Fuggle, S. (2019). The spectacle of discipline and punish: The tableau, the diagram and the calligram. Crime, Media, Culture. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659019827623

Sophie Fuggle, MAE 328, School of Arts and Humanities, Clifton Campus, Nottingham NG11 8NS, UK.

Email: sophie.fuggle@ntu.ac.uk

Abstract

This article returns to Michel Foucault's Discipline and Punish in order to consider its continued relevance for thinking about the representation of incarceration today beyond categories of 'spectacle' and 'surveillance'. In order to rethink the text in relation to contemporary scholarship on visual criminology, it will explore the visual elements of Discipline and Punish in more detail via the concepts of the 'tableau' and the 'diagram' found in Gilles Deleuze's Foucault. These concepts will be supplemented by the notion of the 'calligram', drawing on Foucault's 1968 essay 'Ceci n'est pas une pipe' in order to explore what is at stake in current representations of incarceration via a specific engagement with offender art. Evoking Jacques Rancière's notion of curiosity as a critique of the 'intolerable image', the article will suggest ways in which the relationship between the academic scholar qua 'penal spectator' and the 'represented' incarcerated subject can be reconfigured to produce a more critical, empathetic and socially responsible engagement with such representations.

Introduction

Rereading Michel Foucault's Discipline and Punish today, 40 years after its publication, might not seem to tell us much about the history of our present and its heavily carceral landscape. In an

interview given in Japan in 1978, Foucault claimed that the disciplinary forms of power so effective during the 19th century had begun to lose their relevance in the face of increasingly complex and variegated individual identities and social activities (Foucault, 2001 [1978]: 533). Moreover, his work did not anticipate the super maxes, immigration detention centres and Amazon distribution warehouses that shape the early 21st century. But, in its structure, imagery and language, together with the image plates that 'illustrate' disciplinary techniques, the text provides rich and surprisingly underexplored material with which to examine issues surrounding contemporary representations of incarceration. Indeed, such a rereading might call to account contemporary methods, for both academic researchers and penal spectators, of framing, documenting and representing the subjugated experience of those living and suffering incarceration.

This article argues therefore that Discipline and Punish does not just chart the birth of the prison but is also a history of the representation of punishment from spectacle to instruction to surveillance and beyond. The aim of this article is therefore to make a claim for the continued relevance of Discipline and Punish and, in particular, to redress a recent tendency by those working in the emergent field of visual criminology (Brown, 2014) to dismiss or limit engagement with Foucault due to the perceived prioritization of 'disciplinary power over cultural meaning and emotional sensibility' (Carrabine, 2011: 452) found within traditional Foucauldian approaches towards crime and punishment. At the same time, it is necessary to acknowledge the ongoing importance of the text as a major reference point for the history of crime and punishment. Where Jeffrey Nealon (2007) identified a shift in scholarly focus towards Foucault's later work on governmentality during the early 2000s, we might identify a more recent 'carceral' turn in Foucault scholarship.

In particular this has been driven by the recent publication of the earlier 1972–1973 Collège de France lecture series on punishment, The Punitive Society (Foucault, 2015), and 1971–1972 Penal Theories and Institutions (Foucault, 2018), together with the 2013 re-publication of the Groupe d'Information sur les prisons material (Artières, 2013) alongside contemporary scholarship around

the work of the group (Zurn and Dilts, 2015), which has marked a return to themes of 'discipline', 'power' and the 'carceral' within the field of Foucault studies.

Taking these two seemingly contradictory positions, as they both limit and affirm the contemporary significance of Foucault's work on prison and punishment, into account, the article explores the perceived simplicity of Foucault's conceptual categories of 'spectacle' and 'surveillance'. Where such categories may appear limited or redundant in light of the proliferation of images of incarceration in a world where surveillance appears to have been reappropriated as spectacle, Foucault's seminal text affirms the organizing force not only of the categories of 'spectacle' and 'surveillance' but also of what is at stake in the visual and textual representation of different forms of punishment and discipline via these categories. Earlier engagements with Foucault's narrative techniques and argumentative strategies often sought to expose his own power play as a form of intellectual hypocrisy (Beer, 2002). Returning to Discipline and Punish within a context in which the role of storytelling together with the selection and framing of images are acknowledged as necessary factors in the production and presentation of knowledge, the complex task undertaken within the text acquires a new relevance. Such a reading also moves discussion of Discipline and Punish in relation to Foucault's earlier prison activism as a founding member of the Groupe d'Information sur les prisons (GIP) beyond a stagnant, unproductive dialectic which stages Foucault the academic against Foucault the militant.[1]

My analysis will be focused around a close reading of Discipline and Punish itself organized according to two conceptual framings offered by Gilles Deleuze in his reading of Discipline and Punish in Foucault (Deleuze, 1988 [1986]): the 'tableau' and the 'diagram'. Deleuze is one of the first of Foucault's interlocutors to recognize the significance of Foucault's writing style in his critical methodology and, moreover, the singular importance of Discipline and Punish in the consolidation

of writing and method only glimpsed at in key passages of his earlier works. As Deleuze points out, 'Foucault never looked on writing as an aim or end in itself. This is precisely what makes him a great writer and imbues everything he writes with an increasing sense of joy and gaiety' (Deleuze, 1988 [1986]: 23). While describing Foucault's writing on the history of punishment and prison in terms of 'joy' might initially strike us as odd, it is impossible to deny the seductive enthusiasm of Foucault's text. Taking this as his starting point, Deleuze goes on to explore via the concepts of 'tableau' and 'diagram' the visual stakes of Foucault's writing, something this article picks up and develops further.

'Tableau' and 'diagram' will be supplemented by a third concept, the 'calligram', which will be used to explore not only the central image plates of Discipline and Punish but also a very specific, literal example of contemporary representations of incarceration taken from We Are All Human, the Koestler Trust's 2016 Offender Art exhibition. Drawing on Jacques Rancière's critique of the 'intolerable image' in The Emancipated Spectator (Rancière, 2009), I will propose his notion of 'curiosity' over and against Foucault's use of the same term as it appears throughout Discipline and Punish. Is it the genuinely thoughtful curiosity produced by an image that has the potential to shape and change attitudes towards incarceration and those incarcerated rather than the immediately affective so-called 'intolerable' image that frequently produces paralysis in the spectator?

