol, Fodéré, and others, in the end I found very little use of this family model. It is not true that the doctor tries to reactivate the image or

* The manuscript adds: “The institution neutralizes relations of force, or it only makes them function within the space it defines.”
figure of the father within the space of the asylum; I think this takes place much later, even at the end of what could be called the psychiatric episode in the history of medicine, that is to say only in the twentieth century.

It is not the family, neither is it the State apparatus, and I think it would be equally false to say, as it often is, that asylum practice, psychiatric power, does no more than reproduce the family to the advantage of, or on the demand of, a form of State control organized by a State apparatus.\textsuperscript{21} The State apparatus cannot serve as the basis,\textsuperscript{*} and the family cannot serve as the model, […] for the relations of power that we can identify within psychiatric practice.

In doing without these notions and these models, that is to say, the family model, the norm, if you like, of the State apparatus, the notion of the institution, and the notion of violence, I think the problem that arises is that of analyzing these relations of power peculiar to psychiatric practice insofar as—and this will be the object of the course—they produce statements that are given as valid, justified statements. Rather, therefore, than speak of violence, I would prefer to speak of a micro-physics of power; rather than speak of the institution, I would much prefer to try to see what tactics are put to work in these forces which confront each other; rather than speak of the family model or “State apparatus,” I would like to try to see the strategy of these relations of power and confrontations which unfold within psychiatric practice.

You will say that it is all very well to have substituted a microphysics of power for violence, tactics for institution, strategy for the model of the family, but have I really made an advance? I have avoided terms that would allow the introduction of a psycho-sociological vocabulary into all these analyses, and now I am faced with a pseudo-military vocabulary which is not much better. Nevertheless, we will try to see what we can do with it.\textsuperscript{*}

\textsuperscript{*} The manuscript specifies: “We cannot use the notion of State apparatus because it is much too broad, much too abstract to designate these immediate, tiny, capillary powers that are exerted on the body, behavior, actions, and time of individuals. The State apparatus does not take this microphysics of power into account.”

\textsuperscript{1} (Recording:) for what takes place

\textsuperscript{†} The manuscript (pages 11–23) continues on the question of defining the current problem of psychiatry and puts forward an analysis of antipsychiatry.
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Scene of a cure: George III. From the “macrophysics of sovereignty” to the “microphysics of disciplinary power.” ~ The new figure of the madman. ~ Little encyclopedia of scenes of cures. ~ The practice of hypnosis and hysteria. ~ The psychoanalytic scene; the antipsychiatric scene. ~ Mary Barnes at Kingsley Hall. ~ Manipulation of madness and stratagem of truth: Mason Cox.

OBVIOUSLY YOU KNOW WHAT passes for the great founding scene of modern psychiatry, or of psychiatry period, which got under way at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is the famous scene at Bicêtre, which was not yet a hospital exactly, in which Pinel removes the chains binding the raving lunatics to the floor of their dungeon, and these lunatics, who were restrained out of fear that they would give vent to their frenzy if released, express their gratitude to Pinel as soon as they are freed from their bonds and thereby embark on the path of cure. This then is what passes for the initial, founding scene of psychiatry.

Now there is another scene that did not have the same destiny, although it had considerable repercussions in the same period, for reasons that are easy to understand. It is a scene which did not take place in France, but in England—and was reported in some detail by Pinel, moreover, in his Traité médico-philosophique of Year IX (1800)—and which, as you will see straightaway, was not without a kind of force, a malleable presence, inasmuch as in the period, not in which it took place, which was in 1788, but in which it became known in France, and
finally in the whole of Europe, it had become, let’s say, a certain custom for kings to lose their heads. It is an important scene because it stages precisely what psychiatric practice could be in that period as a regulated and concerted manipulation of relations of power.

Here is Pinel’s text, which circulated in France and made the affair known:

“A monarch [George III of England; M.F.] falls into a mania, and in order to make his cure more speedy and secure, no restrictions are placed on the prudence of the person who is to direct it [note the word: this is the doctor; M.F.]; from then on, all trappings of royalty having disappeared, the madman, separated from his family and his usual surroundings, is consigned to an isolated palace, and he is confined alone in a room whose tiled floor and walls are covered with matting so that he cannot harm himself. The person directing the treatment tells him that he is no longer sovereign, but that he must henceforth be obedient and submissive. Two of his old pages, of Herculean stature, are charged with looking after his needs and providing him with all the services his condition requires, but also with convincing him that he is entirely subordinate to them and must now obey them. They keep watch over him in calm silence, but take every opportunity to make him aware of how much stronger than him they are. One day, in fiery delirium, the madman harshly greets his old doctor who is making his visit, and daubs him with filth and excrement. One of the pages immediately enters the room without saying a word, grasps by his belt the delirious madman, who is himself in a disgustingly filthy state, forcibly throws him down on a pile of mattresses, strips him, washes him with a sponge, changes his clothes, and, looking at him haughtily, immediately leaves to take up his post again. Such lessons, repeated at intervals over some months and backed up by other means of treatment, have produced a sound cure without relapse.”

I would like to analyze the elements of this scene. First of all, there is something quite striking in Pinel’s text, which he took from Willis, the king’s doctor. It seems to me that what appears first of all is, basically, a ceremony, a ceremony of deposition, a sort of reverse coronation in which it is quite clearly shown that it involves placing the king in a situation of complete subordination; you remember the words: “all trappings
of royalty having disappeared," and the doctor, who is, as it were, the
effective agent of this dethronement, of this deconsecration, explicitly
telling him that "he is no longer sovereign."

A decree, consequently, of deposition: the king is reduced to impo­
tence. And it seems to me that the "matting," which surrounds him and
plays [such a big] role* both in the setting and the final scene, are
important. The matting is both what isolates the king from the outside
world, and, as well as preventing him from hearing and seeing the out­
side world, prevents him from communicating his orders to it; that is to
say, all the essential functions of the monarchy are, in the strict sense,
bracketed off by the matting. In place of the scepter, crown, and sword,
which should make the universal power of the king reigning over his
kingdom visible and perceptible to all the spectators, in place of these
signs, there is no more than the "matting" which confines him and
reduces him, there where he is, to what he is, that is to say, to his body.

Deposition and therefore the king's fall; but my impression is that it
is not the same type of fall as we find in, say, a Shakespearian drama: this
is not Richard III⁴ threatened with falling under the power of another
sovereign, nor King Lear⁵ stripped of his sovereignty and roaming the
world in solitude, poverty, and madness. In fact, the king's [George III]
madness, unlike that of King Lear, condemned to roam the world, fixes
him at a precise point and, especially, brings him under, not another
sovereign power, but a completely different type of power which differs
term by term, I think, from the power of sovereignty. It is an anonymous,
nameless and faceless power that is distributed between different per­
sons. Above all, it is a power that is expressed through an implacable
regulation that is not even formulated, since, basically, nothing is said,
and the text actually says that all the agents of this power remain silent.
The silence of regulation takes over, as it were, the empty place left by
the king's dethronement.

So this is not a case of one sovereign power falling under another
sovereign power, but the transition from a sovereign power—decapitated
by the madness that has seized hold of the king's head, and dethroned
by the ceremony that shows the king that he is no longer sovereign—to

* (Recording:) such an important role
a different power. In place of this beheaded and dethroned power, an anonymous, multiple, pale, colorless power is installed, which is basically what I will call disciplinary power. One type of power, that of sovereignty, is replaced by what could be called disciplinary power, and the effect of which is not at all to consecrate someone's power, to concentrate power in a visible and named individual, but only to produce effects on its target, on the body and very person of the dethroned king, who must be rendered "docile and submissive" by this new power.

Whereas sovereign power is expressed through the symbols of the dazzling force of the individual who holds it, disciplinary power is a discreet, distributed power; it is a power which functions through networks and the visibility of which is only found in the obedience and submission of those on whom it is silently exercised. I think this is what is essential in this scene: the confrontation, the submission, and the connecting up of a sovereign power to a disciplinary power.

Who are the agents of this disciplinary power? Curiously, the doctor, the person who organizes everything and really is in fact, up to a certain point, the focal element, the core of this disciplinary system, does not himself appear: Willis is never there. And when we have the scene of the doctor, it is precisely an old doctor and not Willis himself. Who then are the agents of this power? We are told that they are two old pages of Herculean stature.

I think we should stop here for a moment, for they too are very important in the scene. As a hypothesis, and subject to correction, I will say that this relationship of the Herculean pages to the mad king stripped bare should be compared with some iconographic themes. I think the plastic force of this history is due in part precisely to the fact that it contains elements of the traditional iconography for representing sovereigns. Now it seems to me that the king and his servants are traditionally represented in two forms.

There is the representation of the warrior king in breastplate and arms deploying and displaying his omnipotence—the Hercules king, if you like—and beside him, beneath him, subject to this kind of overwhelming power, are figures representing submission, weakness, defeat,
slavery, or possibly beauty. This, more or less, is one of the primary oppositions found in the iconography of royal power.

Then there is another possibility, but with a different play of oppositions. This is not the Herculean king, but the king of human stature who is, rather, stripped of all the visible and immediate signs of physical force and clothed only in the symbols of his power; the king in his ermine, with his scepter, his globe, and then, beneath him, or accompanying him, the visible representation of a force subject to him: soldiers, pages, and servants who are the representation of a force, but of a force which is, as it were, silently commanded by the intermediary of these symbolic elements of power, by scepter, ermine, crown, and so forth. Broadly speaking, it seems to me that the relationship of king to servants is represented in this way in the iconography: always in terms of opposition, but in the form of these two kinds of opposition.

Now, here, in this scene taken from Willis that is recounted by Pinel, you find these same elements, but completely shifted and transformed. On the one hand, you have the wild force of the king who has become the human beast again and who is in exactly the same position as those submissive and enchained slaves we found in the first of the iconographic versions I spoke about. Opposite this, there is the restrained, disciplined, and serene force of the servants. In this opposition of the king who has become wild force and servants who are the visible representation of a force, but of a disciplined force, I think you have in fact the point at which a sovereignty that is disappearing is caught up in a disciplinary power that is being constituted and whose face, it seems to me, can be seen in these silent, muscular, and magnificent pages who are both obedient and all-powerful.

How do these Herculean servants exercise their functions? Here again I think we should examine the text in some detail. The text says that these Herculean servants are present in order to serve the king; it even says very precisely that their purpose is to serve his "needs" and his "condition." Now it seems to me that in what could be called the power of sovereignty, in actual fact the servant really does serve the sovereign's needs and really must satisfy the requirements and needs of his condition: he is in fact the person who dresses and undresses the king, who ensures the provision of services for his body and his property, and so on.
However, when the servant ministers to the sovereign's needs and condition, it is essentially because this is the sovereign's will. That is to say, the sovereign's will binds the servant, and it binds him individually, as this or that servant, to that function which consists in ensuring that he serves the sovereign's needs and condition. The king's will, his status as king, is what fixes the servant to his needs and condition.

Now, in the disciplinary relationship that we see appearing here, the servant is not at all in the service of the king's will, or it is not because it is the king's will that he serves the king's needs. He is in the service of the king's needs and condition without either the king's will or his status being involved. It is only the mechanical requirements of the body, as it were, which fix and determine what the servant's service must be. Consequently will and need, status and condition are disconnected. What's more, the servant will only act as a repressive force, he will leave off serving only in order to curb the king's will, when the latter is expressed over and above his needs and his condition.

This, more or less, is roughly the scene's setting. I would now like to move on to the important episode of this scene set in this context, that is to say the episode of the confrontation with the doctor: "One day, in fiery delirium, the madman harshly greets his old doctor who is making his visit, and daubs him with filth and excrement. One of the pages immediately enters the room without saying a word, grasps by his belt the delirious madman . . ."7

After the deposition scene, or dethronement if you like, there is the scene of rubbish, excrement, and filth. This is no longer just the king who is dethroned, this is not just dispossession of the attributes of sovereignty; it is the total inversion of sovereignty. The only force the king has left is his body reduced to its wild state, and the only weapons he has left are his bodily evacuations, which is precisely what he uses against his doctor. Now in doing this I think the king really inverts his sovereignty, not just because his waste matter has replaced his scepter and sword, but also because in this action he takes up, quite exactly, a gesture with a historical meaning. The act of throwing mud and refuse over someone is the centuries old gesture of insurrection against the powerful.

There is an entire tradition that would have it that we only speak of excrement and waste matter as the symbol of money. Still, a very serious
political history could be done of excrement and waste matter, both a political and a medical history of the way in which excrement and waste matter could be a problem in themselves, and without any kind of symbolization: they could be an economic problem, and a medical problem, of course, but they could also be the stake of a political struggle, which is very clear in the seventeenth century and especially the eighteenth century. And this profaning gesture of throwing mud, refuse, and excrement over the carriages, silk, and ermine of the great, well, King George III, having been its victim, knew full well what it meant.

So there is a total reversal of the sovereign function here, since the king takes up the insurrectional gesture not just of the poor, but even of the poorest of the poor. When the peasants revolted, they used the tools available to them as weapons: scythes, staves, and suchlike. Artisans also made use of the tools of their trade. It was only the poorest, those who had nothing, who picked up stones and excrement in the street to throw at the powerful. This is the role that the king is taking up in his confrontation with the medical power entering the room in which he finds himself: sovereignty, both driven wild and inverted, against pale discipline.

It is at this point that the silent, muscular, invincible page enters, who seizes the king around the waist, throws him on the bed, strips him naked, washes him with a sponge, and withdraws, as the text says, "looking at him haughtily." And once again you find here the displacement of the elements of a scene of power, which this time is no longer of the coronation, of the iconographic representation; it is, as you can see clearly, the scaffold, the scene of public torture. But here as well there is inversion and displacement: whereas the person who violates sovereignty, who throws stones and excrement over the king, would have been killed, hung and quartered according to English law, here instead, discipline, making its entrance in the form of the page, will control, bring down, strip naked, scrub, and make the body clean and true.

That is what I wanted to say about this scene, which, much more than the scene of Pinel freeing the mad, appears to me typical of what is put to work in what I call proto-psychiatric practice, that is to say, roughly, the practice which develops in the last years of the eighteenth century and in the first twenty or thirty years of the nineteenth century, before the appearance of the great institutional edifice of the psychiatric asylum.
in the years between 1830 and 1840, say 1838 in France, with the law on confinement and the organization of the major psychiatric hospitals.\textsuperscript{9}

This scene seems to me to be important. First of all because it means I can correct an error I made in \textit{Histoire de la folie}. You can see that there is no question here of the imposition of anything like a family model in psychiatric practice; it is not true that the father and mother, or the typical relationships of the family structure, are borrowed by psychiatric practice and pinned on madness and the direction of the insane. The relationship to the family will appear in the history of psychiatry, but this will be later, and, as far as I can see at present, we should identify hysteria as the point at which the family model is grafted on to psychiatric practice.

