People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou

Department of English

Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Magister

Specialism: **English**

Option**: Cultural Studies**

Presented by**:**

LAOUARI Mohamed Larbi

Supervised by**:**

Dr. GUENDOUZI Amar

Subject**:**

A Foucauldian Analysis of Power , Punishment and Docile Bodies in Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* (1980)

Examination Panel**:**

Ms. Sabrina ZERAR; Doctor; Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou; Chair

Mr. Amar GUENDOUZI; Doctor; Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou; Supervisor

Mr. Bouteldja RICHE; Professor; Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou; Examiner

Mr. Rachid TITOUCHE; Doctor; Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou; Examiner

- To all my family especially my brother Boukhalfa who taught me to love English
- To all my friends

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr GUENDOUZI Amar for his help, guidance and patience in criticizing this work. It is thanks to his suggestions that this research reached completion. I owe him a lot especially for devoting his precious time to reading and correcting this work.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to Prof Bouteldja RICHE for having suggested and opened my eyes about the possibility of analyzing a movie using a Foucauldian approach.

I also express my thanks to the panel of examiners for having accepted to read, correct and evaluate this humble work.

Abstract

This thesis studied the themes of power, punishment and docile bodies in Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* (1980) from a Foucauldian approach. Looking at these movies as countercultural artistic works that Hollywood released to dramatize a very remarkable period in the American history known basically for its political instability both at the national and the international levels, this thesis analyzed the unjust doctor/ patient power relations inside Oregon Psychiatric Hospital as well as the unfair and corrupt trusties/prisoners relation at Wakefield State Penitentiary. It explained how these oppressive relations are tantamount to the relationship between Americans and their government during a time period marked by the government's strong and effective grip on people and society. It also demonstrated how other strategies like discipline, surveillance and observation are implemented inside institutions, namely prison and hospital, to create a panoptican climate through which both patients and prisoners are, ultimately, transformed into docile conforming bodies. In short, I have explained the symbolic clash that appears in the two movies between freethinking and its ability to reform and question the established order, and the adjusted and controlled life, which is suggestive of an existing clash between two discourses in America. A rather traditional, conservative and pro-government discourse calling Americans for conformity, and complete allegiance to the government on one hand, and an anti-government discourse, which, on the other hand, denounced blind conformism and asked for radical reforms and improvements in the American society. Leaning on Michel Foucault's theoretical perspectives about institutions of punishment, confinement and imprisonment, this work, in its four chapters, has critically analyzed *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *Brubaker*. It uncovered thereby the two movies' ideological and artistic bearings to history by drawing attention to the dramatization of some challenging countercultural ideas and radical movements in the history of the United States in particular and human civilization in general.

Contents

List of tables

List of shots

General Introduction

INTRODUCTION

Theorizing the ideas behind which prison, as an institution of confinement and discipline, stands would raise a heightened debate about the nature of prison, its legitimacy and the degree of its efficiency. It seems that dealing with the problems for which prison is supposed to find a cure is a big problem in itself. It is commonly held that prison is an institution wherein a criminal or simply a lawbreaker is confined as a punishment for committing something that is inscribed in a "not to do" list.

As early as the very first record of the human tendency to live in agglomerations, there happened some transgressions of the conventional delimitations of law. Excommunication or confinement are the ultimate measures by which these law breakers were met.

Literature, as a body of artistic and critical works which often mirrors human concerns, has shed a special light on the imprisonment of human beings and the consequences that may result from such a practice. As a result, a special literary genre under the name of "prison literature" has emerged and it concerns itself with writings from or about prison.

The themes of imprisonment and punishment have been so exciting for cinema to the degree that a huge budget is devoted to the production and promotion of films which depict and deal with prison. Since its inception in the 20th century, the cinema has given a special attention to prison and produced wonderful films like George Hill's *The Big House* (1930), Michael Curtis' *20,000 Years in Sing Sing* (1939) and Busby Berkely's *They Made me a Criminal* (1939), films that aimed often at crystallizing the real conditions of the prisoners.