The tableau Foucault's much cited account of Damiens' execution pitted against the prison timetable continues to be one of the most powerful, if hyperbolic, narratives on the evolution of the penal system in Europe. Where references to the opening passage of Discipline and Punish within larger discussions of power, penal systems and the criminal body do not necessarily tell us anything new or different but simply paraphrase Foucault, there might be a more interesting way of thinking about how we read and use Foucault's text. What is it about the opening passage that is so appealing yet appalling that it works so well? What is the function of the image of punishment

rendered as narrative? How are we then to respond to the stark bureaucracy of the listed timetable, all the more effective in its contrast? Is this a case of transforming the reader into another spectator alongside those in the crowd watching Damiens being torn into pieces? Or, is there an injunction here to distinguish reader from spectator?

To reread Discipline and Punish as both a historical text and critical framework requires deeper reflection on what is being asked of us as readers. On the one hand, such a rereading might emphasize the irony in which academic readers affirm their complicity in the very structures and systems set out by Foucault through their 'enjoyment' of his narrative and appreciation of the neat juxtaposition of two modes of punishment. On the other hand, rereading Discipline and Punish as an intentionally affective text reminds us that at the centre of Foucault's work on prisons, his political activism, lectures and published writing, was a notion of stark political affect: the 'intolerable'.

Defined by the GIP in terms of a public refusal to tolerate the high levels of suffering experienced by many in incarceration, it is a difficult notion and one which has become twisted by contemporary discourses of zero tolerance. To begin to understand the role of image and imagery in defining public perception of criminality and incarceration also involves a more critical awareness of the complexity of our responses to such images and, consequently, the limitations of the 'intolerable' to effect political change.

The concept of 'intolerance' is fluid when referring to public responses to crime and punishment. Using the very carefully chosen term 'illegalisme' which emphasizes an act in relation to a

law rather than its ethico-moral status as a form of wrongdoing against others, Foucault highlights in Discipline and Punish a number of illegal activities widely 'tolerated' during earlier feudal regimes, such as poaching or taking brushwood from a forest. With the emergence of the bourgeois class, such activity became redefined as theft since what could not be 'tolerated' was the unharnessed labour of the lower classes (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 84-85). Poaching and scavenging made it possible to avoid selling one's labour and prevented the new middle classes from creating surplus value and profit from such labour. Tolerance for extra-legal survival tactics of the poorest members of society was turned into intolerance towards those who failed to contribute to economic production. Foucault's articulation of this shift in Discipline and Punish is important as it seems to acknowledge the limitations of the notion of the 'intolerable' despite its central role in describing the work of the Groupe d'information sur les prisons, namely the 'Enquête sur l'intolérable' ('Intolerable Enquiries') involving surveys smuggled into prisons across France (Artières, 2013)

To this fluid and complex understanding of public tolerance/intolerance directed towards the treatment and suffering of offenders, we might supplement the critique directed by Jacques Rancière towards what he terms the 'intolerable image'. Rancière calls into question the political relevance of the so-called 'intolerable' image. This is because there are various examples of images of torture and suffering which have done very little to produce sustained political change and have subsequently become co-opted by the same or similar regimes in the form of artworks. Moreover, he warns about being too quick to refer to an explosion of 'intolerable images' and to link public passivity to a desensitization produced by such a glut of images (Rancière, 2009: 96). We might consider both these criticisms, the co-option of the 'intolerable image' and the paucity of images, in relation to the way in which the opening scene of Discipline and Punish has been presented to multiple generations of undergraduate students across disciplines as a shock tactic

intended to transmit as efficiently as possible the transformations that occurred to punishment in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The stark contrast brought out by Foucault in the opening pages and then reproduced at key points throughout the text serves first to bring our attention to the shifts which rendered incarceration

the dominant mode of punishment, highlighting the reasons why the spectacle of torture

and execution became an unstable mode of power. The juxtaposition of Damiens and the prison timetable is supplemented by a series of other pairings. For example, an account of torture is paired with a brief reference to the contemporary use of lethal injection. The containment and management of a city during the plague which opens Chapter 3 on 'Panopticism' (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 195ff.) is juxtaposed with Foucault's exposition of the panopticon model. These juxtapositions produce a cumulative effect that maintains both the momentum of the text and the seductive force of its argument. The initial impact of the account of Damiens is reasserted often through descriptions that involve at least as much, if not more, gruesome details of torture and suffering. This cumulative effect is lost when the account of Damiens is read as an extract.

In his opening narrative, Foucault actually brings together three different accounts – the official edict, the newspaper report and an extended eyewitness account by one of the officers present. While these three descriptions of the event work together to enable Foucault's reader to visualize the event to a certain degree of detail, they also demonstrate the role of different written testimonies in the representation of punishment and the supplement such representation offered to the physical spectacle of the execution. Foucault's own redaction of the source material doubles with that undertaken by the authors of the sources themselves. Access to the spectacle of suffering is never entirely unmediated.[2]

Elsewhere Foucault suggests we should read these accounts and, in particular, the dying confessions

reported to have been uttered by those on the scaffold with a certain degree of suspicion.

Their purpose, he claims, is less to provide a wider public with an authentic experience of the spectacle than to rework the event into a more coherent form of instruction. Consequently, we might relocate the importance of Foucault's opening comparison of Damiens and the prison timetable in the structure of the text rather than the specific content of the examples, the use of polemical examples serves not simply as a pedagogical tool but one that reworks or reappropriates existing tools, models or examples precisely in order to unpack or expose the very mechanisms by which they work. Deleuze's use of the term 'tableau' to describe Foucault's narrative description is key here. Foucault's 'tableaus' are not flattened or smoothed down but, rather, assume the form of collages. On closer examination the different layers, and processes of construction or compilation, not only become more visible but take on a central role in the object's meaning.