You can see also that the treatment, which, with an optimism subsequently contradicted by the facts, Pinel said would produce "a sound cure without relapse,"\textsuperscript{10} takes place without anything like a valid description, analysis, diagnosis, or true knowledge of the king's illness. Here again, just as the family model only enters later, so too the moment of truth only enters psychiatric practice later.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that one can see very clearly here an interplay of elements, elements of power in a strict sense, which are put to work, shifted, turned around, and so on, outside of any institution. Here again, my impression is that the moment of the institution is not prior to these relationships of power. That is to say, the institution does not determine these relationships of power, any more than a discourse of truth prescribes them, or a family model suggests them. In actual fact, in this kind of scene you see these relationships of power functioning, I was going to say nakedly. In this it seems to me to pick out quite well the basis of relationships of power that constitute the core element of psychiatric practice, on the basis of which, in fact, we will later see the construction of institutional structures, the emergence of discourses of truth, and also the grafting or importation of a number of models.

However, for the moment, we are witnessing the emergence of a disciplinary power, the specific figure of which seems to me to appear here with remarkable clarity precisely to the extent that, in this case, disciplinary power is confronted by another form of political power that I will call the power of sovereignty. That is to say, if the first hypotheses now guiding me are correct, it will not be enough to say that right from
the start we find something like political power in psychiatric practice; it seems to me that it is more complicated, and what's more will become increasingly complicated. For the moment I would like to schematize. We are not dealing with just any kind of political power; there are two absolutely distinct types of power corresponding to two systems, two different ways of functioning: the macrophysics of sovereignty, the power that could be put to work in a post-feudal, pre industrial government, and then the microphysics of disciplinary power, whose functioning we find in the different components I am presenting to you and which makes its appearance here leaning on, as it were, the disconnected, broken down, unmasked components of sovereign power.

There is a transformation, therefore, of the relationship of sovereignty into disciplinary power. And you see at the heart of all this, at bottom, a kind of general proposition which is: "You may well be the king, but if you are mad you will cease to be so," or again: "You may well be mad, but this won't make you king." The king, George III in this case, could only be cured in Willis's scene, in Pinel's fable if you like, to the extent that he was not treated as king, and to the extent that he was subjected to a force that was not the force of royal power. "You are not king" seems to me to be the proposition at the heart of this kind of proto-psychiatry I am trying to analyze. If you refer then to the texts of Descartes, where it is a question of madmen who take themselves for kings, you notice that the two examples Descartes gives of madness are "taking oneself for a king" or believing one "has a body made of glass." In truth, for Descartes and generally [...] for all those who spoke about madness up until the end of the eighteenth century, "taking oneself for a king," or believing one has "a body made of glass," was exactly the same thing, that it to say they were two absolutely identical types of error, which immediately contradicted the most elementary facts of sensation. "Taking oneself for a king," "believing that one has a body of glass," was, quite simply, typical of madness as error.

Henceforth, it seems to me that in this proto-psychiatric practice, and so for all the discourses of truth that get going on the basis of this practice, "believing oneself to be a king" is the true secret of madness.

* (Recording:) we can say
If you look at how a delirium, an illusion, or a hallucination was analyzed in this period, you see that it doesn’t much matter whether someone believes himself to be a king, that is to say, whether the content of his delirium is supposing that he exercises royal power, or, to the contrary, believes himself to be ruined, persecuted, and rejected by the whole of humanity. For the psychiatrists of this period, the fact of imposing this belief, of asserting it against every proof to the contrary, even putting it forward against medical knowledge, wanting to impose it on the doctor and, ultimately, on the whole asylum, thus asserting it against every other form of certainty or knowledge, constitutes a way of believing that one is a king. Whether you believe yourself to be a king or believe that you are wretched, wanting to impose this certainty as a kind of tyranny on all those around you basically amounts to “believing one is a king”; it is this that makes all madness a kind of belief rooted in the fact that one is king of the world. Psychiatrists at the start of the nineteenth century could have said that to be mad was to seize power in one’s head. Moreover, for Georget, in a text from 1820, the treatise De la folie, the major problem for the psychiatrist is basically “how to persuade otherwise” someone who believes that he is a king.

There are a number of reasons why I have stressed this scene of the king. First of all, it seems to me that it enables us to have a better understanding of that other founding scene of psychiatry, the scene of Pinel I spoke about at the start, the scene of liberation. Pinel, at Bicêtre in 1792, entering the dungeons, removing the chains from this or that patient who has been chained up for weeks or months, would seem to be the exact opposite of the history of the king who is dispossessed, the exact opposite of the history of the king who is confined, seized around the waist, and supervised by muscular pages. Actually, when we look closely, we can see the continuity between the two scenes.

When Pinel liberates the patients confined in the dungeons, the person who is liberated incurs a debt to his liberator that will and must be settled in two ways. First, the person liberated will settle his debt continually and voluntarily by obedience; the wild violence of a body, which was only restrained by the violence of chains, will be replaced by the constant submission of one will to another. In other words, removing the chains ensures something like subjection through grateful obedience.
Then the patient will wipe out the debt in a second way, this time involuntarily. From the moment he is subjected in this way, where the continual and voluntary repayment of the debt of gratitude will have made him submit to the discipline of medical power, the working of this discipline and its own force will itself bring about the patient’s cure. As a result, the cure will become involuntarily the second payment in kind for his liberation, the way in which the patient, or rather, the patient’s illness, will pay the doctor for the gratitude he owes him.

You see that, in fact, this scene of liberation is not exactly a scene of humanism, and of course everyone knows this. But I think we can analyze it as a relationship of power, or as the transformation of a certain relationship of power that was one of violence—the prison, dungeon, chains, and here again, all this belongs to the old form of the power of sovereignty—into a relationship of subjection that is a relationship of discipline.

This is the first reason for recounting the history of George III, since it seems to me to inaugurate a psychiatric practice for which Pinel is generally given credit.

The other reason for quoting this case is that it seems to me that the scene of George III is one in a whole series of other scenes. First of all, it is part of a series of scenes, which, in the first twenty-five or thirty years of the nineteenth century, constitute this proto-psychiatric practice. We could say that in the first quarter of the nineteenth century there was a kind of little encyclopedia of canonical cures constituted on the basis of the cases published by Haslam, Pinel, Esquirol, Fodéré, Georget, and Guislain. And this little encyclopedia includes around fifty cases which circulate in all the psychiatric treatises of the time and all of which more or less conform to a similar model. Here, if you like, are one or two examples which show very clearly, I think, how all these scenes of cure resemble that major scene of the cure of George III.

Here, for example, is an example from Pinel’s Traité médico-philosophique: “A soldier, still in a state of insanity (...) is suddenly dominated by the single idea of leaving for the army.” He refuses to return to his room in the evening when he is ordered to do so. When he is in his room, he sets about tearing everything apart and making a mess; then he is tied to the bed. “For eight days he is in this violent state, and he finally appears to realize that in continuing with his tantrums he is not the master. In the
morning, during the head doctor's round, he adopts the most submissive tone and, kissing his hand, says to him, 'You promised to give me my freedom within the home if I was peaceful. Well! I implore you to keep your word.' Smiling, the other tells him of the pleasure he experiences at this happy return to himself; he speaks gently, and instantly removes all constraint."

Another example: a man was occupied with the single idea of "his omnipotence." Only one consideration held him back, the "fear of destroying the Condé army ( . . . ) which, according to him, was destined to fulfill the designs of the Eternal." How to overcome this belief? The doctor watched out for "a misdemeanor that would put him in the wrong and authorize severe treatment." And then, by chance, when "one day the supervisor complained to him about the filth and excrement he had left in his room, the lunatic flared up against him violently and threatened to destroy him. This was a favorable opportunity to punish him and convince him that his power was chimerical."

Yet another example: "A madman at the Bicêtre asylum, who has no other delirium than that of believing himself to be a victim of the Revolution, repeating day and night that he was ready to suffer his fate." Since he is to be guillotined, he thinks it no longer necessary to take care of himself; he "refuses to sleep in his bed," and lays stretched out on the floor. The supervisor is obliged to resort to constraint: "The madman is tied to his bed, but he seeks revenge by refusing any kind of food with the most invincible stubbornness. Exhortations, promises, and threats are all in vain." However, after a time the patient is thirsty; he drinks some water but "firmly rejects even the broth, or any other kind of nourishment, liquid or solid, which is offered to him." Towards the twelfth day, "the supervisor tells him that, since he is so disobedient, he will henceforth be deprived of his drink of cold water and will be given fatty broth instead." Finally, thirst wins out and "he greedily takes the broth." On the following days he takes some solid food and "thus gradually reacquires the qualities of a sound and robust health."

* The manuscript also refers to a case set out in paragraph IX: "Exemple propre à faire voir avec quelle attention le caractère de l'aliéné doit être étudié pour le ramener à la raison" pp. 196 197; "An instance illustrative of the advantage of obtaining an intimate acquaintance with the character of the patient" pp. 191 193.
I will come back to the detailed morphology of these scenes, but I would like to show you that at the beginning of nineteenth century psychiatry, even before and, I think, quite independently of any theoretical formulation and institutional organization, a tactic of the manipulation of madness was defined which in a way sketched out the framework of power relationships needed for the mental orthopedics that had to lead to the cure. The scene of George III is basically one of these scenes, one of the first.

I think we could then trace the future development, and transformation of these scenes, and find again how, and under what conditions, these proto-psychiatric scenes are developed in a first phase, between 1840 and 1870, of what could be called moral treatment, of which Leuret was the hero.²²

Later, this same proto-psychiatric scene, transformed by moral treatment, is further greatly transformed by a fundamental episode in the history of psychiatry, by both the discovery and practice of hypnosis and the analysis of hysterical phenomena.

Then there is, of course, the psychoanalytic scene.

And finally, there is, if you like, the anti-psychiatric scene. Even so, it is strange to see how close this first scene of proto-psychiatry, the scene of George III, is to the scene described in the book by Mary Barnes and Berke. You are familiar with the story of Mary Barnes at Kingsley Hall, in which the elements are more or less the same as those found in the story of George III:

“One day Mary presented me with the ultimate test of my love for her. She covered herself in shit and waited to see what my reaction would be. Her account of this incident amuses her because of her blind confidence that her shit could not put me off. I can assure you the reverse was true. When I, unsuspectingly, walked into the games room and was accosted by foul smelling Mary Barnes looking far worse than the creature from the black lagoon, I was terrified and nauseated. My first reaction was to escape and I stalked away as fast as I could. Fortunately she didn’t try to follow me. I would have belted her.

“I remember my first thoughts very well: ‘This is too much, too bloody much. She can damn well take care of herself from now on. I want nothing more to do with her’.”
Then Berke reflects and says to himself that, after all, if he does not do it, it will be all up for her, and he does not want this. This final argument brooks no reply. He follows Mary Barnes, not without considerable reluctance on his part. "Mary was still in the games room, her head bowed, sobbing. I muttered something like, 'Now, now, it's all right. Let's go upstairs and get you a nice warm bath.' It took at least an hour to get Mary cleaned up. She was a right mess. Shit was everywhere, in her hair, under her arms, in between her toes. I had visions of the principal character in an oldie terror movie, _The Mummy's Ghost_."²³

In reality he had failed to recognize the proto-scene of the history of psychiatry, that is to say the history of George III: it was precisely that.

What I would like to do this year is basically a history of these psychiatric scenes, taking into account what is for me perhaps a postulate, or at any rate a hypothesis, that this psychiatric scene and what is going on in this scene, the game of power which is sketched out in it, should be analyzed before any institutional organization, or discourse of truth, or importation of models. And I would like to study these scenes emphasizing one thing, which is that the scene involving George III that I have been talking about is not only the first in a long series of psychiatric scenes, but is historically part of another, different series of scenes. In the proto-psychiatric scene you find again everything that could be called the ceremony of sovereignty: coronation, dispossession, submission, allegiance, surrender, restoration, and so forth. But there is also the series of rituals of service imposed by some on others: giving orders, obeying, observing rules, punishing, rewarding, answering, remaining silent. There is the series of judicial procedures: proclaiming the law, watching out for infractions, obtaining a confession, establishing a fault, making a judgment, imposing a penalty. Finally, you find a whole series of medical practices, and crucially the major medical practice of the crisis: looking out for the moment at which the crisis intervenes, encouraging its unfolding and its completion, ensuring that the healthy forces prevail over the others.

It seems to me that if we want to produce a true history of psychiatry, at any rate of the psychiatric scene, it will be by situating it in this series of scenes—scenes of the ceremony of sovereignty, of rituals of service, of judicial procedures, and of medical practices—and not by making
analysis of the institution the essential point and our point of departure.*
Let’s be really anti-institutionalist. What I propose to bring to light this
year is, before analysis of the institution, the microphysics of power.

I would like now to look more closely at this proto-psychiatric scene of
which I have given you a first idea. It seems to me that the scene of George III
marks a very important break insofar as it clearly departs from a number of
scenes that had been the regulated and canonical way of treating madness
until then. It seems to me that until the end of the eighteenth century, and
we still find some examples of this right at the start of the nineteenth
century, the manipulation of madness by doctors was part of the stratagem
of truth. It involved constituting around the illness, in the extension of the
illness as it were, by letting it unfold and by following it, a sort of both fic­
tional and real world in which madness will be caught in the trap of a reality
that has been insidiously induced. I will give you an example of this; it
is a case of Mason Cox, which was published in England in 1804 and in

"Mr . . . . aged 36, of full habit, melancholic temperament, extremely
attached to literary pursuits, and subject to depression of spirits without
any obvious cause. His lucubrations were sometimes extended through
whole days and nights in succession, and at these periods he was very
abstemious, drank only water, and avoided animal food; his friends
remonstrated with him on the hazard of such proceedings; and his house
keeper being urgent for his adopting some plan that had his health for the
immediate object, the idea struck him of her having some sinister design
and that she intended to destroy him by means of a succession of poisoned
shirts, under the baneful influence of which he believed himself then suf­
ferring. No arguments availed, and all reasoning was ineffectual, the hallu­
cination therefore was humoured, a suspected shirt was exposed to some
simple chemical experiments, continued, repeated, and varied with much
ceremony, and the results so contrived as to prove the truth of the
patient’s suspicions; the house-keeper, notwithstanding all her protesta­
tions of innocence was served with a pretended warrant, and in the pres­
ence of the patient, hurried out of the house by the proper officers, and

* The manuscript clarifies the notion of scene: “Understanding by scene, not a theatrical
episode, but a ritual, a strategy, a battle.”
secluded from his observation for a time, while he supposed she was in gaol expecting an ignominious death ... After this preface, a formal consultation was held, certain antidotes prescribed, and after a few weeks he perfectly recovered; a new plan of life and regimen were adopted, and he has ever since continued to enjoy mens sana in corpore sano.”