Even though they are aesthetically different modes of artistic expression, literature and cinema have a very strong link. It is no exaggeration to say that any film is first and foremost a text, which entails a form of literature. This justifies why literature is an inexhaustible informative source for cinema. Very ironically, though, it is often said that great books make

mediocre films, and mediocre books make great films. By performing the literature of prison, then, cinema has offered the opportunity for a wider public to discover what actually happens inside prisons.

There is usually a direct relationship between cinema and prison since, under the name of "prison films", special and numerous movies take imprisonment and punishment as their central themes. Movies like Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and Stuart Rosenberg' *Brubaker* (1980) are striking examples which dramatize the themes of imprisonment and confinement. It is crucial to signal that cinema in general, and prison films in particular, have considerably sharpened and deconstructed the old common view about the prison as a neutral institution designed simply to incarcerate law offenders.

The U.S.A. is one of the most outstanding countries in generating both cinema and crime. This makes of the U.S.A. and Hollywood the fields of study the most likely to inform us about prison and power relations inherent to it.

The exploration of the history of the prison system in America can be fulfilled through the survey of the different ways of administering punishment to prisoners. Since the arrival of the early settlers to this "new found" land, the American prison system used different methods to inflict pain on law breakers, and preserve order. In the 1730s, the colony of Massachusetts, for example, would proceed to punish a convicted individual for the first time by a fine, and if he commits another offense, he risks to be publicly hanged. After the Colonial Era, however, most States alleviated their criminal punishment system and the death penalty was no longer used for simple offenses like robberies (Matthew, 1999: 840).

It was starting from the mid 18th century in Europe that criminologists and reformers tried to understand crime and the extra potential reasons that might push the criminal to commit a crime. Punishment, therefore, became less violent and the old methods of torture

were no longer used. This does not mean, however, as I shall demonstrate in this work, that this progression was done for humanitarian reasons. This change was rather the outcome of the shift of the sociopolitical and economic realities of the time. Total efficient control became synonymous with both body and soul control. Institutions like asylums and prisons transgressed their neutrality and became places where docile bodies are produced. In cinema, it is through movies like *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *Brubaker*, as I will explain further, that the old established idea, which assumed that prison and asylum's exclusive role is to keep society in safety, is deconstructed.

The main task of this dissertation is to discuss the themes of power, punishment and docile bodies in Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker* from a Foucauldian approach. By applying Michel Foucault' s notions of power and punishment on the two movies, the present work tries to refute the idea that asylums and prisons are neutral institutions which are designed merely to protect society from deviants. This investigation, therefore, aims to show to what extent power relations inside these two institutions are unjust and based on the dialectic of power/knowledge. It uncovers how the patients and prisoners are transformed into docile conforming bodies.

Review of the previous literature

The themes of imprisonment, punishment and confinement have been extensively studied and analyzed. Indeed, a lot of scholars and critics have approached these issues from different critical perspectives which led to the formation of a special literary genre in itself called prison literature. In the words of Robert Gaucher and Sylvie Frigo, prison literature takes "a multiplicity of forms, styles, and intents, and includes biography, fiction, poetry, drama, sociopolitical commentary and analysis" (quoted in Bosworth, 2005:731).

Gaucher and Frigo provide the reader with a new way to critically understand what's behind the official criminological discourses of governments. They analyze the dialectic of government –prisoners from a Marxist point of view. Behind the apparent neutral relationship between prisoner and government, Gaucher and Frigo think, there lies a discourse based principally on the notion of class and a web of power/knowledge relationships that strive to gain more control over not only the prisoners but also over the individuals outside prisons (quoted in Bosworth, 2005: 732). It follows from this that the principal aim of prison writings is to:

> reveal the scope of political, social, and cultural dissent, resistance to oppression, and the refusal of many to accept the normative structures of dominant classes or elites and their societies as embodied in the concept of "crime. (ibid. 782)

Continuing in the same perspective, other prison writings like *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (1964) by Malcolm X with his collaborator Alex Haley, and George Jackson's *Soledad Brothers* (1970) demonstrated what later social and economic research validated, namely the fact that prison has resulted in a manipulative institution which does not function merely as a control center, but rather as a site of domination over socially and economically disenfranchised people by the powerful dominant class.