Our analysis employs the translation of the word 'tableau' as 'scene'. In the context of Deleuze's claim that Foucault 'has always known how to paint marvellous tableaus' (my translation and italics), the visual metaphor of 'painting' seems key to understanding what is at stake for Deleuze in Foucault's writing process. The metaphor of painting is followed up further on when he insists on how Foucault's writing enables us to see the 'red on red of torture' and the 'grey on grey of the prison'. This emphasis is diluted, impoverished in the published English translation which reads: 'Foucault always managed to illustrate his theatrical analyses in a vivid manner' (Deleuze, 1988 [1986]: 23). Moreover, it detracts from the very specific lens through which Deleuze has chosen to read Discipline and Punish, that of the map and the diagram. Deleuze is looking to cast Foucault as 'un nouveau cartographe' rather than risk reaffirming the theatrics and spectacle of punishment as the raison d'être of Discipline and Punish. His reading identifies both tableau and diagram as providing the macro and microphysical elements of the map of our historical and geographical carceral landscapes. But what such a vision does is to crystallize the living force of Discipline and Punish. This risks erasing or arresting the highly personalized, temporal experience of both torture and incarceration, the choreographed performances of punishment and rehabilitation together

with the role of the spectator, the docile body, as he or she is called upon to watch the unfolding of the drama. To reread Discipline and Punish as a map, we must first encounter it as theatre.

Foucault's frequent and often-contradictory references to theatre, the stage and the theatrical in relation to different forms of punishment again emphasize the fragility of the distinction between spectacle and surveillance. We might also read these references as clues intended to draw our attention to the text's own mise-en-scène. Furthermore, they should be read as a note of caution as they demonstrate how the presentation and re-presentation of punishment must collapse within the space of the text. A brief consideration here of some of the different uses of 'theatre' within Discipline and Punish is useful in identifying the fluidity of theatre as comparison, metaphor and literary device. Early on in the text the shift from sovereign to disciplinary power is itself described in terms of a drama:

It was an important moment. The old partners of the spectacle of punishment, the body and the blood, gave way. A new character came on the scene, masked. It was the end of a certain kind of tragedy; comedy began, with shadow play, faceless voices, impalpable entities.

The apparatus of punitive justice must now bite into this bodiless reality. (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 16)

Here we should be wary of the English translator's use of 'comedy', which does not correspond precisely to the French 'comédie' in its more general reference to theatre. There is nothing amusing about the abstract shadow play of the carceral system. Nor should we read it in terms of a farcical repetition which sees history replayed twice. A 'certain kind of tragedy' might have come to an end, but we should be under no illusion that the removal of the traditional cast of tragic players clears the stage for a more lighthearted performance. Instead, we are henceforth invited to watch the endless bloodlust of the justice system which can never be sated. Foucault's appropriation of theatre metaphor here to explain the unfolding of the birth of the prison affirms reader as spectator watching a play of two very different acts.

If this evocation of the theatre as overarching metaphor for understanding the history of punishment suggests that it has always only ever been about public spectacle and spectatorship, Foucault's reference to theatre elsewhere suggests a more direct comparison to public execution. Medieval street theatre and the subsequent public spaces of Elizabethan theatres like the Globe formed part of a landscape of public spectacle which also included festivals and carnivals.[3] These sites and events, like the scaffold, created and contained moments of subversion and transgression as they erased and reversed social hierarchies (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 60) whilst also providing access to the sovereign. Foucault's presentation of the spectacle of the scaffold echoes Mikhail Bakhtin's definition of carnival as:

past millennia's way of sensing the world as one great communal performance. This sense of the world, liberating one from fear, bringing the world maximally close to a person and bringing one person maximally close to another (everything is drawn into the zone of free

familiar contact), with its joy at change and its joyful relativity, is opposed to that one-sided and gloomy official seriousness which is dogmatic and hostile to evolution and change, which seeks to absolutize a given condition of existence or a given social order. From precisely that sort of seriousness did the carnival sense of the world liberate man. (Bakhtin, 1984 [1963]: 160)

It is as a form of theatre with all its subversive potential for audience participation that, according to Foucault, the public are 'summoned as spectators' to displays of torture and execution: 'The people also had a right to take part. The condemned man, carried in procession, exhibited, humiliated, with the horror of his crime recalled in innumerable ways, was offered to the insults, sometimes to the attacks of the spectators' (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 58).

Moreover, Foucault explains how the specific details of torture and execution 'performed on the body of the condemned' often constituted 'an almost theatrical reproduction of the crime … with the same instruments, the same gestures' (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 45). In marking the shift from public execution to incarceration, Foucault identifies the scaffold with the theatre or stage as architectural embodiment of sovereign power on public display in contrast to the closed, hidden and complex structure of the prison as disciplinary apparatus. Writing of Bentham's panopticon, he states emphatically that:

our society is one not of spectacle, but of surveillance … we are neither in the amphitheatre, nor the stage, but in the panoptic machine, invested by its effects of power, which we bring to ourselves since we are part of its mechanism. (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 217)

Yet, elsewhere, this distinction is undermined by the use of reference to theatre to describe the penitentiary:

By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery. They are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 200)

The prison conceived as panopticon or permanent observatory thus reintroduces the idea of a public spectatorship composed, at least in theory, of a cross-section of society.

It does not matter what motive animates him: the curiosity of the indiscreet, the malice of a child, the thirst for knowledge of a philosopher who wishes to visit this museum of human nature, or the perversity of those who take pleasure in spying and punishing. The more numerous those anonymous and temporary observers are, the greater the risk for the inmate of being surprised and the greater his anxious awareness of being observed. (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 202)

Here, there is an implicit connection between the curiosity of those visiting the prison or penitentiary and observing the inmates and the 'insatiable curiosity' of those gathered around the scaffold (Foucault, 1977 [1975]: 46). Moreover, where Foucault focuses his analysis on the use of surveillance in the construction of the criminal and docile body, we should turn our attention to the invisible spectator invited to 'watch' the inmate or mental patient or to visit the human zoos composed of colonial subjects. The implication here is to perhaps count ourselves, readers of Foucault, amongst those anonymous and temporary observers and consider our complicity more than our motives in the production and circulation of images and discourses which serve to maintain the current carceral landscape as a given.

Yet, in dismissing the 'motives' of such observers, Foucault is evoking and also side-stepping

the difficult issue of ‘curiosity’ as ‘indiscretion’, ‘malice’ or ‘perversity’. The notion of curiosity runs throughout his history of punishment and goes some way to explaining the role of the public in defining and affirming certain punitive practices whilst rejecting others. At certain points, Foucault mocks this public fascination, for example when he dismisses crime literature as a form of cheap, bourgeois entertainment.