In a case history like this, you see finally how a psychiatric practice functioned. Basically, starting from the delirious idea, it involved developing a sort of labyrinth exactly patterned on the delirium itself, homogeneous with the erroneous idea, through which the patient is taken. The patient believes, for example, that his servant gives him shirts poisoned with sulfur which irritate his skin. Okay, we pursue the delirium. His shirts are examined by an expert, which naturally produces a positive result. Since we have a positive result, the case is submitted to a court: the proofs are submitted and a judgment, a condemnation, is pronounced, and we pretend to send the servant to prison.

There is, then, the organization of a labyrinth homogeneous with the delirious idea, and a sort of forked outcome is placed at the end of this labyrinth, an outcome at two levels, which, precisely, will bring about the cure. On the one hand, there will be an event produced within the delirium. That is to say, at the level of the patient’s delirium, the imprisonment of the guilty party confirms the truth of the delirium, but, at the same time, assures the patient that he has been freed from what, within his delirium, was the cause of his illness. There is then this first result, at the level of the delirium itself, authenticating the delirium and getting rid of what it is that functions as cause within the delirium.

Now, at a different level, that is to say at the level of the doctors, of those around the patient, something very different happens. By pretending to imprison the servant, she is put out of play, she is separated from the patient, and the patient thus finds himself sheltered from what, in reality, was the cause of his illness, that is to say his mistrust and hatred of her. So that which is the cause within, and the cause of, his delirium are short-circuited in one and the same operation.

This operation had to be one and the same; that is to say, it had to take place at the end of the labyrinth of the delirium, because for the doctors it was quite clear that if the servant was purely and simply dismissed, without being dismissed as the cause within the delirium,
then the delirium could have begun again. The patient would imagine that she was still pursuing him, that she had found a way of getting round them, or he would redirect mistrust of his servant on to someone else. From the moment that one effectuates the delirium, that one accords it reality, authenticates it and, at the same time, suppresses the cause within it, one has the conditions for the liquidation of the delirium itself.* And if the conditions for liquidating the delirium are at the same time the suppression of what caused the delirium itself, then the cure is assured as a result. So, if you like, there is both suppression of the cause of delirium, and suppression of the cause within the delirium. And it is this kind of fork, arrived at through the labyrinth of fictional verification, that assures the very principle of the cure.

Now—and this is the third moment—when the patient really believes that his delirium was the truth, when the patient believes that what, within his delirium, was the cause of his illness has been suppressed, then he discovers as a result the possibility of accepting medical intervention. On the pretext of curing him of the illness inflicted on him by the servant, one slips into this kind of opening a medication that is medication within the delirium, a medication that within the delirium will enable him to escape the illness caused by the servant, and which is a medication for the delirium since he is actually given medicine that, by calming his humors, by calming his blood, by discharging all the congestions of his blood system, etcetera, ensures the cure. And again you can see that an element of reality, the medicine, functions at two levels: as medication within the delirium and as therapy for the delirium. It is this kind of organized game around the fictional verification of the delirium that effectively ensures the cure.

Okay, this game of truth, within delirium and of delirium, will be completely suppressed in the psychiatric practice that commences at the start of the nineteenth century. It seems to me that the emergence of what we can call a disciplinary practice, this new microphysics of power, will sweep all this away and establish the core elements of all the psychiatric scenes that develop subsequently, and on the basis of which psychiatric theory and the psychiatric institution will be built.

---

* The manuscript adds: "One really suppresses that which functions as the cause within the delirium, but it is suppressed in a form that the delirium can accept."
1. "Philippe Pinel freeing the mad from their chains at Bicêtre"—where, appointed on 6 August 1793, he took up his post as "infirmary doctor" on 11 September 1793—is the version given by his eldest son, Scipion Pinel (1795-1859), referring the event to 1792, in an apocryphal article attributed to his father: "Sur l'abolition des chaînes des aliénés, par Philippe Pinel, membre de l'Institut. Note extraite de ses cahiers, communiqués par M. Pinel fils" Archives de médecine, 1st year, vol. 2, May 1823, pp. 15-17; and communication to the Academy of Medicine: "Bicêtre en 1792. De l'abolition des chaînes" Mémoires de l'Académie de médecine, no. 5, 1856, pp. 32-40. In 1849 the painter Charles Müller immortalized him in a painting entitled Pinel removes the chains from the mad of Bicêtre. Foucault refers to this in Histoire de la folie, Part 3, ch. 4, pp. 483-484 and 496-501; Madness and Civilization, ch. 9, pp. 241-243. In 1849 the painter Charles Muller immortalized him in a painting entitled Pinel removes the chains from the mad of Bicêtre. Foucault refers to this in Histoire de la folie, Part 3, ch. 4, pp. 483-484 and 496-501; Madness and Civilization, ch. 9, pp. 241-243 (pages 484-501 of the French edition are omitted from the English translation).


3. Sir Francis Willis (1718-1807), the proprietor of an establishment in Lincolnshire for people suffering from mental disorders, was called to London on 5 December 1788 within the framework of a commission created by Parliament in order to pronounce on the King's condition. Willis looked after George III until the remission of his disorder in March 1789. The episode referred to by Pinel is in "Observations sur le régime moral que est le plus propre à rétablir, dans certains cas, la raison égarée des monarques" pp. 13-15, reproduced in J. Postel, Genèse de la psychiatrie. Les premiers écrits de Philippe Pinel (Le Plessis Robinson, Institut Synthelabo, 1998) pp. 194-197, and Traité médico-philosophique, pp. 192-193; A Treatise on Insanity, pp. 187-188, and pp. 286-290 in which Pinel quotes the Report from the Committee Appointed to Examine the Physicians who Have Attended His Majesty during his Illness, touching the Present State of His Majesty's Health (London: 1789).[This latter section, entitled "Exemple mémorable d'une discussion sur la manie, devenue une affaire d'état," is omitted from the English translation; G.B.]

4. William Shakespeare, The Tragedy of King Richard the Third, written at the end of 1592 and the beginning of 1593, describes the accession to the throne, by usurpation, of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, the brother of King Edward IV, and then his death at the Battle of Bosworth.

5. The Tragedy of King Lear (performed at Court on 26 December 1606, first published in 1608, and then in a revised version in 1623), Foucault refers to King Lear in Histoire de la folie, p. 49; Madness and Civilization, p. 31, and also refers to the work of A. Adnès, Shakespeare et la folie. Étude médico-psychologique (Paris: Maloine, 1935) [the reference to Adnès is omitted from the English translation; G.B.]. He returns to it in the Course at the Collège de France of 1983-1984, "Le Gouvernement de soi et des autres. Le courage de la vérité," lecture of 21 March 1984.
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Genealogy of “disciplinary power.” The “power of sovereignty.”
The subject-function in disciplinary power and in the power of sovereignty.
Forms of disciplinary power: army, police, apprenticeship, workshop, school.
Disciplinary power as “normalizing agency.”
Technology of disciplinary power and constitution of the “individual.”
Emergence of the human sciences.

WE CAN SAY THAT between 1850 and 1930 classical psychiatry reigned and functioned without too many external problems on the basis of what it considered to be, and put to work as, a true discourse. At any rate, from this discourse it deduced the need for the asylum institution as well as the need to deploy a medical power as an internal and effective law within this institution. In short, it deduced the need for an institution and a power from a supposedly true discourse.

It seems to me that we can say that criticism of the institution—I hesitate to say “antipsychiatry”—let’s say a certain form of criticism which developed from around 1930 to 1940, did not start from a supposedly true psychiatric discourse in order to deduce the need for an institution and a medical power, but rather from the fact of the institution and its functioning, and from criticism of the institution that sought to bring to light, on the one hand, the violence of the medical power exercised within it, and, on the other, the effects of incomprehension that right from the start distorted the supposed truth of this medical discourse. So, if you like, this form of analysis started from the institution in order to denounce power and analyse effects of incomprehension.
What I would like to do instead is try to bring this problem of power to the fore, which is why I have begun the lectures in the way I have. I will leave the relationships between this analysis of power and the problem of the truth of a discourse on madness until a bit later.2

I started then with this scene of George III confronted by his servants who were, at the same time, agents of medical power, because it seemed to me a fine example of the confrontation between a power, which, in the person of the king himself, is sovereign power embodied in this mad king, and another type of power, which is instead anonymous and silent, and which, paradoxically, gets support from the servants' strength, from a muscular, obedient force not articulated in discourse. So, on the one hand, there is the king's furious outburst and, facing this, the controlled force of the servants. And the therapeutic process presupposed by Willis and, after him, Pinel, consisted in getting madness to migrate from a sovereignty it drove wild and within which it exploded, to a discipline supposed to subjugate it. What appears in this capture of madness, prior to any institution and outside any discourse of truth, was therefore a power that I call "disciplinary power."

What is this power? I would like to advance the hypothesis that something like disciplinary power exists in our society. By this I mean no more than a particular, as it were, terminal, capillary form of power; a final relay, a particular modality by which political power, power in general, finally reaches the level of bodies and gets a hold on them, taking actions, behavior, habits, and words into account; the way in which power converges below to affect individual bodies themselves, to work on, modify, and direct what Servan called "the soft fibers of the brain."3 In other words, I think that in our society disciplinary power is a quite specific modality of what could be called the synaptic contact of bodies-power.*

The second hypothesis is that disciplinary power, in its specificity, has a history; it is not born suddenly, has not always existed, and is formed and follows a diagonal trajectory, as it were, through Western society. If we take only the history going from the Middle Ages until our own time, I think we can say that the formation of this power, in its

* The manuscript adds: "Methodologically this entails leaving the problem of the State, of the State apparatus, to one side and dispensing with the psycho-sociological notion of authority."
specific characteristics, was not completely marginal to medieval society, but it was certainly not central either. It was formed within religious communities from where, being transformed in the process, it was taken into the lay communities that developed and multiplied in the pre-Reformation period, let’s say in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. We can see this transfer to communities like the famous “Brothers of the Common Life,” which are not exactly monastic but which, on the basis of techniques taken from monastic life, as well as ascetic exercises taken from a whole tradition of religious exercises, defined disciplinary methods for daily life and pedagogy. This is just one example of the spread of monastic or ascetic disciplines before the Reformation. We then see these techniques gradually spreading far afield, penetrating sixteenth, and especially seventeenth and eighteenth century society, and, in the nineteenth century, becoming the major general form of this synaptic contact: political power-individual body.

To take a somewhat symbolic reference point, I think this evolution, which goes from the Brethren of the Common Life, that is to say from the fourteenth century, to its point of explosion, that is to say, when disciplinary power becomes an absolutely generalized social form, ends up, in 1791, with Bentham's Panopticon, which provides the most general political and technical formula of disciplinary power. I think the confrontation between George III and his servants—which is more or less contemporaneous with the Panopticon—this confrontation of the king’s madness and medical discipline is one of the historical and symbolic points of the emergence and definitive installation of disciplinary power in society. Now I do not think that we can analyze how psychiatry functions by restricting ourselves to the workings of the asylum institution. Obviously there’s no question of analyzing how psychiatry functions starting from its supposedly true discourse; but nor do I think we can understand how it functions by analyzing the institution. The mechanism of psychiatry should be understood starting from the way in which disciplinary power works.

So, what is this disciplinary power? This is what I would like to talk about this evening.
It is not very easy to study it. First of all, because I will take a fairly broad time scale; I will take examples from disciplinary forms that appear in the sixteenth century and develop up until the eighteenth century. It is not easy because, in order to study this disciplinary power, this meeting point of the body and power, it must be analyzed in contrast with another type of power, which preceded it and which will be juxtaposed to it. This is what I will begin to do, without being very certain, moreover, of what I will say.

It seems to me that we could oppose disciplinary power to a power that preceded it historically and with which it was entangled for a long time before finally prevailing in turn. I will call this earlier form of power, in opposition then to disciplinary power, the power of sovereignty, but without being exactly happy with this word for reasons you will soon see.

What is the power of sovereignty? It seems to me to be a power relationship that links sovereign and subject according to a couple of asymmetrical relationships: a levy or deduction one side, and expenditure on the other. In the relationship of sovereignty, the sovereign imposes a levy on products, harvests, manufactured objects, arms, the labor force, and courage. In a symmetrical reverse process, at the same time as he imposes a levy on services, there will be, not repayment for what he has deducted, for the sovereign does not have to pay back, but the sovereign’s expenditure, which may take the form of the gift, which may be made during ritual ceremonies, such as gifts for happy events, like a birth, or gifts of service, such as the service of protection or the religious service ensured by the Church, for example, very different from the kind of service he has levied. It may also be the outlay of expenditure when, for festivals, for the organization of a war, the lord makes those around him work in return for payment. So this system of levy-expenditure seems to me to be typical of this sovereign type of power. Of course, deductions always largely exceed expenditure, and the dissymmetry is so great that, behind this relationship of sovereignty and this dissymmetrical coupling of levy-expenditure, we can see quite clearly the emergence of plunder, pillage, and war.
Second, I think the relationship of sovereignty always bears the mark of a founding precedence. For there to be a relationship of sovereignty there must be something like divine right, or conquest, a victory, an act of submission, an oath of loyalty, an act passed between the sovereign who grants privileges, aid, protection, and so forth, and someone who, in return, pledges himself; or there must be something like birth, the rights of blood. In short, we can say that the relationship of sovereignty always looks back to something that constituted its definitive foundation. But this does not mean that this relationship of sovereignty does not have to be regularly or irregularly reactualized; a characteristic feature of the relationship of sovereignty is that it is always reactualized by things like ceremonies and rituals, by narratives also, and by gestures, distinguishing signs, required forms of greeting, marks of respect, insignia, coats of arms, and suchlike. That the relationship of sovereignty is thus founded on precedence and reactualized by a number of more or less ritual actions stems from the fact that the relationship is, in a sense, intangible, that it is given once and for all but, at the same time, is fragile and always liable to disuse or breakdown. For the relationship of sovereignty to really hold, outside of the rite of recommencement and reactualization, outside of the game of ritual signs, there is always the need for a certain supplement or threat of violence, which is there behind the relationship of sovereignty, and which sustains it and ensures that it holds. The other side of sovereignty is violence, it is war.