In addition, Lee Bernstein explains, in his book *America is the Prison: Arts and Politics in Prison in the 1970* (2010), that imprisonment and confinement are the indirect means that the American government utilizes to exercise and affirm its power over the less privileged such as the minorities in general and blacks in particular. For Bernstein, there are certainly "more continuities between the history of slavery and the Jim Crow era and the culture of American prisons in the 1970s." (2010: 07) Relying on some statistics, Cyndi Banks, in *Punishment in America* (2005), establishes a direct link between imprisonment and

joblessness. She affirms that individuals from the lower class are more likely to be imprisoned. She declares that:

> Punishment seems always to have been imposed most on the poor and jobless. This is true today when looking at the number of African-Americans in prison compared with their representation in the population as a whole. (Banks, 2005: xiv)

Punishment and imprisonment of individuals have been subjects of debate and criticism for theorists like John Howard, Jeremy Bentham and, more recently, Jeffrie Murphy. These thinkers, despite their different penal philosophical views, try to answer questions like why we punish? And what is the utility of individuals' imprisonment? Jeffry Murphy, for example, questions the very essence of punishment arguing that, if this practice aims to ameliorate society, "history proves with the complete evidence that since Cain, the world has been neither intimidated nor ameliorated by punishment." (quoted in Simmons , 1995: 3)

Being among the most known outstanding cinematic works which deal with imprisonment and confinement, *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *Brubaker* have been extensively studied and analyzed separately. To begin, Stephen Tanner and James F. Knapp respectively in *The Western American Context of One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (2007) and *Tangled in the Language of the Past: Ken Kesey and Cultural Revolution* (2007) present to the reader a historicist analysis of the movie, suggesting that the film reflects the time period of its release, since it depicts the American nonconformist antigovernment spirit that reigned in America during the sixties and seventies in regard to its vivid embodiment of "the fear and desires that are underneath articulation" (quoted in Bloom, 2007: 161) For Tanner, *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest:*

> contains the essence of this social-cultural turmoil. More importantly, it dramatically articulated the nation's queasy suspicion that its valued tradition of self-reliant individualism was being eroded by institutionalized conformity and dehumanized technology. (ibid)

For Christian Perring, Chair of the Philosophy Department at Dowling College, Long Island, and editor of *Metapsychology Online Review*, the movie's genius and efficiency reside in the fact that the validity of its message is not only limited to its period of release (1970s), but it is still relevant even to recent times. He explains that the film's message is, on the one hand, anti-psychiatric, since, as depicted in the film, the people in mental hospitals are no crazier than ordinary people and that institutionalization crushes individuality and spontaneity. On the other hand, it presents another different message. That's to say, ordinary people, represented mainly through the figure of the brutal Nurse Ratched, are just crazy as people in mental hospitals. The essential moral of the film is humanitarian; that we should treat patients with respect rather than label and confine them. It is this aspect of the film, Christian Perring argues, that makes it

> as relevant to society today as it was in the 1970s, and means that it can be counted as one of the few films in which mental illness is portrayed sympathetically and positively. *(*Perring, 2003 : para. 09)

As for Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker*, it dramatizes brilliantly the idea of corruption inside prisons and the will to reform the penitentiary system. Based on real experience that Tom Murton and Joe Hyams narrated in *Accomplices to the Crime: The Arkansas Prison Scandal* (1969), the film is a portrayal of the political and bureaucratic hindrances provoked by the federal administration against the prison reform attempts. The film shows to what extent the state and the politicians can be inhuman by privileging their personal achievements over any attempt to better the prisons' conditions.