Elsewhere, he comes closer to identifying such curiosity with academic research and, more specifically, the social sciences, such as his evocation of the ‘philosopher’ in the watchtower. There is no sense that the forms of curiosity described by Foucault in relation to emerging disciplinary and penal technologies are ever converted into comprehension, empathy or greater enlightenment but, rather, like the fascination of those watching a hanging or beheading, they are used to produce an affective response – a mixture of horror and excitement to be relived later in the recounting of the experience to others. Yet, while always assuring some degree of complicity with the concept and display of ‘punishment’, this notion of `curiosity’ is also where we might locate the potential for individual resistance (or resistances) to existing punitive practices. Curiosity is thus the pivot upon which the docile, co-operative body’s capacity to tolerate, or refuse to tolerate, rests.

What seems to be key to Foucault’s conceptual move is a reframing of spectator from active participant to distanced onlooker. If the theatre metaphor continues to hold it is because the theatre

has been reconceived and greater space imposed between audience and actor. However, if Foucault is concerned with charting the different ways in which both ‘criminal’ and ‘docile’ body are regulated, presented and framed within different systems of power, Rancière’s discussion on the ‘emancipated spectator’ offers a useful note of warning against reductive readings of the figure of the ‘spectator’ as either interactive participant or passive observer. Rancière suggests

that various attempts to ‘reform’ theatre in the mid-20th century simply drew further attention to the artificial distances imposed between the audience and the stage. He goes on to challenge the active/passive binary at work in conceptions of theatre and other performing arts, arguing that rather than trying to reduce or eliminate the passivity of the spectator’s ‘gaze’, we should instead consider what is going on in the processes of ‘watching’, ‘looking’, ‘listening’:

> Emancipation begins when we challenge the opposition between viewing and acting; when we understand that the self-evident facts that structure the relations between saying, seeing and doing themselves belong to the structure of domination and subjection. It begins when we understand that viewing is also an action that confirms or transforms this distribution of positions. (Rancière, 2009: 13)

Transposed to the context of what Michelle Brown (2009) has termed ‘penal spectatorship’, referring specifically to contemporary public fascination with incarceration, it becomes possible to see how the figure of the anonymous observer is as much implicated in the framing and presentation of the incarcerated body as the crowd was in the spectacle of execution. Both audiences are state sanctioned, called upon to play a key political role in the endorsement and perpetuation of punishment. As such, both are also open to reinterpretation and reframing via the agencies of the individual and collective spectators. Moreover, for Rancière, it is the ‘indeterminate affect’ of ‘curiosity’ produced out of the desire to see and learn more that provides a riposte or counterpoint to the intolerable image of suffering incapable of producing anything more than the ‘exhausted affect of indignation’ (Rancière, 2009: 104–105).

The diagram

The spatial repositioning of the ‘criminal’ body occurs via the imposition of a series of new frames. Beyond the bars of the prison cell, these take the form of windows, screens and lenses.

Further reframing takes place in the reproduction or reimagining of the 'criminal' or 'deviant' body and its management as pedagogical tool. Fundamental to this process is the concept of the diagram, a term used by Gilles Deleuze to elucidate a key methodological approach taken up by Foucault alongside his use of the 'tableau'. A diagram might be understood in terms of a plan or project, a set of instructions to be carried out at a future moment. It does not constitute a concrete, historical reality but, rather, what (Deleuze, 1988 [1986]) refers to as an 'abstract machine'. It combines an imagined structure or organization with the procedural steps required to achieve this. Only imagined, the representation is also only an estimation, an artist's impression of how the finished structure might appear and the steps or instructions proposed might remain open to modification and improvization on being executed. It is this notion of the diagram as 'abstract machine' that Deleuze takes from Foucault's account of the panopticon and applies as an organizing principle with which to understand disciplinary power more broadly. There are two important things at stake here. First, the panopticon as originally imagined by Jeremy Bentham should not be considered as the apotheosis of disciplinary power.[grow] While the watchtower model was integrated into various penal institutions around the world, the vision of the panopticon as producing total self-surveillance remained a vision. Bentham's panopticon design was never actually built. The watchtower did not become the absolute form of disciplinary power but remained, as Deleuze points out, one of many 'abstract machines': 'If there are many diagrammatic functions and even matters, it is because every diagram is a spatio-temporal multiplicity. But it is also because there are as many diagrams as there are social fields in history' (Deleuze, 1988 [1986]). Second, in stating that 'every society has its diagram(s)', (Deleuze, 1988 [1986]) reiterates the need (implicit but often missed in Foucault) to think these diagrams collectively within a given historical context.

Alongside and sometimes overlapping with the 'abstract machines' that Foucault enumerates

in painstaking detail in his written account of disciplinary power, the image plates or Illustrations provide an important commentary on a series of 'projected' visions that is worth more detailed analysis. In identifying 'knowledge' of the criminal or docile body with its 'representation', Discipline and Punish not only explains how the individual subject is at once produced by and subjected to different forms of power. It also encourages us to look for the gaps, the non-coincidences, the irreducibility which prevents a subject coinciding exactly with his or her 'representation' or a building conforming exactly to the architectural blue prints and the activities and practices taking place within it corresponding to the instruction manual or rulebook.

Although Foucault often begins his books with highly visual narratives, notably the ship of fools in Madness and Civilization (Foucault, 1961) and Las Meninas in The Order of Things (Foucault, 1966), the use of actual images is largely absent from his work with the exception perhaps of the diagrams in his 1968 text 'This is not a pipe', written as a homage to artist René Magritte who had died the previous year (Foucault, 2001 [1968]: 668). However, in keeping with the notion of 'homage', the 'pipe' diagrams work less to illustrate or clarify than to add a further layer of complexity and indeed confusion to Magritte's own play of negations in his 1926 La Trahison des Images and its subsequent reframing as Les Deux Mystères in 1966. In particular, Foucault points out Magritte's use of a style of methodical, cursive writing akin to that of a school teacher or, indeed, a label found in a botanical textbook (Foucault, 2001 [1968]: 663, 665). Consequently, the reciprocal undermining of text and image within Magritte's original 1926 painting and the additional undermining carried out by the reframing of the first image in the 1966 version take place within a context of pedagogy and science. It is this very context which is also at stake in the birth of the prison. Punishment is replaced by rehabilitation, and criminal and docile bodies emerge as objects and subjects of scientific enquiry. This provides a starting point for thinking

about the image plates in Discipline and Punish.