The third feature of relationships of sovereignty is that they are not isotopic. By this I mean that they are intertwined and tangled up with each other in such a way that we cannot establish a system of exhaustive and planned hierarchy between them. In other words, relationships of sovereignty are indeed perpetual relationships of differentiation, but they are not relationships of classification; they do not constitute a unitary hierarchical table with subordinate and superordinate elements. Not being isotopic means first of all that they are heterogeneous and have no common measure. There is, for example, the relationship of sovereignty between serf and lord, and a different relationship of sovereignty, which absolutely cannot be superimposed on this, between the holder of a fief and a suzerain, and there is the relationship of sovereignty exercised by the priest with regard to the laity, and all these relationships cannot be
integrated within a genuinely single system. Furthermore—this again marks the non-isotopic nature of the relationship of sovereignty—the elements it involves, that it puts into play, are not equivalents: a relationship of sovereignty may perfectly well concern the relationship between a sovereign or a suzerain—I do not distinguish them in an analysis as schematic as this—and a family, a community, or the inhabitants of a parish or a region; but sovereignty may also bear on something other than these human multiplicities. Sovereignty may bear on land, a road, an instrument of production—a mill, for example—and on users: those who pass through a tollgate, along a road, fall under the relationship of sovereignty.

So you can see that the relationship of sovereignty is a relationship in which the subject element is not so much, and we can even say it is almost never, an individual, an individual body. The relationship of sovereignty applies not to a somatic singularity but to multiplicities—like families, users—which in a way are situated above physical individuality, or, on the contrary, it applies to fragments or aspects of individuality, of somatic singularity. It is insofar as one is the son of X, a bourgeois of this town, etcetera, that one will be held in a relationship of sovereignty, that one will be sovereign or, alternatively, subject, and one may be both subject and sovereign in different aspects, so that these relationships can never be wholly plotted and laid out according to the terms of a single table.

In other words, in a relationship of sovereignty, what I call the subject-function moves around and circulates above and below somatic singularities, and, conversely, bodies circulate, move around, rest on something here, and take flight. In these relationships of sovereignty there is therefore a never ending game of movements and disputes in which subject-functions and somatic singularities, let's say—with a word I am not very happy with for reasons you will soon see—individuals, are moved around in relation to each other. The pinning of the subject-function to a definite body can only take place at times in a discontinuous, incidental fashion, in ceremonies for example. It takes place when the individual's body is marked by an insignia, by the gesture he makes: in homage, for example, when a somatic singularity is effectively marked with the seal of the sovereignty that accepts it. Or it takes place in the violence with which sovereignty asserts its rights and forcibly imposes them on someone it subjects. So, at the actual level at which the
relationship of sovereignty is applied, at the lower extremity of the rela-
tionship, if you like, you never find a perfect fit between sovereignty and
corporeal singularities.

On the other hand, if you look towards the summit you will see there
the individualization absent at the base; you begin to see it sketched out
towards the top. There is a sort of underlying individualization of the
relationship of sovereignty towards the top, that is to say, towards the
sovereign. The power of sovereignty necessarily entails a sort of monar-
chical spiral. That is to say, precisely insofar as the power of sovereignty
is not isotopic but entails never ending disputes and movements, to the
extent that plunder, pillage, and war still rumble behind these sovereign
relationships, and the individual as such is never caught in the relation-
ship, then, at a given moment and coming from above, there must be
something that ensures arbitration: there must be a single, individual
point which is the summit of this set of heterotopic relationships that
absolutely cannot be plotted on one and the same table.

The sovereign's individuality is entailed by the non-individualization
of the elements on which the relationship of sovereignty is applied.
Consequently there is the need for something like a sovereign who, in
his own body, is the point on which all these multiple, different, and
irreconcilable relationships converge. Thus, at the summit of this type of
power, there is necessarily something like the king in his individuality,
with his king's body. But straightaway you see a very odd phenomenon,
which has been studied by Kantorowicz in his book *The King's Two
Bodies*; in order to ensure his sovereignty, the king really must be an
individual with a body, but this body must not die along with the king's
somatic singularity. The monarchy must remain when the monarch no
longer exists; the king's body, which holds together all these relation-
ships of sovereignty, must not disappear with the death of this individ-
ual X or Y. The king's body, therefore, must have a kind of permanence;
more than just his somatic singularity, it must be the solidity of his
realm, of his crown. So that the individualization we see outlined at the
summit of the relationship of sovereignty entails the multiplication of
the king's body. The king's body is at least double according to
Kantorowicz, and on closer examination, starting from a certain period
at least, it is probably an absolutely multiple body.
So I think we can say that the relationship of sovereignty does put something like political power in contact with the body, applies it to the body, but that it never reveals individuality.* It is a form of power without an individualizing function, or which only outlines individuality on the sovereign’s side, and again, at the cost of this curious, paradoxical, and mythological multiplication of bodies. We have bodies without any individuality on one side, and individuality but a multiplicity of bodies on the other.

Okay, now for disciplinary power, since this is what I particularly want to talk about.

I think we could contrast it almost term for term with sovereignty. First of all, disciplinary power does not make use of this mechanism, this asymmetrical coupling of levy expenditure. In a disciplinary apparatus there is no dualism, no asymmetry; there is not this kind of fragmented hold. It seems to me that disciplinary power can be characterized first of all by the fact that it does not involve imposing a levy on the product or on a part of time, or on this or that category of service, but that it is a total hold, or, at any rate, tends to be an exhaustive capture of the individual’s body, actions, time, and behavior. It is a seizure of the body, and not of the product; it is a seizure of time in its totality, and not of the time of service.

We have a very clear example of this in the appearance of military discipline at the end of the seventeenth century and throughout the course of the eighteenth century. Until the beginning of the seventeenth century, roughly until the Thirty Years War, military discipline did not exist; what existed was a never-ending transition from vagabondage to the army. That is to say, the army was always constituted by a group of people recruited for a finite time for the needs of the cause, and to whom food and lodging were assured through pillage and the occupation of any premises found on the spot. In other words, in this system, which was still part of the order of sovereignty, a certain amount of time was deducted from people’s lives, some of their resources were deducted by the requirement that they bring their arms, and they were promised something like the reward of pillage.

* The manuscript clarifies: “The subject pole never coincides continually with the somatic singularity, except in the ritual of branding.”
From the middle of the seventeenth century you see something like the disciplinary system appearing in the army; that is to say an army lodged in barracks and in which the soldiers are engaged. That is to say, they are engaged for the whole day for the duration of the campaign, and, apart from demobilizations, they are equally engaged during peacetime, because, from 1750 or 1760, when his life of soldiering comes to an end, the soldier receives a pension and becomes a retired soldier. Military discipline begins to be the general confiscation of the body, time, and life; it is no longer a levy on the individual's activity but an occupation of his body, life, and time. Every disciplinary system tends, I think, to be an occupation of the individual's time, life, and body.7

Second, the disciplinary system does not need this discontinuous, ritual, more or less cyclical game of ceremonies and marks in order to function. Disciplinary power is not discontinuous but involves a procedure of continuous control instead. In the disciplinary system, one is not available for someone's possible use, one is perpetually under someone's gaze, or, at any rate, in the situation of being observed. One is not then marked by an action made once and for all, or by a situation given from the start, but visible and always in the situation of being under constant observation. More precisely, we can say that there is no reference to an act, an event, or an original right in the relationship of disciplinary power. Disciplinary power refers instead to a final or optimum state. It looks forward to the future, towards the moment when it will keep going by itself and only a virtual supervision will be required, when discipline, consequently, will have become habit. There is a genetic polarization, a temporal gradient in discipline, exactly the opposite of the reference to precedence that is necessarily involved in relationships of sovereignty. All discipline entails this kind of genetic course by which, from a point, which is not given as the inescapable situation, but as the zero point of the start of discipline, something must develop such that discipline will keep going by itself. What is it, then, that ensures this permanent functioning of discipline, this kind of genetic continuity typical of disciplinary power? It is obviously not the ritual or cyclical ceremony, but exercise; progressive, graduated exercise will mark out the growth and improvement of discipline on a temporal scale.

Here again we can take the army as our example. In the army as it existed in the form I call the power of sovereignty, there was certainly
something that could be called exercises, but actually its function was not at all that of disciplinary exercise: there were things like jousts and games. That is to say, warriors, those at least who were warriors by status—nobles and knights—regularly practiced jousting and suchlike. We could interpret this as a sort exercise, as a training of the body, in a sense, but I think it was essentially a kind of repetition of bravery, a test by which the individual displayed that he was in a permanent state of readiness to assert his status as a knight and so do honor to the situation in which he exercised certain rights and obtained certain privileges. The joust was perhaps a kind of exercise, but I think it was above all the cyclical repetition of the great test by which a knight became a knight.

On the other hand, from the eighteenth century, especially with Frederick II and the Prussian army, you see the appearance of physical exercise in the army, something that hardly existed before. In the army of Frederick II, and in western armies at the end of eighteenth century, this physical exercise does not consist in things like jousting, that is to say, the repetition and reproduction of the actions of war. Physical exercise is a training of the body; it is the training of skill, marching, resistance, and elementary movements in accordance with a graduated scale, completely different from the cyclical repetition of jousts and games. So what I think is typical of discipline is not ceremony, but exercise as the means for assuring this [sort] of genetic continuity.8

I think discipline necessarily resorts to writing as an instrument of this control, of the permanent and overall taking charge of the individual’s body. That is to say, whereas the relation of sovereignty entails the actualization of the distinctive mark, I think we could say that discipline, with its requirement of complete visibility, its constitution of genetic paths, this kind of typical hierarchical continuum, necessarily calls on writing. This is first of all to ensure that everything that happens, everything the individual does and says, is graded and recorded, and then to transmit this information from below up through the hierarchical levels, and then, finally, to make this information accessible and thereby assure the principle of omnivisibility, which is, I think, the second major characteristic of discipline.

It seems to me that the use of writing is absolutely necessary for disciplinary power to be total and continuous, and I think we could study the way in which, from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in the
army as in schools, in centers of apprenticeship as in the police or judicial system, people's bodies, behavior, and discourse are gradually besieged by a tissue of writing, by a sort of graphic plasma which records them, codifies them, and passes them up through the hierarchy to a centralized point.* I think this direct and continuous relationship of writing to the body is new. The visibility of the body and the permanence of writing go together, and obviously their effect is what could be called schematic and centralized individualization.

I will take just two examples of this game of writing in discipline. The first is in the schools of apprenticeship that are formed in the second half of the seventeenth century and multiply during the eighteenth century. Consider corporative apprenticeship in the Middle Ages, in the sixteenth and still in the seventeenth centuries. For a fee, an apprentice joined a master whose only obligation, in return for this sum of money, was to pass on the whole of his learning to the apprentice. In return the apprentice had to provide the master with any services the latter demanded. There was an exchange, then, of daily service for the major service of the transmission of knowledge. At the end of the apprenticeship, there was only a form of checking, the masterpiece, which was submitted to the jurande, that is to say a jury of the responsible individuals of the town's corporation or professional body.

Now a completely new type of institution appears in the second half of the seventeenth century. As an example of this, I will take the Gobelins' professional school of design and tapestry, which was organized in 1667 and gradually improved up until an important regulation of 1737.9 Apprenticeship takes place here in a completely different way. That is to say, the students are first of all divided up according to age, and a certain type of work is given to each age block. This work must be done in the presence either of teachers or supervisors, and it must be assessed at the same time and together with assessment of the student's behavior, assiduity, and zeal while performing his work. These assessments are entered on registers which are kept and passed on up the hierarchy to the director of the Gobelins' manufacture himself, and, on this

* The manuscripts says: "Bodies, actions, behaviors, and discourses are gradually besieged by a tissue of writing, a graphic plasma, which records them, codifies them, and schematizes them."
basis, a succinct report is sent to the minister of the King's Household concerning the quality of the work, the student's abilities, and whether he can now be considered a master. A whole network of writing is constituted around the apprentice's behavior, and this will first codify all his behavior in terms of a number of assessments determined in advance, then schematize it, and finally convey it to a point of centralization which will define his ability or inability. There is, then, an investment by writing, codification, transfer, and centralization, in short, the constitution of a schematic and centralized individuality.

We could say the same thing about the police discipline established in most European countries, and especially in France, in the second half of the eighteenth century. Police practice in the area of writing was still very simple in the second half of the seventeenth century: when an infraction was committed that was not a court matter, the lieutenant of the police (or his deputies) took charge and made a decision, which was simply notified. And then, in the course of the eighteenth century, gradually you see the individual beginning to be completely besieged by writing. That is to say, you see the appearance of visits to maisons d'internement to check up on the individual: why was he arrested, when was he arrested, how has he conducted himself since, has he made progress, and so on? The system is refined and in the second half of the eighteenth century you see the constitution of files for those who have simply come to the notice of the police, or whom the police suspect of something. Around the 1760s, I think, the police are required to make two copies of reports on those they suspect—reports which must be kept up to date, of course—one remaining on the spot, enabling a check to be made on the individual where he lives, and a copy sent to Paris, which is centralized at the ministry and redistributed to the other regions falling under different lieutenants of police, so that the individual can be immediately identified if he moves. Biographies are constituted in this way, or, in actual fact, police individualities based on the techniques of what I will call perpetual investment by writing. This administrative and centralized individuality is constituted in 1826 when a way is found to apply the cataloguing techniques already in use in libraries and botanical gardens.  

Finally, the continuous and endless visibility assured by writing has an important effect: the extreme promptness of the reaction of disciplinary
power that this perpetual visibility in the disciplinary system made possible. Unlike sovereign power—which only intervenes violently, from time to time, and in the form of war, exemplary punishment, or ceremony—disciplinary power will be able to intervene without halt from the first moment, the first action, the first hint. Disciplinary power has an inherent tendency to intervene at the same level as what is happening, at the point when the virtual is becoming real; disciplinary power always tends to intervene beforehand, before the act itself if possible, and by means of an infra judicial interplay of supervision, rewards, punishments, and pressure.

If we can say that the other side of sovereignty was war, I think we can say that the other side of the disciplinary relationship is punishment, both miniscule and continuous punitive pressure.

Here again, we could take an example of this from work discipline, from discipline in the workshop. In workers’ contracts which were signed, and this was sometimes the case very early on, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the worker typically had to end his work before a given time, or he had to give so many days work to his patron. If he did not finish the work or provide the full number of days, then he had to give either the equivalent of what was lacking, or add on a certain quantity of work or money as amends. So there was, if you like, a punitive system that hung on, worked on and starting from what had actually been done, as either damage or fault.