According to *Bluray Movie Reviews*, Rosenberg's *Brubaker* unquestionably merits its place among the most inspiring films that Fox studios had ever released. It significantly leaves its imprints on the audience and provokes a great change, since it is a very "entertaining and a thought provoking" film. (Hough, M. 2013: para. 01)

In addition, Freddy Bauche, one of the supporters of the realist school in film studies, expressed his utter fondness of the qualities of *Brubaker* that he considers to be an eternal work of art due, principally, to its commitment and its realist depiction of the prisoners' terrible conditions (quoted in Bloom, 2007:149). In the same perspective, Wilson and O'Sullivan write in *Images of Incarceration: Representation of Prison in Film and Television Drama* (2004) that this film reflects particular aspects of reality and truthfully depicts the historical context of its release. He thinks that what makes this film noble in mission is the fact that it aims to be:

> both revelatory about conditions and to connote those conditions as being something that we should be ashamed of , although one problem with prison film genre is that not all prison films do this. (2004: 148)

As shown in the above review of literature, the themes of imprisonment and punishment in general, and the two movies in special, have already been subject of study and analysis by many scholars and from different perspectives. However, to our knowledge, no work has already been done so as to study the two movies from a Foucauldian approach. My task in the following work, therefore, is to study the Foucauldian notions of power, punishment and docile bodies in relation to the two movies so as to demonstrate: how power manifests itself? What kind of power relations exist inside these two institutions? And, ultimately, how docile disciplined bodies are produced?

Issue and working hypothesis

My work studies the themes of power, punishment and confinement in Milos *Forman's One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* from a Foucauldian perspective. I try, therefore, to suggest a new way of thinking about punishment by studying the dialectic of power/ knowledge in the two movies so as to show that prisons

and asylums should no longer be seen as neutral institutions whose functions are merely to incarcerate criminals and mad people to protect society.

Principally, I assume that punishment is not something well understood and that it functions in an arbitrary way, which frequently causes injustice and unfair oppression. Certainly, it is true to consider punishment as simply society imposing a penalty on an individual for breaking its rules and norms, but it is also totally plausible to see punishment as an attempt by the government, or those in power, to control individuals' activities and, as such, an overall strategy to impose social control. Through this work, I attempt to explain how punishment, in its broadest sense, can be seen as an aspect of, to use a Foucauldian concept, a disciplinary society where individuals are thought to be in need of direction and control through punishment and discipline so as to render them docile bodies, compliant and unresisting to the actions of those in power.

In Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker*, one can easily detect the themes of punishment and confinement. Such themes can be studied, for example, by using the dialectic of power-knowledge to ultimately explain how prisoners and "patients" are subjected. My aim is to study the discourses of psychiatry in the asylum and penology in the prison, and how these so called "deviants" are controlled, neutralized and disciplined into "docile bodies". In addition, lots of examples can be used to explain resistance as an omnipresent entity that accompanies power. For instance, McMurphy, the principal actor of *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*, symbolizes resistance against the authority and conformity that Nurse Ratched personifies. Noticeably, the same thing can be said about Rosenberg's *Brubaker* which depicts the protagonist Brubaker (Robert Redford) in bold defiance of the federal administration's political strategy. Furthermore, the prison and the mental hospital, the settings of both movies, are perfect examples of what Foucault considers as heterotopic places where a web of power relations operates using principally

surveillance and panoptican techniques as their prime modes to assure compliance and control.

Methods and materials

To study the strategies of punishment and confinement and to show the intricacies of the discourses of psychiatry and penology, I believe it is relevant to use Michel Foucault's works and theoretical perspectives about the institutions of mental hospital and prison. Such institutions, Foucault thinks, are very good examples of spaces wherein power relations manifest. They are hegemonic panoptican constructions that governments use to control not only those inside, but subscribes to its exhaustive strategy of control and regulation of the whole society. In *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1961) and *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (1975), Foucault argues that, behind the usually taken for granted raison d'être of asylums and prisons, there lies a set of discursive practices and a complex web of power relations that aim to create a disciplinary society adjusted according to the wishes of the government.