If we take these images at face value, we might read into them two specific illustrative functions. On the one hand, they serve simply to reinforce Foucault's claim that the direct spectacle of punishment had been replaced by a system of representations, a semiotics of punishment which served to educate rather than terrorize the population. Most obvious here is the image taken from 18th century physician Nicolas Andry's text on orthopaedics of the crooked tree attached to a stick aimed at correcting its growth.[5] Within the context of Discipline and Punish, the tree functions as visual metaphor enabling the errant child, madman or criminal it evokes to remain absent and invisible. Palladino has commented on Foucault's use of the image that:

Presumably [he] was particularly interested in the frontispiece to Andry's Orthopaedia because it clearly conveyed how, at some point in the eighteenth century, practices as disparate as orthopaedics and horticulture were increasingly predicated on operative principles that focused on the manipulation of these different life forms. (Palladino, 2003: 82)[6]

In its affirmation of order as aspiration or achievement, the image clearly works within the same system of representation as the commemorative coin featuring a seemingly endless row of soldiers. On the other hand, other images may have been selected by Foucault because they appear to have been originally intended to provide the public with greater insight into how disciplinary institutions function. The artist's impression of the watchtower seems to fulfil this role. Read thus, these images also attest to a public desire to 'see inside' and, indeed, encourage this desire as itself a means of shaping public perceptions of incarceration.

Considered within this context alongside Foucault's reading of Magritte, the inclusion of the

‘Modèle pour l’écriture’ plate should be re-examined as more than merely an example of micro-technologies of disciplinary power operating on and through the body. The images are taken from Diderot and D’Alembert’s (1783) L’Art de l’écriture, a short 43-page volume of the Encyclopédie. Interestingly, the two images reproduced by Foucault as a single plate did not appear together in L’Art de l’écriture. Instead, the portrait of the man writing appeared above a series of artist sketches of writing instruments with no annotation. The hand diagram appeared underneath an image of a woman writing. Given that all the images illustrate much the same thing – writing as a microtechnology of power – the decision to reposition images from two different plates suggests we should look closer.

The top image is a portrait of a man writing, indicating the correct sitting position for good penmanship. A series of almost imperceptible letters and dotted lines marking out the exact position of the writer draw our attention to the diagrammatic quality of the representation. The dotted lines align with other lines: the window, the floor, the symmetrical frames on the wall all work to emphasize position. This is not a representation of a man actually writing but a representation of how a man should write. Next to the writer sat at his desk, it is possible to make out a pamphlet propped up on a chair – L’Art d’Ecrire, a guide to writing by maître écrivain Charles Pallaisson, published in 1760 roughly contemporaneously with the Encyclopédie (published between 1751 and 1777). Here, pedagogical text is absorbed by a later pedagogical image. The text lends the portrait authority, but in doing so negates its own role. There is no need to read Pallaisson’s text since the portrait shows us what it teaches.

The bottom image might be considered to work in reverse. Where at first glance the upper image appears to be a standard portrait sketch, the lower image acts as its diagrammatic counterpart, zooming in on the hand and writing tools themselves. The diagram centres on an

illustration of a hand holding a pen surrounded by examples of other pens. Like the upper image, the hand is rendered diagram by a series of positions marked out on its wrist and fingers and on the nib and quill of the pen. This is what Foucault refers to as 'l'articulation corps-objet'. Yet there is a peculiar aesthetics at work, one that could not have escaped Foucault's notice. Where the disembodied pens evoke the strange floating pipe of Les Deux Mystères, there is also something strange about the doodles that frame the hand and pen. They seem to serve no illustrative, pedagogical function since they do not denote anything except perhaps a nice ink flow, serving simply to mark off the hand from the other pens. Moreover, the implication is that both the doodles and the numeration of the hand and pen have emanated from the same hand via the very same nib.

Consequently, both images embody the precise continuity between image and text, art and annotation that Magritte sought to undermine. For Foucault, Magritte's paintings functioned as unravelled calligrams. Usually a calligram involves a doubling or overlapping of text and image. In Guillaume Apollinaire's Calligrammes (1918), to cite perhaps the most notable example, it is the spatial arrangement of the text, as it forms an image of a horse, the Eiffel Tower or the vertical lines of rainfall, which reinforces the poem's semantics. In the case of the 'unravelled calligram', the doubling usually found in calligrams between word and image falls apart. The images composing 'Modèle pour l'écriture' also involve a series of doublings and overlappings which, on close inspection, risk unravelling. Yet, this is precisely why and how they work so well. The self-referentiality of the hand which annotates and frames itself perfectly encapsulates the self-policing and regulation located at the centre of disciplinary power and its operation. A displacement or deferral of authority occurs in both top and bottom images, meaning there is no end point to power. We will explore the self-referentiality of the calligram in further detail later in the article in the context of offender art. If we consider Foucault's choice and use of images in Discipline and Punish in more detail it is also possible to see an intentionally similar form of doubling at work in how he deliberately and carefully sets up and develops an 'aesthetics' of modern punishment at the

same time as ensuring that every image selected plays a precise illustrative role in relation to his text.

The presentation of the image plates in Discipline and Punish varies according to the edition and translation. The original 1975 Gallimard text included 30 images placed before the text. More recent editions in French have presented the images as central plates, which has no doubt shifted the role of the images. As François Boullant (2003: 33n) has suggested, the original positioning of the images 'anticipate[s]' or 'institute[s]' rather than simply illustrating the text. A further modification takes place in the English language edition of the text. Images are reduced from 30 to 10.[7] While the order of the plates presented does not change, the omission of two-thirds of the images selected for inclusion by Foucault means that a number of significant and powerful juxtapositions are lost. In particular, most of the architectural plans and diagrams of prisons and other institutions are omitted, leaving only Bentham's 'panopticon' model as archetypal example. Indeed we might read a tendency to overemphasize the importance of the panopticon watchtower within Discipline and Punish as a result of the privileging of a repentant prisoner knelt in front of the inspection tower in 'Plan for a penitentiary' (1840) and the photograph of the Stateville penitentiary watchtower in the United States. In the original French series, this is one of two photographs. An aerial photo of 'Prison de la Petite Roquette' located in Paris and which closed in 1974 is presented on the previous page. The removal of this image in the English selection changes the role of the Stateville watchtower enormously, drawing an imaginary historical line between European disciplinary models of the 18th and 19th centuries and their concrete manifestations in present-day United States.