On the other hand, from the eighteenth century you see the birth of a subtle system of workshop discipline that focuses on potential behavior. In the workshop regulations distributed at this time you see a comparative supervision of workers, their lateness and absences noted down to the last minute; you also see the punishment of anything that might involve distraction. For example, a Gobelins regulation of 1680 notes that even hymns sung while working must be sung quietly so as not to disturb one’s fellow workers. There are regulations against telling bawdy stories when returning from lunch or dinner, because this distracts the workers who will then lack the calmness of mind required for work. So, there is a continuous pressure of this disciplinary power, which is not brought to bear on an offense or damage but on potential behavior. One must be able to spot an action even before it has been
performed, and disciplinary power must intervene somehow before the actual manifestation of the behavior, before the body, the action, or the discourse, at the level of what is potential, disposition, will, at the level of the soul. In this way something, the soul, is projected behind disciplinary power, but it is a very different soul from the one defined by Christian practice and theory.

To summarize this second aspect of disciplinary power, which we could call the panoptic character of disciplinary power, the absolute and constant visibility surrounding the bodies of individuals, I think we could say the following: the panoptic principle—seeing everything, everyone, all the time—organizes a genetic polarity of time; it proceeds towards a centralized individualization the support and instrument of which is writing; and finally, it involves a punitive and continuous action on potential behavior that, behind the body itself, projects something like a psyche.

Finally, the third characteristic distinguishing disciplinary power from the apparatus of sovereignty is that a disciplinary apparatus is isotopic or, at least, tends towards isotopy. This means a number of things.

First of all, every element in a disciplinary apparatus has its well defined place; it has its subordinate elements and its superordinate elements. Grades in the army, or again in the school, the clear distinction between classes of different age groups, between different ranks within age groups, all of this, which was established in the eighteenth century, is a superb example of this isotopy. To show how far this went, we should not forget that in classes that were disciplinarized according to the Jesuit model, and above all in the model of the school of the Brethren of the Common Life, the individual’s place in the class was determined by where he was ranked in his school results. So what was called the individual’s locus was both his place in the class and his rank in the hierarchy of values and success. This is a fine example of the isotopy of the disciplinary system.

Consequently, movement in this system cannot be produced through discontinuity, dispute, favor, etcetera; it cannot be produced as the result of a breach, as was the case for the power of sovereignty, but is produced by a regular movement of examination, competition, seniority, and suchlike.
But isotopic also means that there is no conflict or incompatibility between these different systems; different disciplinary apparatuses must be able to connect up with each other. Precisely because of this codification, this schematization, because of the formal properties of the disciplinary apparatus, it must always be possible to pass from one to the other. Thus, school classifications are projected, with some modification, but without too much difficulty, into the social-technical hierarchies of the adult world. The hierarchism in the disciplinary and military system takes up, while transforming them, the disciplinary hierarchies found in the civil system. In short, there is an almost absolute isotopy of these different systems.

Finally, in the disciplinary system, isotopic means above all that the principle of distribution and classification of all the elements necessarily entails something like a residue. That is to say, there is always something like "the unclassifiable." The wall one came up against in relations of sovereignty was the wall between the different systems of sovereignty; disputes and conflicts, the kind of permanent war between different systems, was the stumbling block for the system of sovereignty. Disciplinary systems, on the other hand, which classify, hierarchize, supervise, and so on, come up against those who cannot be classified, those who escape supervision, those who cannot enter the system of distribution, in short, the residual, the irreducible, the unclassifiable, the inassimilable. This will be the stumbling block in the physics of disciplinary power. That is to say, all disciplinary power has its margins. For example, the deserter did not exist prior to disciplined armies, for the deserter was quite simply the future soldier, someone who left the army so that he could rejoin it if necessary, when he wanted to, or when he was taken by force. However, as soon as you have a disciplined army, that is to say people who join the army, make a career of it, follow a certain track, and are supervised from end to end, then the deserter is someone who escapes this system and is irreducible to it.

In the same way, you see the appearance of something like the feebleminded or mentally defective when there is school discipline. The individual who cannot be reached by school discipline can only exist in relation to this discipline; someone who does not learn to read and write can only appear as a problem, as a limit, when the school adopts the disciplinary schema. In the same way, when does the category of
Delinquent appear? Delinquents are not law breakers. It is true that the correlate of every law is the existence of offenders who break the law, but the delinquents as an inassimilable, irreducible group can only appear when it is picked out in relation to a police discipline. As for the mentally ill, they are no doubt the residue of all residues, the residue of all the disciplines, those who are inassimilable to all of a society's educational, military, and police disciplines.

So the necessary existence of residues is, I think, a specific characteristic of this isotopy of disciplinary systems, and it will entail, of course, the appearance of supplementary disciplinary systems in order to retrieve these individuals, and so on to infinity. Since there are the feeble-minded, that is to say, individuals inaccessible to school discipline, schools for the feeble-minded will be created, and then schools for those who are inaccessible to schools for the feeble-minded. It is the same with respect to delinquents; in a way, the organization of the "underworld" was formed partly by the police and partly by the hard core themselves. The underworld is a way of making the delinquent collaborate in the work of the police. We can say that the underworld is the discipline of those who are inaccessible to police discipline.

In short, disciplinary power has this double property of being "anomizing," that is to say, always discarding certain individuals, bringing anomie, the irreducible, to light, and of always being normalizing, that is to say, inventing ever new recovery systems, always reestablishing the rule. What characterizes disciplinary systems is the never ending work of the norm in the anomic.

I think all this can be summarized by saying that the major effect of disciplinary power is what could be called the reorganization in depth of the relations between somatic singularity, the subject, and the individual. In the power of sovereignty, in that form of exercising power, I tried to show you how procedures of individualization take shape at the summit, that there was an underlying individualization on the side of the sovereign, with that game of multiple bodies that determines that individuality is lost at the very moment it appears. On the other hand, it seems to me that the individual function disappears at the summit of disciplinary systems, on the side of those who exercise this power and make these systems work.
A disciplinary system is made so that it works by itself, and the person who is in charge of it, or is its director, is not so much an individual as a function that is exercised by this and that person and that could equally be exercised by someone else, which is never the case in the individualization of sovereignty. Moreover, even the person in charge of a disciplinary system is caught up within a broader system in which he is supervised in turn, and at the heart of which he is himself subject to discipline. There is then, I think, an elimination of individualization at the top. On the other hand, the disciplinary system entails, and I think this is essential, a very strong underlying individualization at the base.

I tried to show you that the subject-function in the power of sovereignty is never fastened to a somatic singularity, except in incidental cases like the ceremony, branding, violence, and so on, but that most of the time, and outside of these rituals, the subject-function moves around above and below somatic singularities. In disciplinary power, on the other hand, the subject-function is fitted exactly on the somatic singularity: the subject function of disciplinary power is applied and brought to bear on the body, on its actions, place, movements, strength, the moments of its life, and its discourses, on all of this. Discipline is that technique of power by which the subject-function is exactly superimposed and fastened on the somatic singularity.

In a word, we can say that disciplinary power, and this is no doubt its fundamental property, fabricates subjected bodies; it pins the subject-function exactly to the body. It fabricates and distributes subjected bodies; it is individualizing [only in that] the individual is nothing other than the subjected body. And all this mechanics of discipline can be summarized by saying this: Disciplinary power is individualizing because it fastens the subject-function to the somatic singularity by means of a system of supervision-writing, or by a system of pangraphic panopticism, which behind the somatic singularity projects, as its extension or as its beginning, a core of virtualities, a psyche, and which further establishes the norm as the principle of division and normalization, as the universal prescription for all individuals constituted in this way.

There is a series in disciplinary power, therefore, that brings together the subject-function, somatic singularity, perpetual observation, writing, the mechanism of infinitesimal punishment, projection of the psyche,
and, finally, the division between normal and abnormal. All this constitutes the disciplinary individual and finally fits somatic singularity together with political power. What we may call the individual is not what political power latches on to; what we should call the individual is the effect produced on the somatic singularity, the result of this pinning, by the techniques of political power I have indicated. In no way am I saying that disciplinary power is the only procedure of individualization that has existed in our civilization, and I will try to come back to this next week, but I wanted to say that discipline is this terminal, capillary form of power that constitutes the individual as target, partner, and vis-à-vis in the relationship of power.

To that extent, and if what I have been saying is true, you can see that we cannot say that the individual pre-exists the subject-function, the projection of a psyche, or the normalizing agency. On the contrary, it is insofar as the somatic singularity became the bearer of the subject function through disciplinary mechanisms that the individual appeared within a political system. The individual was constituted insofar as uninterrupted supervision, continual writing, and potential punishment enframed this subjected body and extracted a psyche from it. It has been possible to distinguish the individual only insofar as the normalizing agency has distributed, excluded, and constantly taken up again this body-psyche.

There is no point then in wanting to dismantle hierarchies, constraints, and prohibitions so that the individual can appear, as if the individual was something existing beneath all relationships of power, preexisting relationships of power, and unduly weighed down by them. In fact, the individual is the result of something that is prior to it: this mechanism, these procedures, which pin political power on the body. It is because the body has been “subjectified,” that is to say, that the subject-function has been fixed on it, because it has been psychologized and normalized, it is because of all this that something like the individual appeared, about which one can speak, hold discourses, and attempt to found sciences.

The sciences of man, considered at any rate as sciences of the individual, are only the effect of this series of procedures. And it seems to me that you can see that it would be absolutely false historically, and so politically,
to appeal to the original rights of the individual against something like the subject, the norm, or psychology. Actually, right from the start, and in virtue of these mechanisms, the individual is a normal subject, a psychologically normal subject; and consequently desubjectification, denormalization, and depychologization necessarily entail the destruction of the individual as such. Deindividualization goes hand in hand with these three other operations I have mentioned.

I would like to add just one last word. We are used to seeing the emergence of the individual in European political thought and reality as the effect of a process of both the development of the capitalist economy and the demand for political power by the bourgeoisie. The philosophico-juridical theory of individuality, which develops, more or less, from Hobbes up to the French Revolution, would arise from this. However, although it is true that there is a way of thinking about the individual at this level, I think we should equally see the real constitution of the individual on the basis of a certain technology of power. Discipline seems to me to be this technology, specific to the power that is born and develops from the classical age, and which, on the basis of this game of bodies, isolates and cuts out what I think is an historically new element that we call the individual.

We could say, if you like, that there is a kind of juridico-disciplinary pincers of individualism. There is the juridical individual as he appears in these philosophical or juridical theories: the individual as abstract subject, defined by individual rights that no power can limit unless agreed by contract. And then, beneath this, alongside it, there was the development of a whole disciplinary technology that produced the individual as an historical reality, as an element of the productive forces, and as an element also of political forces. This individual is a subjected body held in a system of supervision and subjected to procedures of normalization.

The function of the discourse of the human sciences is precisely to twin, to couple this juridical individual and disciplinary individual, to make us believe that the real, natural, and concrete content of the juridical
individual is the disciplinary individual cut out and constituted by political technology. Scratch the juridical individual, say the (psychological, sociological, and other) human sciences, and you will find a particular kind of man; and what in actual fact they give as man is the disciplinary individual. Conjointly, there is the humanist discourse that is the converse of the discourse of the human sciences, taking the opposite direction, and which says: the disciplinary individual is an alienated, enslaved individual, he is not an authentic individual; scratch him, or rather, restore to him the fullness of his rights, and you will find, as his original, living, and perennial form, the philosophico-juridical individual. This game between the juridical individual and the disciplinary individual underlies, I believe, both the discourse of the human sciences and humanist discourse.

What I call Man, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is nothing other than the kind of after image of this oscillation between the juridical individual, which really was the instrument by which, in its discourse, the bourgeoisie claimed power, and the disciplinary individual, which is the result of the technology employed by this same bourgeoisie to constitute the individual in the field of productive and political forces. From this oscillation between the juridical individual—ideological instrument of the demand for power—and the disciplinary individual—real instrument of the physical exercise of power—from this oscillation between the power claimed and the power exercised, were born the illusion and the reality of what we call Man.
1. In reality, two forms of the criticism of the asylum institution should be distinguished:
(a) In the thirties a critical current emerged tending towards a progressive distancing from the asylum space instituted by the 1838 law as the almost exclusive site of psychiatric intervention and the role of which was reduced, as Edouard Toulouse (1865-1947) said, to that of a "supervised assistance" ("L'Evolution de la psychiatrie" Commemoration of the foundation of the Henri Roussel hospital, 30 July 1937, p. 4). Wanting to dissociate the notion of "mental illness" from that of confinement in an asylum subject to particular legal and administrative conditions, this current under took "to study by what changes in the organization of asylums a wider role could be given to moral and individual treatment" (J. Raynier and H. Beaudouin, L'Aliéné et les Asiles d'aliénés au point de vue administratif et juridique [Paris: Le Français, (1922) 1930, 2nd revised and enlarged edition]). In this perspective the traditional hospital centered approach was undermined by new approaches: diversification of ways of taking into care, projects for post cure supervision, and, especially, the appearance of free services illustrated by the installation, at the heart of the fortress of asylum psychiatry at Sainte Anne, of an "open service" the management of which was entrusted to Edouard Toulouse and which became the Henri Roussel hospital in 1926 (see, E. Toulouse, "L'hôpital Henri Roussel" in La Prophylaxie mentale, no. 43, January July 1937, pp. 1-69). This movement became official on 13 October 1937 with the circular of the Minister of Public Health, Marc Rucart, concerning the organization of services for the mentally ill within the departmental framework. On this point see, E. Toulouse, Réorganisation de l'hospitalisation des aliénés dans les asiles de la Seine (Paris: Imprimerie Nouvelle, 1920); J. Raynier and J. Lauzier, La Construction et l'Aménagement de l'hôpital psychiatrique et des asiles d'aliénés (Paris: Pyronnet, 1935); and G. Daumezon, La Situation du personnel infirmier dans les asiles d'aliénés (Paris: Doin, 1935) an account of the lack of means available to psychiatric institutions in the nineteen thirties.