In *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Foucault speaks about the rapid shift in target that punishment, as a disciplinary technique, had witnessed by comparing the old public executions to the modern technologies of punishment that happen inside the walls of prisons. As a result, he distinguishes between two strategies that he named respectively Monarchical punishment and Disciplinary punishment. The first type involves a whole ritual of people's repression through brutal public displays of executions and torture. Disciplinary punishment involves more secrecy and efficiency and, contrary to the former strategy, the latter is practiced in the modern era. Some argue that this was the result of a civilizing process and that the public, by the end of the eighteenth century, seemed to have developed a distaste for the public nature of punishment and became sensitive to watching others' pain. Foucault,

on the contrary, argues that the state by this time had already consolidated its power and no longer needed to perform public executions to ensure obedience. The reform of punishment, therefore, is "not to punish less but to punish better" (Foucault, 1991: 82).

In addition, as I will demonstrate later in this investigation, disciplinary punishment gives professionals (psychologists, programme facilitators, parole officers… etc) power over the prisoner, most notably in that the prisoner's and patients' length of stay depends on the professionals' judgment. Inside the institution of prison and mental hospitals, as is the case with other institutions like schools and factories, a web of power relations and strategies of surveillance and discipline operate to create obedient subjects. Interestingly enough, Foucault discusses how these techniques of total surveillance lead to self-policing by individuals who unconsciously assume the control of themselves by themselves.

Discipline, Foucault suggests, is this new economy and politics reserved for bodies. Modern institutions required that bodies must be individuated according to their tasks by continuous training, observation, examination and control. This is why discipline, for Foucault, should be seen as a new form of power which creates a whole new form of individuality for bodies. As a result, this new individuality enables the individuals to perform their duties within the new forms of economic, political, and military organization that starting from the eighteenth century have been developed into complex institutions with different tasks but one goal which is to control society and ensure the state's power. Foucault's argument is that discipline creates docile bodies; bodies that not only do what governments want but do it precisely in the way it wants (quoted in Gutting, 2005: 82).

Gary Gutting assumes that the most striking thesis in *Discipline and Punish* is that the disciplinary techniques introduced for criminals become the model for other modern sites of control (schools, hospitals, factories, etc.) Discipline, in its various forms, pervades the

modern society and becomes one of its principle omnipresent features, since we live, as Foucault writes, in a "carceral archipelago" (quoted in Gutting, 2005: 81). On the same idea, Sara Mills, in her book *Michel Foucault* (2003), writes that:

> Discipline consists of a concern with control which is internalized by each individual : it consists of a concern with time keeping, self control over one's posture and bodily functions, concentration, sublimation of immediate desires and emotions_ all of these elements are the effects of disciplinary pressure and at the same time they are all actions which produce the individual as subjected to a set of procedures which come from outside of themselves but whose aim is the disciplinary of the self by self. (2003: 43)

One of Foucault's important ideas is his comment about modern societies and their panoptican systems. To find an adequate adjective to the narrowly watched modern society, he suggestively uses Jeremy Bentham's panoptican model of prison which signifies: "pan" as all, "optic" as watching. According to Foucault, the worldwide communications network constitutes a kind of camouflaged panoptican. The recent developments in telecommunications along with other new means of collecting and distributing information give Bentham's understanding of the Panotpican a great contemporary significance that overlap and coincide with what happens in modern societies. I shall, therefore, use in this work the Foucauldian understanding of asylums and prisons as heterotopic places of deviants where power relations as well as the disciplinary strategies of surveillance and control manifest themselves, and explain how they operate to ensure the state's hold over individuals, both inside and outside prison walls.

Materials

The materials that I will use in my investigation of punishment and confinement are two movies entitled *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and *Brubaker* (1980) directed respectively by Milos Forman and Stuart Rosenberg. Both movies are adaptations of books

which are correspondingly Ken Kesey's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) and Tom Murton and Joe Hyams' *Accomplices to the Crime: the Arkansas Prison Scandal* (1969).

Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* narrates the story of the rebellious McMurphy who feigned madness to escape prison and his highly suggestive questioning as well as refusal of the rules and the authority of administration. His rebellion against the repressive Ratched led the other patients, formerly obedient and machine like, to acquire a consciousness and start questioning the established authority. At the end of the film, McMurphy's free rebellious spirit is portrayed as being terribly altered into zombie like.

Brubaker dramatizes the real experience of Tom Murton as a superintendent in the Arkansas prison. It is about the protagonist Brubaker (Robert Redford) who entered the prison disguised a prisoner to effectively investigate the conditions and the rumors of corruption at Wakefield State Penitentiary. His determination to carry out serious investigation leads him to find and prove the rumors of corruption. However, it is this determination that caused, as depicted in the end of the film, Brubaker to be fired by the governor.

Methodological Outline

I shall divide my work into four chapters. The first chapter will be divided into two sections. In the first, for the sake of putting the reader into context, I shall provide the sociopolitical context of the U.S.A during the time periods when Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker* were released. Concepts like counterculture and hippie movement will be briefly looked at. In the second section, however, a succinct account of the historical development of prison in the U.S.A. and the main philosophical doctrines that theorized punishment will be provided.

The second chapter deals with the presentation of the theory and materials used in the present investigation. This chapter will be divided into two sections. In the first section, I shall provide a synopsis of the two movies as well as the main differences between these movies and the books from which they were adapted. In the second section, I will try to present and explain Foucault's concepts of power, discipline and his theoretical perspectives about punishment that will be of great importance in my work.

The third chapter of this investigation is an analysis of *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* from a Foucauldian perspective. In this chapter, I shall study power and punishment in the movie and try to explain how power operates in the asylum to produce docile bodies. This will be carried out through leaning on what Foucault terms 'Correct training of individuals' which has three principles namely: Hierarchical observation, normalizing judgments, and examination. In the fourth chapter, I will attempt to study *Brubaker* from a Foucauldian approach. I will try to study the themes of power and punishment as vehicled in the movie. My aim in this chapter is to explore the kind of power relations that exist in the prison and to show how the prisoners are transformed into docile conforming bodies because of the prison's reformatory function that implies the use of three principles namely: the principle of isolation, the principle of obligatory work, and the principle of the modulation of penalties.

Chapter One

The 1960s and 1970s and Prison Development in the U.S.A.

Introduction

The present chapter is divided into two sections. In the first section, I try to investigate the sociopolitical context in the U.S.A. during the sixties and seventies. I will also provide the historical background of the time period when MILOS Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and STUART Rosenberg's *Brubaker* (1980) were released. My aim is to offer a succinct account of the main historical and cultural events that appeared at that time. Thus, concepts like: counterculture, woman's liberation, the anti-Vietnam sentiment and the Hippie Movement will be explored.

The second section deals with the development of prison through history. In this section, my aim is to offer an archaeological study of prison by studying its development both from a historical as well as a philosophical perspective. Special attention, though, is reserved to the development of prison in the U.S.A. I try to study the different types of penal philosophy that underpin and promote the validity and the function of prisons including deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation, and retribution philosophies. Some statistics will be included so as to show the dangerously high rate of imprisonment in the U.S.A.

Section 01: The Sociopolitical Context in the U.S.A. during 1960s and 1970s

Because there is often a direct link between history and a given artistic work, providing the historical and philosophical backgrounds to the subject under study in a research paper is of great importance. This would surely help the reader to position and situate himself in a specific phase of human intellectual development and historical progress and thereby allow him to understand the artistic work even at its deepest levels.

The United States of America has passed through critical periods throughout its continuing historical development. It is argued that one can't understand present-day America without looking back at its post World War II historical and political situation.