Thus in the English editions, the images no longer work collectively and cumulatively to produce an 'aesthetics' of discipline in quite the same way as was allowed by the repetition of a range of circular and rectangular diagrams. An appreciation of the range of art forms placed in the service of disciplinary power is also lost in the abridged set of images. This includes the original opening plate which embodies the neoclassicism of the mid-18th century and features a mother

measuring her cherub-like children with a ruler marked HAEC EST REGULA RECTI. The juxtaposition in the French selection of more classical art forms and architectural diagrams demonstrates the pervasiveness of disciplinary power via both the structural similarities between different types of institution and the range of imagery co-opted into its representation. Moreover, as Boullant points out, the first (the mother and children) and last (the crooked tree that constituted the frontispiece of Andry's Orthopédie) images of the series are from the same source and work together to present the image sequence as a circularity rather than as a chronology (Boullant, 2003: 33).

Whilst wishing to avoid sweeping conclusions about reader reception of Foucault, it is nevertheless clear that the impact of the original French selection on readers would therefore have been significantly different to both subsequent editions in French and in English. Foucault's selection of 'diagrams' involves a doubling in which images intended to explain and instruct individuals and society are once again called upon to do so within a different context. Yet, Foucault achieves this via a process of distancing or defamiliarization, situating images showing disciplinary techniques or plans for disciplinary institutions as a preface to the text's violent and graphic opening account of Damiens. Echoing Magritte's reframing, this deliberate recontextualization should also alert us to the complex and often underappreciated stakes of our own use and reuse of images as pedagogical or illustrative tools. In their study of the use of images of street crime and white-collar crime in criminology textbooks, Wright and Ducaji (1992: 39) found that photos of street crime featured far more prominently in many introductory textbooks, despite narratives explaining the larger impact of white-collar crimes. On surveying how these images impacted on student perceptions of crime, they found that the images often undermined students' reception of the main ideas and concepts presented (Wright and Ducaji, 1992: 40–41). Once again, it is impossible to refer to the history of crime and punishment as distinct from its representation.

Calligram

To bring together the concept of 'curiosity' proposed above alongside practices of framing which implicate us as 'penal spectators' within a more contemporary context, I want to further develop the concept of 'calligram' proposed above in relation to the image plates in Discipline and Punish. As suggested above, the doubling which takes place between the visual and the textual, but also more specifically in the doubling and slippage which constantly occurs in Foucault's use of theatrics, theatrical metaphor and direct comparison of punishment and theatre, collapses the representation, the aesthetic, literary and philosophical framing of punishment with the history of its operation. Foucault's text not only shows us exactly how this is done but, according to Deleuze, offers up direct evidence of the seductive pleasure involved in writing and reading about the punishment and disciplining of others. What this shows us is first that bound up in all punishment is its representation. And second that we are all complicit in the production, dissemination and reception of this representation.

In her 2014 article on the emergence of 'visual criminology', Michelle Brown highlights both the difficulty and urgency in producing 'counter-images' aimed at critiquing both individual suffering and wider social inequalities that define the penal system. One of the main problems is the seemingly immovable framing of incarcerated subjects according to a reduced aesthetics of visibility, firstly defined in terms of the 'invisibility' of subjects removed from society into the space of the prison or detention centre, and secondly framed by the architecture of these spaces. According to Brown (2014: 185):

We need to ensure that the theoretical frameworks we employ within visual criminology address the catch-22 of the spectacle of disappearance and the human-in-a-cage as the sole modes of visibility.

In addition to public protests and events which redress the 'invisibility' of incarcerated subjects, Brown also identifies practices by prison activists which seek to remove those subjects from existing modes of representation which frame them within the space of the prison. Instead, activists refuse to show images of prisons and imprisoned bodies, emphasizing instead the pre-existing family and community relationships of those being detained (Brown, 2014: 187). If removing the frame of the prison in order to represent those suffering within it differently constitutes one possible approach, another might be to offer a different set of frames within which to resituate the incarcerated body. In its annual exhibition at Southbank in London, the Koestler Trust features artworks by those housed in secure units across the UK, whether these be prisons, young offender institutes, immigration detention centres or mental health hospitals. The artwork is thus reframed in terms of the experience of detention. The therapeutic, rehabilitative role of art is emphasized rather than the transgressive, creative genius of the criminal mind fetishized in the 18th and 19th centuries. While a sustained analysis of the Koestler Trust and other prison art programmes should be flagged up as an important project for the future, it is useful to provide some brief context and critique before exploring the specific example of an artwork, Comfort, that I wish to present in relation to the concept of the calligram.

Many of the artworks featured reproduce common aesthetics and imagery associated with incarceration and freedom rather than exploring other themes. On the one hand, the exhibition provides a unique outlet for inmates to represent their own experiences and so it is inevitable that their work includes (an often political) commentary on prison and the government that put them there. On the other hand, a lot of the artwork seems to attest to the desire for public approval precisely by 'performing' a certain carceral or criminal aesthetic. Indeed, the perceived ethicomoral judgment by visitors towards the artists featured in the exhibition is reproduced in a statement

made in the exhibition guide:

Not all the exhibited artists have committed crimes. As well as those on remand or in secure children's homes, around 20% of entrants to the Koestler Awards are patients in medium or high security mental health units, where the arts can be therapeutic or educational. The Koestler Awards are also open to people in immigration removal centres, where art is usually run as a leisure activity. (Koestler Trust, 2016)

The disclaimer seems to pre-empt potential hostility towards offender art from visitors, hence the emphasis on those in secure units and children's homes. The final sentence quite intentionally avoids defining those detained in immigration removal centres as belonging to either category of 'criminal' or 'not criminal', but as a result is also unable to define the role of art within such centres beyond its function as a 'leisure activity'. So while the main merit of the awards is that they lay some of the groundwork required to recognize the deep inhumanity of all forms of locking people up and the potential of art to produce different forms of response to this inhumanity, more needs to be done to unpack the different types of confinement going on here as well as the way in which the public judges the artwork being produced in different contexts according to preformed prejudices.