(b) In the forties criticism took another direction, initiated by the communication of Paul Belvet, at that time director of the hospital of Saint Alban (Lozère) which became a reference point for all those driven by the desire for a radical change of asylum structures: "Asile et hôpital psychiatrique. L'expérience d'un établissement rural" in XLIII congrès des Médecins aliénistes et neurologistes de France et des pays de langue française. Montpellier, 28-30 octobre 1942 (Paris: Masson, 1942). At this time a small militant fraction of the professional body became aware that the psychiatric hospital is not only a hospital for the insane (aliénés), but that it is itself "alienated (aliéné)," since it is constituted "into an order that conforms to the principles and practice of a social order that excludes what disturbs it." See, L. Bonnafé, "Sources du désaliénisme" in Désaliénier? Folie(s) et société(s) (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mraill/Privat, 1991) p. 221. Proposing to reexamine how the psychiatric hospital works in order to turn it into a genuinely therapeutic organization, this current began to question the nature of the psychiatrist's relationships with patients. See G. Daumezon and L. Bonnafé, "Perspectives de réforme psychiatrique en France depuis la Libération" in XLIV congrès des Médecins aliénistes et neurologistes de France et des pays de langue française. Genève, 22-27 juillet 1946 (Paris: Masson, 1946) pp. 584-590. See also below, "Course context" pp. 355-360.
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Elements for a history of disciplinary apparatuses: religious communities in the Middle Ages; pedagogical colonization of youth; the Jesuit missions to Paraguay; the army; workshops; workers’ cities. The formalization of these apparatuses in Jeremy Bentham’s model of the Panopticon. The family institution and emergence of the Psy-function.

I WILL BEGIN WITH some remarks on the history of these disciplinary apparatuses (dispositifs). Last week tried to describe them rather abstractly, without any diachronic dimension and apart from any system of causes that may have led to their establishment and generalization. What I described is a sort of apparatus (appareil) or machinery, the major forms of which are clearly apparent in the seventeenth century, let’s say especially in the eighteenth century. Actually, the disciplinary apparatuses (dispositifs) were not formed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, far from it, and they certainly did not replace overnight those apparatuses of sovereignty with which I tried to compare them. Disciplinary apparatuses come from far back; for a long time they were anchored and functioned in the midst of apparatuses of sovereignty; they were formed like islands where a type of power was exercised which was very different from what could be called the period’s general morphology of sovereignty.

Where did these disciplinary apparatuses exist? It is not difficult to find them and follow their history. They are found basically in religious
communities, either regular communities, by which I mean statutory communities, recognized by the Church, or spontaneous communities. Now what I think is important is that throughout the Middle Ages, up to and including the sixteenth century, the disciplinary apparatuses we see in religious communities basically played a double role.

These disciplinary apparatuses were, of course, integrated within the general schema of feudal and monarchical sovereignty, and it is true that they functioned positively within this more general apparatus that enframed them, supported them, and at any rate absolutely tolerated them. But they also played a critical role of opposition and innovation. Very schematically, I think we can say that not only religious orders in the Church, but also religious practices, hierarchies, and ideology are transformed through the elaboration or reactivation of disciplinary apparatuses. I will take just one example.

The kind of reform, or rather series of reforms, that took place within the Benedictine order in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, basically represents an attempt to extract religious practice, or to extract the entire order, from the system of feudal sovereignty within which it was held and embedded. Broadly speaking, we can say that the Cluniac form of monasticism had at that time been surrounded or even invaded by the feudal system, and the Cluny order, in its existence, economy, and internal hierarchies, was entirely an apparatus of sovereignty. In what did the Citeaux reform consist? The Cistercian reform restored a certain discipline to the order by reconstituting a disciplinary apparatus which was seen as referring back to a more original and forgotten rule; a disciplinary system in which we find the rule of poverty, the obligation of manual labor and the full use of time, the disappearance of personal possessions and extravagant expenditure, the regulation of eating and clothing, the rule of internal obedience, and the tightening up of the hierarchy. In short, you see all the characteristics of the disciplinary system appearing here as an effort to disengage the monastic order from the apparatus of sovereignty that had permeated it and eaten into it. Furthermore, it was precisely as a result of this reform, as a result of the rule of poverty, the hierarchical systems, the rules of obedience and work, and also the whole system of assessment and accounting linked to disciplinary practice, that the Citeaux order was able to make a number of economic innovations.
It could be said that in the Middle Ages disciplinary systems played a critical and innovative role not only in the economic, but also in the political realm. For example, the new political powers trying to emerge through feudalism and on the basis of apparatuses of sovereignty, the new centralized powers of the monarchy on the one hand and the papacy on the other, try to provide themselves with instruments that are new with regard to the mechanisms of sovereignty, instruments of a disciplinary kind. In this way, the Dominican order, for example, with its discipline that is completely new with regard to the other regular monastic orders,¹ and the Benedictine order, were instruments in the hands of the papacy, and of the French monarchy, for breaking up certain elements of the feudal system, certain apparatuses of sovereignty, which existed, for example, in the Midi, in Occitanie, and elsewhere.⁵ Later, in the sixteenth century, the Jesuits were used in the same way, as an instrument for breaking up certain residues of feudal society.⁶ So, there was both economic and political innovation.

We can also say that these disciplinary investigations, these kinds of disciplinary islands we see emerging in medieval society, also made social innovations possible; at any rate, they made possible certain forms of social opposition to the hierarchies, to the system of differentiation of the apparatuses of sovereignty. In the Middle Ages, and much more on the eve of the Reformation, we see the constitution of relatively egalitarian communal groups which are not governed by the apparatus of sovereignty but by the apparatus of discipline: a single rule imposed on everyone in the same way, there being no differences between those on whom it is applied other than those indicated by the internal hierarchy of the apparatus. Thus, very early on you see the appearance of phenomena like the mendicant monks, who already represent a kind of social opposition through a new disciplinary schema.⁷ You also see religious communities constituted by the laity, like the Brethren of the Common Life, who appear in Holland in the fourteenth century;⁸ and then, finally, all the working class or bourgeois communities that immediately preceded the Reformation and which, in new forms, continue up to the seventeenth century, in England for example, with their well-known political and social role; and equally in the eighteenth century. We could also say that freemasonry was able to function in eighteenth
century French and European society as a sort of disciplinary innovation intended to work on the networks of systems of sovereignty from within, short circuit them, and, to a certain extent, break them up.

Very schematically, all of this amounts to saying that for a long time disciplinary apparatuses existed like islands in the general plasma of relations of sovereignty. Throughout the Middle Ages, in the sixteenth century, and still in the eighteenth century, these disciplinary systems remained marginal, whatever the uses to which they may have been put or the general effects they may have entailed. They remained on the side, but nevertheless it was through them that a series of innovations were sketched out which will gradually spread over the whole of society. And it is precisely in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, through a sort of progressive extension, a sort of general parasitic interference with society, that we see the constitution of what we could call, but very roughly and schematically, a “disciplinary society” replacing a society of sovereignty.

How did this extension of disciplinary apparatuses take place? In what stages? And, finally, what mechanism served as their support? I think we can say, again very schematically, that from the sixteenth to the seventeenth centuries, the historical extension, the overall parasitic invasion carried out by disciplinary apparatuses had a number of points of support.

First, there was a parasitic invasion of young students who, until the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, had maintained their autonomy, their rules of movement and vagabondage, their unruliness, and also their links with popular unrest. Whether this was in the form of the Italian or the French system, whether in the form of a community of students and teachers together, or of an autonomous community of students distinct from that of the teachers, is not important; there was anyway, within the general system of social functioning, a sort of group in movement, coming and going in a kind of emulsive state, a state of unrest. The disciplinarianization of this student youth, this colonizing of youth, was one of the first points of application and extension of the disciplinary system.

What is interesting is that the point of departure for the colonizing of this unruly and mobile youth by the disciplinary system was the
community of the Brethren of the Common Life, that is to say, a religious community whose objective, whose ascetic ideal, was very clear, since its founder, someone called Groote, was closely linked to Ruysbroek the Admirable, and therefore well-informed about the fourteenth century movement of German and Rhenish mysticism. We find the mould, the first model of the pedagogical colonization of youth, in this practice of the individual’s exercise on himself, this attempt to transform the individual, this search for a progressive development of the individual up to the point of salvation, in this ascetic work of the individual on himself for his own salvation. On the basis of this, and in the collective form of this asceticism in the Brethren of the Common Life, we see the great schemas of pedagogy taking shape, that is to say, the idea that one can only learn things by passing through a number of obligatory and necessary stages, that these stages follow each other in time, and, in the same movement that distributes them in time, each stage represents progress. The twinning of time and progress is typical of ascetic exercise, and it will be equally typical of pedagogical practice.

As a result, in the schools founded by the Brethren of the Common Life, first at Deventer, then at Liège and Strasbourg, for the first time there are divisions according to age and level, with programs of progressive exercises. Second, something very new appears in this new pedagogy with regard to the rule of life for young people in the Middle Ages, that is to say, the rule of seclusion. Pedagogical exercise, just like ascetic exercise, will have to take place within a closed space, in an environment closed in on itself and with minimal relations with the outside world. Ascetic exercise required a special place; in the same way, pedagogical exercise will now demand its own place. Here again, what is new and essential is that the mixing and intrication of the university and the surrounding milieu, and in particular the link between university youth and the popular classes, which was so fundamental throughout the Middle Ages, will be severed by the transfer of this ascetic principle of cloistered life to pedagogy.

Third, one of the principles of ascetic exercise is that although it is an exercise of the individual on himself, it always takes place under the constant direction of someone who is the guide or the protector, at any rate, someone who takes responsibility for the steps of the person
setting out on his own ascetic path. Ascetic progress requires a constant guide who keeps his eye on the progress, or setbacks and faults, of the person beginning the exercise. In the same way, and once again this is a complete innovation with regard to the university pedagogy of the Middle Ages, there is the idea that the teacher must follow the individual throughout his career, or, at least, that he must lead him from one stage to the other before passing him on to another, more learned guide, someone more advanced, who will be able to take the student further. The ascetic guide becomes the class teacher to whom the student is attached either for a course of studies, or for a year, or possibly for the whole of his school life.

Finally, and I am not at all sure if the model for this is an ascetic one, but in any case, in the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life we find a very strange paramilitary type of organization. It is quite possible that this schema has a monastic origin. In fact, in monasteries, especially those of the ancient period, we find divisions into “decuries,” each comprising ten individuals under the direction of someone who is responsible for them, and which are, at the same time, groupings for work, for meditation, and also for intellectual and spiritual training. This schema, clearly inspired by the Roman army, may have been transposed into the monastic life of the first Christian centuries; in any case, we find it again in the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life that follow a rhythm based on this military schema of the decury. Maybe the organization of bourgeois militias in Flanders could have relayed this model in some way. Anyway, there is this very interesting schema, both monastic and military, which will be an instrument of the colonization of youth within pedagogical forms.

I think we can see all this as one of the first moments of the colonization of an entire society by means of disciplinary apparatuses.

We find another application of these disciplinary apparatuses in a different type of colonization; no longer that of youth, but quite simply of colonized peoples. And there is quite a strange history here. How disciplinary schemas were both applied and refined in the colonial
populations should be examined in some detail. It seems that discipli-
narization took place fairly unobtrusively and marginally to start with,
and, interestingly, as a counterpoint to slavery.

In fact, it was the Jesuits in South America who opposed slavery for
theological and religious reasons, as well as for economic reasons, and who
countered the use of this probably immediate, brutal and, in terms of the
consumption of human lives, extremely costly and poorly organized prac-
tice of slavery, with a different type of distribution, control and [...] exploitation by a disciplinary system. The famous, so-called “communist”
Guarani republics in Paraguay were really disciplinary microcosms in
which there was a hierarchical system to which the Jesuits held the keys;
Guarani individuals and communities received an absolutely statutory
schema of behavior indicating their working hours, mealtimes, time
allowed for rest, and the fixed time when they were woken up to make love
and produce children. It therefore involved the full employment of time.

Permanent supervision: everyone had their own dwelling in the vil-
lages of these Guarani republics, however, there was a sort of walkway
alongside these dwellings from which it was possible to look through
the windows, which naturally had no shutters, so that what anyone was
done during the night could be supervised at any time. Above all, there
was also a kind of individualization, at least at the level of the family
micro-cell, since each one received a dwelling, which broke up the old
Guarani community moreover, and it was precisely on this dwelling that
the supervising eye was focused.

In short, it was a kind of permanent penal system, which was very
lenient in comparison with the European penal system at the same
time—that is to say, there was no death penalty, public execution or
torture—but which was an absolutely permanent system of punishment
that followed the individual throughout his life and which, at every
moment, in each of his actions or his attitudes, was liable to pick out
something indicating a bad tendency or inclination, and that conse-
quently entailed a punishment which, on the one hand, could be lighter
because it was constant, and, on the other, was only ever brought to bear
on potential actions or the beginnings of action.

* (Recording:) human
The third type of colonization you see taking shape, after that of student youth and colonized peoples, was the internal colonization and confinement of vagrants, beggars, nomads, delinquents, prostitutes, etcetera, in the classical age. I will not return to this, because it has been studied a thousand times. Disciplinary apparatuses are installed in more or less all of these cases, and we can see quite clearly that they derive directly from religious institutions. In a way, it was religious institutions, like the "Brethren of the Christian Doctrine," then followed by the big teaching orders, like the Jesuits, which extended, by pseudopodia as it were, their own discipline over young people able to attend school.12

It was also the religious orders, in this case the Jesuits again, who transposed and transformed their own discipline in colonial countries. As for the system of confinement and the methods for colonizing vagrants and nomads, etcetera, the forms were again very close to those of religion, since in most cases it was the religious orders who had, if not the initiative for creating, at least the responsibility for managing these establishments. It is therefore the external version of religious disciplines that we see being progressively applied in ever less marginal and ever more central sectors of the social system.

Then, at the end of the seventeenth century, and during the eighteenth century, disciplinary apparatuses appear and are established which no longer have a religious basis, which are the transformation of this, but out in the open as it were, without any regular support from the religious side. You see the appearance of disciplinary systems. There is, of course, the army, with quartering to start with, which dates from the second half of the eighteenth century, the struggle against deserters, that is to say, the use of files and all the techniques of individual identification to prevent people from leaving the army as they entered it, and, finally, in the second half of the eighteenth century, physical exercises and the full use of time.13

After the army, it was quite simply the working class that began to receive disciplinary apparatuses. With the appearance of the big workshops in the eighteenth century, of the mining towns or big centers of metallurgy, to which a rural population had to be transported and was employed for the first time using completely new techniques, with the
metallurgy of the Loire basin and the coalmines of the Massif Central
c and northern France, you see the appearance of disciplinary forms
imposed on workers, with the first workers' cities, like that of Creusot.
Then, in the same period, the great instrument of worker discipline, the
employment document, the *livret*, is imposed on every worker. No
worker can or has the right to move without a *livret* recording the name
of his previous employer and the conditions under which and reasons
why he left him; when he wants a new job or wants to live in a new
town, he has to present his *livret* to his new boss and the municipality,
the local authorities; it is the token, as it were, of all the disciplinary
systems that bear down on him.  