The period which spans form the 1960s to the 1970s, when the two movies that we are studying in this investigation were released, has witnessed many noteworthy events. These events are viewed as the stimuli that promoted a fertile ground for the fosterage of groundbreaking ideas which, directly or indirectly, shaped the modern American spirit. The key points that characterized this period may be summarized in some ideas that I try, in the following paragraphs, to explain.

1_The Nineteen sixties and seventies in the U.S.A.

The term "sixties" covers much more than the period which stretches from 1960 to 1969 in modern American history. Indeed, the "sixties" is an era of new movements and new ideas that constantly challenged the status quo in the U.S.A. It is a term used by some historians, journalists and academics to refer to the counterculture and social revolution that characterized America at that era.

The sixties was a time, as Forman's and Rosenberg's movies depict, of political and cultural tumult in the United States: the shooting of John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Junior, the space race, the Civil Rights movements, the emergence of the hippies, the sexual revolution, the Vietnam War protests, and the formation of the New Left all happened in that decade. Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines, editors of *Takin' it to the streets: A Sixties Reader*, state that in the sixties there was a "tumultuous world of sixties culture" (2003:8). Because of the emergence of radical movements and drastic ideas during the sixties, a tumultuous culture was inevitable.

The American Dream of the 1950s; owning a home, the opportunity to start a nuclear family, television sets, laundry machines, and cars, was challenged by a powerful counterculture. In the words of John Hollowell, author of *Fact and Fiction: the New Journalism and the Nonfiction Novel* (1977), the overwhelming mood in the 1960's America was**:**

> Apocalyptic and perpetual crisis seemed in many ways the rule. Throughout the decade the events reported daily by newspapers and magazines documented the sweeping changes in every sector of our national life and often strained our imagination to the point of disbelief. Increasingly, everyday "reality" became more fantastic than visions of even of our best novelists. (1977: 3)

The sixties had left a deep imprint on American culture. People, at that time, thought they could actually revolutionize the world and render it a better place through some strategies including political activism, spiritual experimenting, and artistic expression. The abstraction of the American Dream was hoped to become a reality; a reality that takes into consideration the disfranchised and those previously left out and marginalized from society. Questioning prison's and mental hospitals' harsh policies, as vehicled in the two movies, became widespread.

In the political affairs, the sixties have been described by history books as a period of "rising dangers". The Soviet Union (SU) had become the second superpower beside the USA. With different ideological systems (Communism versus Capitalism), the differences between these two powers became bigger and bigger culminating in the Cold War; a Darwinian challenge with two possibilities- win and rule over the world or lose and perish.

The idea of changing the situation became clear and urgent with the assassination of the President John F. Kennedy in 1963, and that of the Civil Rights activists Malcolm X in 1965 and Martin Luther King Junior in 1968. Undeniably, these assassinations inspired many Americans to assess their country and policy makers with a critical eye.

If the sixties can be described as a period of optimism, the seventies would be qualified as an era of profound pessimism. Indeed, the seventies was a period that witnessed not only the fading of some cultural movements like the Hippies and also the proliferation of other cultural manifestations like women and environmental movements. It was a critical period from which Henry Kissinger, Secretary of State in the 1970s, warned his countryman, saying:

> today, for the first time in our history, we face the stark reality that the [communist] challenge is unending[…]we must learn to conduct foreign policy as other nations have had without escape and respite[…]This condition will not go away. (quoted in Fuckuyama, 1992: 8)

If the Americans had an optimistic view about their future during the fifties, by the coming of the1960s and the seventies, they were greatly disillusioned. The concept of counterculture is probably the best example which expresses this disillusionment.

2-Counterculture

Because the two movies I am studying are countercultural in terms of genre, explaining this concept is very crucial for understanding the two movies. Counterculture is identified as referring to the values, beliefs and attitudes that constitute the culture of a minority group that is in opposition to the mainstream or ascendant culture (Barker, 2004:36).