Furthermore, this 'doubling' whereby inmates feel obliged to represent their experiences according to established perceptions around incarceration produces a kind of erasure or silence around prisons. Together with the ultimately reformist agenda of the Koestler Trust itself, its very existence predicated on that of long term incarceration and detention as well as Arts Council and other public funding, these artworks attest to the 'invisibility' of prison precisely as a result of their 'visibility' in so central and public a location as Southbank.

However, on visiting the exhibition in Autumn 2016, I was confronted with a self-portrait which seemed to contest the usual framing of the criminal body and the 'performance' required of this body. The portrait was entitled Comfort: A Self-Portrait (or a Picture Paints a Thousand Kind Words) by an inmate called Ryan. The picture is an extended calligram of the inmate in his cell with his artwork on the wall along with a feedback form from the Koestler Trust. The writing which composes the picture is made up of all the comments he received for previous entries in the awards. The feedback form in the picture addresses the spectator past and present directly as follows:

This drawing has been created using all the kind, amazing words that people have said about my artwork in the last two Koestler exhibitions.

They provide me so much comfort.

Thank you and keep sending these cards to the artists.

While this seems like a straightforward, neatly executed endorsement of the awards, we might also read it in terms of the stifling demands made to produce art that is painfully self-reflexive and which depends on one's status as a confined, criminal or dangerous other to gain meaning and recognition by the public and the art world. This calls into question the role of offender art as either therapeutic or emancipating, since the inmate or detainee is obliged to reproduce his or her experience of confinement and even when he or she eludes or avoids doing this, his or her artwork is judged within this framework. The award winners are defined as inmates and detainees who are artists rather than artists who also happen to be locked up. The Koestler Awards risk

becoming the end point of inside art rather than a platform for creative, artistic and even political expression within prison and secure units.

But to settle with this reading of Ryan's self-portrait also involves a refusal to acknowledge and take responsibility for one's own curiosity. Once again we might evoke Rancière's definition of 'curiosity' here and the challenge it presents to the notion of the 'intolerable image'. Ryan's

artwork cannot be reduced to a direct representation of the suffering object. There is no direct line between the image and the thing it represents. Rereading is necessary and the calligram is key once more. Like Magritte's 'unravelled' calligrams, Ryan's self-portrait resists the exercise of 'doubling'

usually defining the calligrams whereby text and image neatly reproduce each other. If anything, Ryan's picture is a response to the expectation of 'doubling' which defines many of the artworks in the exhibition. However, where Magritte's 'unravelled' calligrams worked to shift the parameters of the frame, unsettling the potential for text and image to affirm each other within a flattened artistic space, Ryan's picture maintains the frame as it is, instead bringing the spectator back via his or her feedback but also via Ryan's response into the space of the frame. The spectator is complicit in the production of the artwork and as such becomes part of Ryan's self-representation. The voyeuristic gaze of the gallery visitor who – like the anonymous observer Foucault situates in the watchtower – is looking to consume images of incarceration is short-circuited. Their curiosity is directed instead to the words of other spectators composing the lines which form Ryan's body and the cell in which he sits.

In our proposed reading of the artwork, it is worth noting Ryan's choice of the word 'comfort' both as the artwork title and to articulate how he felt about receiving feedback. To be 'comforted' by these comments implies an underlying suffering that needs comforting. It also evokes the distinct lack of physical comfort of the prison cell. But by placing the spectators within this space via their comments, Ryan is also taking them out of their 'comfort' zone of passive, unengaged and anonymous spectatorship. His insistence that visitors continue to send feedback to artists which follows his reference to his own 'comfort' further raises the stakes of his own artistic practice. This now becomes politicized as he employs the space to speak for other artists. We might easily dismiss the feedback forms as belonging to an audit culture which often demands the impossible

evidencing and quantification of the impact and efficacy of art and education programmes like those supported by the Koestler Trust. Yet, Ryan turns these into a more effective tool with which to call to account public engagement with offender art, challenging its existing role to neatly frame and contain inmates and detainees within the safe context of artwork and gallery. Ryan collapses the perceived vacuum in which visitors leave comments and inmates address their imagined viewers. Both are now found within the same intense space of the calligram, doubling one another, and affirming the responsibility they owe to each other as interlocutors.

Conclusion

There is perhaps one image amongst the plates in Discipline and Punish which, more than the others, exceeds and resists its 'diagrammatic' status. That is the engraving (gravure) of the lecture on the evils of alcohol being delivered to a group of inmates enclosed in individual boxes revealing only their heads. There is something ridiculous, grotesque about the design and construction of these boxes. There is the sense that the compartmentalization of discipline has reached its logical extreme, reducing men to caged animals. The men themselves look as if they have been entombed in the boxes; their grimaces seem to refuse the discourse being imposed upon them from the pulpit. Their attention when it is offered is elsewhere. Even the guard at the front of the room is asleep. This image which is intended to demonstrate the neatness of the compartments whilst emphasizing the depravity of those contained within them is of a similar order to the photographic images and engravings of hysteria produced by Jean-Martin Charcot and his team at La Salpêtrière.[8]

The Victorian prison located next to Lincoln Castle in the United Kingdom featured a chapel with individual compartments. Today it is possible to visit the prison as a museum and to assume the position of 'entombed' inmate as well as that of the preacher surveying the inmates

from the pulpit. I cite this opportunity to 'play' at being both punished and punisher by way of conclusion as it brings us back to some of the contradictions of Discipline and Punish as performance and critique which provided the impetus for a rereading of the text. The art gallery and the prison museum are just two possible spaces where we are invited to engage with the embodied experience of incarceration beyond passive spectatorship offered by television documentary and fictional dramatization. But it is here, in these spaces which offer the temptation to lose ourselves in the laughter of the spectacle, that our rereading of Discipline and Punish comes into play as a map, a blueprint for exploring the representation of punishment as inseparable from punishment itself.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This article is the outcome of a preliminary research paper and subsequent discussions taking place as part of the Time Served: Discipline and Punish 40 Years On conference organized by the author in 2015. The event received generous funding from Nottingham Trent University and the UK Society for French Studies.