So, once again very schematically, these isolated, local, marginal
disciplinary systems, which took shape in the Middle Ages, begin to
cover all society through a sort of process that we could call external and
internal colonization, in which you find again all the elements of the dis
ciplinary systems I have been talking about. That is to say: fixing in
space, optimum extraction of time, application and exploitation of the
body's forces through the regulation of actions, postures and attention,
constitution of constant supervision and an immediate punitive power,
and, finally, organization of a regulatory power which is anonymous and
non-individual in its operations, but which always ends up with an
identification of subjected individualities. Broadly speaking, the singu
lar body is taken charge of by a power that trains it and constitutes it as
an individual, that is to say, as a subjected body. Very schematically, this
is what we can say regarding the history of disciplinary apparatuses. To
what does this history correspond? What is there behind this kind of
extension that is easily identified on the surface of events and institutions?

My impression is that the question behind this general deployment
of disciplinary apparatuses involved what could be called the accumula-
tion of men. That is to say, alongside and, what's more, necessary for the
accumulation of capital, there was an accumulation of men, or, if you
like, a distribution of the labor force with all its somatic singularities. In
what do the accumulation of men and the rational distribution of
somatic singularities with the forces they carry consist?

First, they consist in bringing about the maximum possible use of
individuals. They make all of them usable, not so that they can all be
used in fact, but, precisely, so that they do not all have to be used; extending the labor market to the maximum in order to make certain of an unemployed reserve enabling wages to be lowered. As a result, making everyone usable.

Second, making individuals usable in their very multiplicity; ensuring that the force produced by the multiplicity of these individual forces of labor is at least equal to and, as far as possible, greater than the addition of these individual forces. How to distribute individuals so that as a group they are more than the pure and simple addition of these individuals set alongside each other?

Finally, to make possible the accumulation not only of these forces, but equally of time: the time of work, of apprenticeship, of improvement, of the acquisition of knowledge and aptitudes. This is the third aspect of the problem posed by the accumulation of men.

This triple function, this triple aspect of the techniques of the accumulation of men and of the forces of work, is, I think, the reason why the different disciplinary apparatuses were deployed, tried out, developed, and refined. The extension, movement, and migration of the disciplines from their lateral function to the central and general function they exercise from the eighteenth century are linked to this accumulation of men and to the role of the accumulation of men in capitalist society.

Considering things from a different angle, looking at it from the side of the history of the sciences, we could say that seventeenth and eighteenth century classical science responded to the empirical multiplicities of plants, animals, objects, values, and languages, with an operation of classification, with a taxonomic activity, which was, I think, the general form of these empirical forms of knowledge throughout the classical age. On the other hand, with the development of the capitalist economy, and so when the problem of the accumulation of men arose alongside and linked with the accumulation of capital, it became clear that a purely taxonomic and simple classificatory activity was no longer valid. To respond to these economic necessities men had to be distributed according to completely different techniques than those of classification. Rather than use taxonomic schemas to fit individuals into species and genus, something other than a taxonomy had to be used that I will call a tactic, although this also involved questions of distribution. Discipline
is a tactic, that is to say, a certain way of distributing singularities according to a non-classificatory schema, a way of distributing them spatially, of making possible the most effective temporal accumulations at the level of productive activity.

Okay, again very schematically, I think we could say that what gave birth to the sciences of man was precisely the irruption, the presence, or the insistence of these tactical problems posed by the need to distribute the forces of work in terms of the needs of the economy that was then developing. Distributing men in terms of these needs no longer entailed taxonomy, but a tactic, and the name of this tactic is "discipline." The disciplines are techniques for the distribution of bodies, individuals, time, and forces of work. It was these disciplines, with precisely these tactics with the temporal vector they entail, which burst into Western knowledge in the course of the eighteenth century, and which relegated the old taxonomies, the old models for the empirical sciences, to the field of an outmoded and perhaps even entirely or partially abandoned knowledge. Tactics, and with it man, the problem of the body, the problem of time, etcetera, replaced taxonomy.

We come here to the point at which I would like to go back to our question, that is to say, to the problem of asylum discipline as constitutive of the general form of psychiatric power. I have tried to show [that—and to show] how—what appeared openly, as it were, in the naked state, in psychiatric practice at the start of the nineteenth century, was a power with the general form of what I have called discipline.

In actual fact, there was an extremely clear and quite remarkable formalization of this microphysics of disciplinary power. It is found quite simply in Bentham's Panopticon. What is the Panopticon?16

It is usually said that in 1787 Bentham invented the model of a prison, and that this was reproduced, with a number of modifications, in some European prisons: Pentonville in England,17 and, in a modified form, Petite Roquette in France,18 and elsewhere. In fact, Bentham's Panopticon is not a model of a prison, or it is not only a model of a prison; it is a model, and Bentham is quite clear about this, for a prison,
but also for a hospital, for a school, workshop, orphanage, and so on. I was going to say it is a form for any institution; let’s just say that it is a form for a series of institutions. And again, when I say it is a schema for a series of possible institutions, I think I am still not exactly right.

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. The Panopticon is a multiplier; it is an intensifier of power within a series of institutions. It involves giving the greatest intensity, the best distribution, and the most accurate focus to the force of power. Basically these are the three objectives of the Panopticon, and Bentham says so: “Its great excellence consists, in the great strength it is capable of giving to any institution it may be thought proper to apply it to.” In another passage he says that what is marvelous about the Panopticon is that it “gives a herculean strength to those who direct the institution.” It “gives a herculean strength” to the power circulating in the institution, and to the individual who holds or directs this power. Bentham also says that what is marvelous about the Panopticon is that it constitutes a “new mode of obtaining power, of mind over mind.” It seems to me that these two propositions—constituting a Herculean strength and giving the mind power over the mind—are exactly typical of the Panopticon mechanism and, if you like, of the general disciplinary form. “Herculean strength,” that is to say, a physical force which, in a sense, bears on the body, but which is such that this force, which hems in and weighs down on the body, is basically never employed and takes on a sort of immateriality so that the process passes from mind to mind, although in actual fact it really is the body that is at stake in the Panopticon system. This interplay between “Herculean strength” and the pure ideality of mind is, I think, what Bentham was looking for in the Panopticon. How did he bring it about?

There is a circular building, the periphery of the Panopticon, within which cells are set, opening both onto the inner side of the ring through an iron grate door and onto the outside through a window. Around the inner circumference of this ring is a gallery, allowing one to walk around the building, passing each cell. Then there is an empty space and, at its
center, a tower, a kind of cylindrical construction of several levels at the
top of which is a sort of lantern, that is to say, a large open room, which
is such that from this central site one can observe everything happening
in each cell, just by turning around. This is the schema.

What is the meaning of this schema? Why did it strike minds and
why was it seen for so long, wrongly in my view, as a typical example of
eighteenth century utopias? First, one and only one individual will be
placed in each cell. That is to say, in this system, which can be applied to
a hospital, a prison, a workshop, a school, and so on, a single person will
be placed in each of these boxes; each body will have its place. So there
is pinning down in space, and the inspector’s gaze will encounter a body
in whatever direction taken by his line of sight. So, the individualizing
function of the coordinates are very clear.

This means that in a system like this we are never dealing with a
mass, with a group, or even, to tell the truth, with a multiplicity: we are
only ever dealing with individuals. Even if a collective order is given
through a megaphone, addressed to everyone at the same time and
obeyed by everyone at the same time, the fact remains that this collec-
tive order is only ever addressed to individuals and is only ever received
by individuals placed alongside each other. All collective phenomena,
all the phenomena of multiplicities, are thus completely abolished. And,
as Bentham says with satisfaction, in schools there will no longer be the
“cribbing” that is the beginning of immorality; in workshops there will
be no more collective distraction, songs, or strikes; in prisons, no more
collusion; and in asylums for the mentally ill, no more of those
phenomena of collective irritation and imitation, etcetera.

You can see how the whole network of group communication, all
those collective phenomena, which are perceived in a sort of interdepen-
dent schema as being as much medical contagion as the moral diffusion
of evil, will be brought to an end by the panoptic system. One will be
dealing with a power which is a comprehensive power over everyone, but
which will only ever be directed at series of separate individuals. Power
is collective at its center, but it is always individual at the point where it
arrives. You can see how we have here the phenomenon of individual-
ization I was talking about last week. Discipline individualizes below; it
individualizes those on whom it is brought to bear.
As for the central cell, this kind of lantern, I told you that it was entirely glazed; in fact Bentham stresses that it should not be glazed or, if it is, one should install a system of blinds, which can be raised and lowered, and the room be fitted with intersecting, mobile partitions. This is so that surveillance can be exercised in such a way that those who are being supervised cannot tell whether or not they are being supervised; that is to say, they must not be able to see if there is anyone in the central cell. So, on the one hand, the windows of the central cell must be shuttered or darkened, and there must be no backlighting which would enable prisoners to see through this column and see whether or not there is anyone in the central lantern; hence the system of blinds and the internal partitions that can be moved as desired.

So, as you can see, it will be possible for power to be entirely anonymous, as I was saying last week. The director has no body, for the true effect of the Panopticon is to be such that, even when no one is there, the individual in his cell must not only think that he is being observed, but know that he is; he must constantly experience himself as visible for a gaze, the real presence or absence of which hardly matters. Power is thereby completely de-individualized. If necessary, the central lantern could be completely empty and power would be exercised just the same.

There is a de-individualization and disembodiment of power, which no longer has a body or individuality, and which can be anyone whomsoever. Furthermore, one of the essential points of the Panopticon is that within the central tower, not only may anyone be there—surveillance may be exercised by the director, but also by his wife, his children, or his servants, etcetera—but an underground passage from outside to the center allows anyone to enter the central tower if they wish and to carry out supervision. This means that any citizen whomsoever must be able to supervise what is going on in the hospital, school, workshop, or prison: supervising what is going on, supervising to check that everything is in order, and supervising to check that the director is carrying out his functions properly, supervising the supervisor who supervises.

There is a sort of ribbon of power, a continuous, mobile, and anonymous ribbon, which perpetually unwinds within the central tower. Whether it has or does not have a figure, whether or not it has a name, whether or not it is individualized, this anonymous ribbon of power perpetually
unwinds anyway and is exercised through this game of invisibility. What's more, this is what Bentham calls "democracy," since anyone can occupy the place of power and power is not the property of anyone since everyone can enter the tower and supervise the way in which power is exercised, so that power is constantly subject to control. Finally, power is as visible in its invisible center as those who occupy the cells; and, due to this, power supervised by anyone really is the democratization of the exercise of power.

Another feature of the Panopticon is that, to make the interior of the cells visible, on the side facing inwards there is, of course, a door with a window, but there is also a window on the outer side, indispensable for producing an effect of transparency and so that the gaze of the person in the central tower can pass through all the cells from one side to the other, seeing against the light everything the person—student, patient, worker, prisoner, or whomsoever—is doing in the cell. So the condition of permanent visibility is absolutely constitutive of the individual's situation in the Panopticon. You can see that the relationship of power really does have that immateriality I was just talking about, for power is exercised simply by this play of light; it is exercised by the glance from center to periphery, which can, at every moment, observe, judge, record, and punish at the first gesture, the first attitude, the first distraction. This power needs no instrument; its sole support is sight and light.

Panopticon means two things. It means that everything is seen all the time, but it also means that the power exercised is only ever an optical effect. The power is without materiality; it has no need of all that symbolic and real armature of sovereign power; it does not need to hold the scepter in its hand or wield the sword to punish; it does not need to intervene like a bolt of lightning in the manner of the sovereign. This power belongs rather to the realm of the sun, of never ending light; it is the non-material illumination that falls equally on all those on whom it is exercised.

Finally, the last feature of this Panopticon is that this immaterial power exercised in constant light is linked to an endless extraction of knowledge. That is to say, the center of power is, at the same time, the center of uninterrupted assessment, of the transcription of individual behavior. The codification and assessment of everything individuals are
doing in their cells; the accumulation of knowledge and the constitution of sequences and series that will characterize these individuals; and a written, centralized individuality constituted in terms of a general network, forms the documentary double, the written ectoplasm, of the body's placement in its cell.

The first effect of this relationship of power is therefore the constitution of this permanent knowledge of the individual—pinned in a given space and followed by a potentially continuous gaze—which defines the temporal curve of his development, his cure, his acquisition of knowledge, or the acknowledgement of his error, and so forth. As you can see, the Panopticon is therefore an apparatus of both individualization and knowledge; it is an apparatus of both knowledge and power that individualizes on one side, and which, by individualizing, knows. Hence Bentham's idea of using it as an instrument for what he called "discovery in metaphysics." He thought that the panoptic apparatus could be used to conduct metaphysical experiments on children. Imagine taking foundlings, he said, right from birth, and putting them in a panoptic system, even before they have begun to talk or be aware of anything. In this way, Bentham says, we could follow "the genealogy of each observable idea" and, as a result, repeat experimentally what Condillac deduced without any equipment for metaphysical experimentation. As well as verifying Condillac's genetic conception, we could also verify the technological ideal of Helvétius when he said, "anyone can be taught anything." Is this fundamental proposition for the possible transformation of humanity true or false? An experiment with a panoptic system would suffice to find out; different things could be taught to different children in different cells; we could teach no matter what to no matter which child, and we would see the result. In this way we could raise children in completely different systems, or even systems incompatible with each other; some would be taught the Newtonian system, and then others would be got to believe that the moon is made of cheese. When they were eighteen or twenty, they would be put together to discuss the question. We could also teach two different sorts of mathematics to children, one in which two plus two make four and another in which they don't make four; and then we would wait again until their twentieth year when they would be put together for discussions. And,
Bentham says, clearly having a bit of fun, this would be more worthwhile than paying people to give sermons, lectures, or arguments; we could have a direct experiment. Finally, of course, he says it would be necessary to conduct an experiment on boys and girls in which they are put together until they reach adolescence to see what happens. You see that this is the same story as *La Dispute* by Marivaux: a kind of panoptic drama that we find again, basically, in the piece by Marivaux.  

At any rate, you can see that the Panopticon is the formal schema for the constitution of an individualizing power and for knowledge about individuals. I think that the principal mechanisms of the panoptic schema, which we find at work in Bentham’s *Panopticon*, are found again in most of the institutions which, as schools, barracks, hospitals, prisons, reformatories, etcetera, are sites both for the exercise of power and for the formation of a certain knowledge about man. It seems to me that the panoptic mechanism provides the common thread to what could be called the power exercised on man as a force of work and knowledge of man as an individual. So that panopticism could, I think, appear and function within our society as a general form; we could speak equally of a disciplinary society or of a panoptic society. We live within generalized panopticism by virtue of the fact that we live within a disciplinary system.

You will say that this is all very well, but can we really say that disciplinary apparatuses have extended over the whole of society, and that the mechanisms, apparatuses and powers of sovereignty have been eliminated by disciplinary mechanisms?

Just as the disciplinary type of power existed in medieval societies, in which schemas of sovereignty were nevertheless prevalent, so too, I think, forms of the power of sovereignty can still be found in contemporary society. Where do we find them? Well, I would find them in the only institution in the traditional dynasty of schools, barracks, prisons and so forth, that I have not yet spoken about, and the absence of which may have surprised you; I mean the family. I was going to say that the family is a remnant, but this is not entirely the case. At any rate, it seems to me that the family is a sort of cell within which the power exercised is not, as one usually says, disciplinary, but rather of the same type as the power of sovereignty.
I do not think it is true that the family served as the model for the asylum, school, barracks, or workshop. Actually, it seems to me that nothing in the way the family functions enables us to see any continuity between the family and the institutions, the disciplinary apparatuses, I am talking about. Instead, what do we see in the family if not a function of maximum individualization on the side of the person who exercises power, that is to say, on the father's side? The anonymity of power, the ribbon of undifferentiated power which unwinds indefinitely in a panoptic system, is utterly foreign to the constitution of the family in which the father, as bearer of the name, and insofar as he exercises power in his name, is the most intense pole of individualization, much more intense than the wife or children. So, in the family you have individualization at the top, which recalls and is of the very same type as the power of sovereignty, the complete opposite of disciplinary power.

Second, in the family there is constant reference to a type of bond, of commitment, and of dependence established once and for all in the form of marriage or birth. And it is this reference to the earlier act, to the status conferred once and for all, which gives the family its solidity; mechanisms of supervision are only grafted on to it, and membership of the family continues to hold even when these mechanisms do not function. Supervision is not constitutive of but supplementary to the family, whereas permanent supervision is absolutely constitutive of disciplinary systems.

Finally, in the family there is all that entanglement of what could be called heterotopic relationships: an entanglement of local, contractual bonds, bonds of property, and of personal and collective commitments, which recalls the power of sovereignty rather than the monotony and isotopy of disciplinary systems. So that, for my part, I would put the functioning and microphysics of the family completely on the side of the power of sovereignty, and not at all on that of disciplinary power. To my mind this does not mean that the family is the residue, the anachronistic or, at any rate, historical residue of a system in which society was completely penetrated by the apparatuses of sovereignty. It seems to me that the family is not a residue, a vestige of sovereignty, but rather an essential component, and an increasingly essential component, of the disciplinary system.
Inasmuch as the family conforms to the non-disciplinary schema of an apparatus (dispositif) of sovereignty, I think we could say that it is the hinge, the interlocking point, which is absolutely indispensable to the very functioning of all the disciplinary systems. I mean that the family is the instance of constraint that will permanently fix individuals to their disciplinary apparatuses (appareils), which will inject them, so to speak, into the disciplinary apparatuses (appareils). It is because there is the family, it is because you have this system of sovereignty operating in society in the form of the family, that the obligation to attend school works and children, individuals, these somatic singularities, are fixed and finally individualized within the school system. Does obligatory school attendance require the continued functioning of this sovereignty, the sovereignty of the family? Look at how, historically, the obligation of military service was imposed on people who clearly had no reason to want to do their military service: it is solely because the State put pressure on the family as a small community of father, mother, brothers and sisters, etcetera, that the obligation of military service had real constraining force and individuals could be plugged into this disciplinary system and taken into its possession. What meaning would the obligation to work have if individuals were not first of all held within the family's system of sovereignty, within this system of commitments and obligations, which means that things like help to other members of the family and the obligation to provide them with food are taken for granted? Fixation on the disciplinary system of work is only achieved insofar as the sovereignty of the family plays a full role. The first role of the family with regard to disciplinary apparatuses (appareils), therefore, is this kind of pinning of individuals to the disciplinary apparatus (appareil).

I think it also has another function, which is that it is the zero point, as it were, where the different disciplinary systems hitch up with each other. It is the switch point, the junction ensuring passage from one disciplinary system to another, from one apparatus (dispositif) to another. The best proof of this is that when an individual is rejected as abnormal from a disciplinary system, where is he sent? To his family. When a number of disciplinary systems successively reject him as inassimilable, incapable of being disciplined, or uneducable, he is sent back to the
family, and the family’s role at this point is to reject him in turn as incapable of being fixed to any disciplinary system, and to get rid of him either by consigning him to pathology, or by abandoning him to delinquency, etcetera. It is the sensitive element that makes it possible to determine those individuals inassimilable to any system of discipline, those who cannot pass from one system to the other and must finally be rejected from society to enter new disciplinary systems intended for this purpose.

The family, therefore, has this double role of pinning individuals to disciplinary systems, and of linking up disciplinary systems and circulating individuals from one to the other. To that extent I think we can say that the family is indispensable to the functioning of disciplinary systems because it is a cell of sovereignty, just as the king’s body, the multiplicity of the king’s bodies, was necessary for the mutual adjustment of heterotopic sovereignties in the game of societies of sovereignty. What the king’s body was in societies of mechanisms of sovereignty, the family is in societies of disciplinary systems.

To what does this correspond, historically? I think we can say that in systems in which the type of power was essentially that of sovereignty, in which power was exercised through apparatuses of sovereignty, the family was one of these apparatuses and was therefore very strong. The medieval family, as well as the family of the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, were actually strong families owing their strength to their homogeneity with the other systems of sovereignty. However, to the extent that the family was thus homogeneous with all the other apparatuses of sovereignty, you can see that basically it had no specificity, no precise limits. That is why the family’s roots spread far and wide, but it was quickly silted up and its borders were never well determined. It merged into a whole series of other relationships with which it was very close because they were of the same type: relationships of suzerain to vassal, of membership of corporations, etcetera, so that the family was strong because it resembled other types of power, but for the same reason it was at the same time imprecise and fuzzy.

On the other hand, in our kind of society, that is to say, in a society in which there is a disciplinary type of microphysics of power, the family has not been dissolved by discipline; it is concentrated, limited, and
intensified. Consider the role played by the civil code with regard to the family. There are historians who will tell you that the civil code has given the maximum to the family; others say that it has reduced the power of the family. In fact, the role of the civil code has been to limit the family while, at the same time, defining, concentrating, and intensifying it. Thanks to the civil code the family preserved the schemas of sovereignty: domination, membership, bonds of suzerainty, etcetera, but it limited them to the relationships between men and women and parents and children. The civil code redefined the family around this micro-cell of married couple and parents and children, thus giving it maximum intensity. It constituted an alveolus of sovereignty through the game by which individual singularities are fixed to disciplinary apparatuses.

This intense alveolus, this strong cell, was necessary for bringing into play the major disciplinary systems that had invalidated the systems of sovereignty and made them disappear. I think this explains two phenomena.

The first is the very strong re-familialization we see in the nineteenth century, and particularly in the classes in society in which the family was in the process of breaking up and discipline was indispensable—basically, in the working class. At the time when, in the nineteenth century, the European proletariat was being formed, conditions of work and housing, movements of the labor force, and the use of child labor, all made family relationships increasingly fragile and disabled the family structure. In fact, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, entire bands of children, young people, and transhumant workers were living in dormitories and forming communities, which then immediately disintegrated. There was an increasing number of natural children, foundlings, and infanticides, etcetera. Faced with this immediate consequence of the constitution of the proletariat, very early on, around 1820-1825, there was a major effort to reconstitute the family; employers, philanthropists, and public authorities used every possible means to reconstitute the family, to force workers to live in couples, to marry, have children and to recognize their children. The employers even made financial sacrifices in order to achieve this refamilialization of working class life. Around 1830-1835, the first workers' cities were constructed at Mulhouse. People were given houses in which to reconstitute a
family, and crusades were organized against those who lived as man and wife without really being married. In short, there were a series of arrangements that were disciplinary.

Equally, in some towns, those living together without being properly married were rejected by workshops. There was a series of disciplinary apparatuses, which functioned as disciplinary apparatuses, within the workshop, in the factory, or in their margins anyway. But the function of these disciplinary apparatuses was to reconstitute the family cell. Or rather, their function was to constitute a family cell conforming to a mechanism that is not itself disciplinary but belongs, precisely, to the order of sovereignty, as if—and this is no doubt the reason—the only way disciplinary mechanisms could effectively function and get a grip with maximum intensity and effectiveness was if, alongside them, and to fix individuals, there was this cell of sovereignty constituted by the family. So, between familial sovereignty and disciplinary panopticism, the form of which is, I think, completely different from that of the family cell, there is a permanent game of cross-reference and transfer. In the course of the nineteenth century, in this project of refamilialization, the family, this cell of sovereignty is constantly being secreted by the disciplinary tissue, because however external it may be to the disciplinary system, however heterogeneous it may be because it is heterogeneous to the disciplinary system, it is in fact an element of that system's solidity.

The other consequence is that when the family breaks down and no longer performs its function—and this also appears very clearly in the nineteenth century—a whole series of disciplinary apparatuses are established to make up for the family's failure: homes for foundlings, orphanages, the opening, around 1840-1845, of a series of homes for young delinquents, for what will be called children at risk, and so on. In short, the function of everything we call social assistance, all the social work which appears at the start of the nineteenth century, and which will acquire the importance we know it to have, is to constitute a kind of disciplinary tissue which will be able to stand in for the family, to both reconstitute the family and enable one to do without it.

This was how young delinquents, most without a family, were placed at Mettray for example. They were regimented in an absolutely military, that is to say, disciplinary, non-familial way. Then, at the same time,
within this substitute for the family, within this disciplinary system which rushes in where there is no longer a family, there is a constant reference to the family, since the supervisors, the chiefs, etcetera, are called father, or grandfather, and the completely militarized groups of children, who operate in the manner of decures, are supposed to constitute a family.35

You have here then a [sort]* of disciplinary network which rushes in where the family is failing and which, as a result, constitutes the advance of a State controlled power where there is no longer a family. However, this advance of disciplinary systems never takes place without reference to the family, without a quasi or pseudo familial mode of functioning. I think this is a typical phenomenon of the necessary function of familial sovereignty with regard to disciplinary mechanisms.

What I will call the Psy function, that is to say, the psychiatric, psychopathological, psycho-sociological, psycho-criminological, and psychoanalytic function, makes its appearance in this organization of disciplinary substitutes for the family with a familial reference. And when I say “function,” I mean not only the discourse, but the institution, and the psychological individual himself. And I think this really is the function of these psychologists, psychotherapists, criminologists, psychoanalysts, and the rest. What is their function if not to be agents of the organization of a disciplinary apparatus that will plug in, rush in, where an opening gapes in familial sovereignty?

Consider what has taken place historically. The Psy-function was clearly born by way of psychiatry. That is to say, it was born at the beginning of the nineteenth century, on the other side of the family, in a kind of vis-à-vis with the family. When an individual escaped from the sovereignty of the family, he was put in a psychiatric hospital where it was a matter of training him in the apprenticeship of pure and simple discipline, some examples of which I gave you in the previous lectures, and where, gradually, throughout the nineteenth century, you see the birth of reference to the family. Psychiatry gradually puts itself forward as the institutional enterprise of discipline that will make possible the individual’s refamilialization.

* (Recording:) kind, a constitution
The Psy-function is therefore born in this kind of vis-à-vis with the family. The family requested confinement and the individual was placed under psychiatric discipline and supposed to be refamilialized. Then, gradually, the Psy-function was extended to all the disciplinary systems: school, army, workshop, and so forth. That is to say, the Psy function performed the role of discipline for all those who could not be disciplined. Whenever an individual could not follow school discipline or the discipline of the workshop, the army, and, if it comes to it, of prison, then the Psy function stepped in. And it came in with a discourse attributing the individual's inability to be disciplined to the deficiency and failure of the family. This is how, in the second half of the nineteenth century, you see full responsibility for the individual's lack of discipline being laid at the door of familial deficiency. Then, finally, at the start of the twentieth century, the Psy function became both the discourse and the control of all the disciplinary systems. The Psy-function was the discourse and the establishment of all the schemas for the individualization, normalization, and subjection of individuals within disciplinary systems.

This is how psycho-pedagogy appears within school discipline, the psychology of work within workshop discipline, criminology within prison discipline, and psychopathology within psychiatric and asylum discipline. The Psy-function is, then, the agency of control of all the disciplinary institutions and apparatuses, and, at the same time and without any contradiction, it holds forth with the discourse of the family. At every moment, as psycho-pedagogy, as psychology of work, as criminology, as psychopathology, and so forth, what it refers to, the truth it constitutes and forms, and which marks out its system of reference, is always the family. Its constant system of reference is the family, familial sovereignty, and it is so to the same extent as it is the theoretical authority for every disciplinary apparatus.

The Psy function is precisely what reveals that familial sovereignty belongs profoundly to the disciplinary apparatuses. The kind of heterogeneity that seems to me to exist between familial sovereignty and disciplinary apparatuses is functional. And psychological discourse, the psychological institution, and psychological man are connected up to this function. Psychology as institution, as body of the individual, and as
discourse, will endlessly control the disciplinary apparatuses on the one hand, and, on the other, refer back to familial sovereignty as the authority of truth on the basis of which it will be possible to describe and define all the positive or negative processes which take place in the disciplinary apparatuses.

It is not surprising that, from the middle of the twentieth century, the discourse of the family, the most "family discourse" of all psychological discourses, that is to say, psychoanalysis, can function as the discourse of truth on the basis of which all disciplinary institutions can be analyzed. And if what I am telling you is true, this is why you can see that a truth formed on the basis of the discourse of the family cannot be deployed as a critique of the institution, or of school, psychiatric, or other forms of discipline. To refamilialize the psychiatric institution, to refamilialize psychiatric intervention, to criticize the practice, institution, and discipline of psychiatry or the school in the name of a discourse of truth which has the family as its reference, is not to undertake the critique of discipline at all, but to return endlessly to discipline.*

By appealing to the sovereignty of the family relationship, rather than escape the mechanism of discipline, we reinforce this interplay between familial sovereignty and disciplinary functioning, which seems to me typical of contemporary society and of that residual appearance of sovereignty in the family, which may seem surprising when we compare it to the disciplinary system, but which seems to me in fact to function quite directly in harmony with it.
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