1. For further discussion of Foucault's intellectual 'agenda' and the privileging of his voice over those of the prisoners during his involvement with the GIP, see Brich (2008) and Fuggle (2015).

2. For a useful overview on scholarship looking at the role of 18th century print culture in ‘shaping ritual

effects of punishment’, see Schorb (2012).

3. For more in-depth work on Foucault, theatre and Shakespeare, see Stuart Elden’s Progressive Geographies

blog which contains details of his current and forthcoming research in this area as well as his

forthcoming Shakespearean Territories (Elden, 2018).

4. Focusing on the panopticon in ‘isolation’ is a charge directed towards Foucault most notably by Alford

in his 20 year retrospective on Discipline and Punish (Alford, 2000: 142).

5. Discipline and Punish indicates a 1749 publication date for Andry’s Orthopédie, ou l’Art de prévenir et de corriger dans les enfants les difformités du corps. However, the original French edition was published in 1741, a year before Andry’s death, with the English translation published as Orthopoedia: Or, the art of correcting and preventing deformities in children in 1743.

6. Christian Borsch (2015: 62–63) provides further discussion of the tree image in his examination of

psychiatrist George Stürup’s use of similar tree symbolism in relation to his work on clinical criminology during the 1940s and 1950s.

7. Stuart Elden (2014), on his blog Progressive Geographies, has called for a new English translation of Discipline and Punish, including a reproduction of all the original images.

8. For an excellent, in-depth study of Charcot’s development of photographic techniques as part of his work on hysteria at La Salpêtrière, see Didi-Huberman (2003).

References

Alford CF (2000) What would it matter if everything Foucault said about prison were wrong? Discipline and Punish after twenty years. Theory and Society 29: 125–146.

Apollinaire G (1918) Calligrammes: Poèmes de la paix et de la guerre (1913–1916). Paris: Mercure de France.

Artières P, (ed.) (2013) Intolérable: Groupe d'Information sur les prisons. Paris: Gallimard.

Bakhtin M (1984 [1963]) Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Edited and translated by C Emerson. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Beer D (2002) Michel Foucault: Form and Power. Oxford: Legenda.

Borsch C (2015) Foucault, Crime and Power: Problematisations of Crime in the Twentieth Century. London: Routledge.

Boullant F (2003) Michel Foucault et les prisons. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Brich C (2008) The Groupe d'Information sur les prisons: The voice of the prisoners? Or Foucault's? Foucault Studies 5(January): 26–47.

Brown M (2009) The Culture of Punishment: Prison, Society and Spectacle. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Brown M (2014) Visual criminology and carceral studies: Counter-images in the carceral age. Theoretical Criminology 18(2): 176–197.

Carrabine E (2011) The iconography of punishment: Execution prints and the death penalty. The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice 50(2): 452–464.

Deleuze G (1988 [1986]) Foucault. Translated by S Hand. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Diderot D and D'Alembert J le R (1783) L'Art de l'écriture. Paris.

Didi-Huberman G (2003) Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of La Salpêtrière. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Elden S (2014) Beyond Discipline and Punish: Is it time for a new translation of Foucault's Surveiller et punir? Progressive Geographies, 22 January. Available at: https://progressivegeographies.com/2014/01/22 /beyond-discipline-and-punish-is-it-time-for-a-new-translation-of-foucaults-surveiller-et-punir/ (accessed 15 February 2017).

Elden S (2018) Shakespearean Territories. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault M (1961) Folie et déraison: L'histoire de la folie à l'âge classique. Paris: Plon.

Foucault M (1966) Les mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines. Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault M (1977 [1975]) Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by A Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault M (2001 [1968]) Ceci n'est pas une pipe. In: Foucault M Dits et Ecrits I (1954–1975). Paris: Quarto /Gallimard, pp. 663–678.

Foucault M (2001 [1978]) La société disciplinaire en crise. Asahi Jaanaru 20(19), 12 May. In: Foucault M Dits et Écrits II (1976–1988). Paris: Quarto/Gallimard, pp. 532–534.

Foucault M (2015) The Punitive Society. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1972–1973. Translated by G Burchell. London and New York, NY: Palgrave.

Foucault M (2018) Penal Theories and Institutions. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1971–1972. Translated by G Burchell. London and New York, NY: Palgrave.

Fuggle S (2015) Beyond Slogans and Snapshots: The Story of the Groupe d'Information sur les prisons. In: Fuggle S, Lanci Y and Tazzioli M (eds) Foucault and the History of Our Present. London: Palgrave, pp. 142-158.

Koestler Trust (2016) We Are All Human. Exhibition Guide. London.

Nealon J (2007) Foucault Beyond Foucault: Power and Its Intensifications Since 1984. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Palladino P (2003) Life … On biology, biography, and bio-power in the age of genetic engineering. Configurations 11(1): 81–109.

Rancière J (2009) The Emancipated Spectator. Translated by G Elliott. London: Verso.

Schorb J (2012) Punishment's prisms: Execution and eighteenth century print culture. Early American Literature 47(2): 461–476.

Wright RA and Ducaji CM (1992) When pictures lie: Photographs of crimes and criminals in introductory criminology textbooks. Teaching Sociology 20(January): 36–43.

Zurn P and Dilts A (eds) (2015) Active Intolerance: Michel Foucault, the Prisons Information Group and the Future of Abolition. London and New York, NY: Palgrave.

Author biography

Sophie Fuggle is a senior lecturer in French at Nottingham Trent University, UK. She is author of Foucault/ Paul: Subjects of Power (Palgrave, 2013) and co-editor with Yari Lanci and Martina Tazzioli of Foucault and the History of Our Present (Palgrave, 2015). She is currently an AHRC Early Career Leadership Fellow working on the project 'Postcards from the bagne' looking at heritage sites related to France's former penal colonies.