Counterculture is particularly associated with the cultural and political movements of the 1960s and early 1970s in the United States and Britain. Arguably, to speak about counterculture in the U.S.A. is to speak about such cultural manifestations namely the Hippie movement.

2-1: **The Hippie movement**

The common impression about "Hippie" is that they are strangely clothed young people with long hair and unshaved beards, glassy eyes due to smoking marijuana, driving colorful cars and listening to singers like Bob Dylan or Joan Baez singing war and peace and a world where all people can live in harmony. Though this image may be half true, it is a very simplistic stereotype about a movement that was far more complex and meaningful.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, intellectuals like Friedrich Nietzsche have advanced the idea of criticizing the values of the dominant culture and the urgency of celebrating nature and individual freedom. As McMurphy does with the patients inside the asylum, hedonist philosophers like Nietzsche had inspired the Hippies in their quest for more sensual pleasures.

The Hippies of the early sixties had clearly inherited the attitudes of Beat Generation that characterized America in the 1950s. The latter was a group of post World War II American writers who promoted a new revolutionary counterculture which prompts both a rejection of the materialist values of the prevailed culture and a celebration of human condition, adventures and extreme sensations. Among the legacies of the Beat Generation were sexual, spiritual and women's liberations. The beat generation had considerably shaped the philosophy which gave birth to the Hippie movement. Indeed, many of the original Beats remained active participants in the sixties, notably Allen Ginsberg, who strongly expressed his anti-war ideas.

Jack Kerouac and William S. Burroughs had written many novels depicting and reflecting the Hippie spirit and ideals. For example, Kerouac's masterpiece *On the Road* (1957) influenced both the Beat Generation and the Hippie movement and was a pioneering novel of nonconformist sentiment which criticized the American social norms of that time.

In addition, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) by Ken Kesey was considered to be one of the novels which best reflect the main issues of the American society during the sixties. In this book Kesey creates, to use Michel Foucault's terminology, a "heterotopic" site: set in a mental institution among patients and workers, the story relates the conflict between Randle Patrick McMurphy, fun-loving, non-conformist new inmate, and manipulative and dictatorial Nurse Ratched who runs the "Combine," a term which stands for the "System". In this novel, the themes of rebellion, individuality and non conformity are very recurrent. Heterotopias, as Foucault wrote in the mid-sixties in an article entitled *Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias,* are something like counter-sites, in which all other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted. (Foucault, 1984: 46-49)

Hippie ideas and values had a significant effect on culture, influencing popular music television, literature, and the arts. Many aspects of Hippie culture have been incorporated by mainstream society. The religious and cultural diversity supported by the Hippies has gained widespread acceptance and reached a larger audience. Within the American contemporary culture, the Hippie had left a remarkable legacy in countless forms including health, food, music festivals and sexual mores.

Section 02: Prison History in the United States of America

The following retraces the historical development of prison, and demonstrates the main historical phases through which the prison passed. My aim in this section is to argue that the prison is a cultural production that appeared in the past and developed to be a dangerously "normalized" institution. My choice of prison, not mental hospitals, is justified by the fact that it would take much time and a long space to provide the histories of both institutions. On the one hand, I think that it is better to provide a relatively detailed history of the prison rather

than superficial accounts of both institutions. On the other hand, my aim in this dissertation is not oriented towards studying what distinguishes prison from asylum as two separate institutions, but it is an attempt to study punishment as a theme that combines and appears in both institutions. Therefore, my approach is a summative one which views prison and asylum as 'heterotopic' spaces of 'deviants' that the government uses to control and discipline both prisoners and patients and transform them, as I will demonstrate in the third and fourth chapters, into docile bodies which obey the system.

1- Prison in History

Trying to locate the earliest use of prison in an accurate date seems to be quite impossible. A prison may be generally seen as a place in which an individual is held, against his desire, by an established authority. Considering this, some form of prison has surely existed at any given point in history. Although imprisonment in the past was used principally as provisional detention preceding trial, banishment or execution, it served other purposes as well. Indeed, important political prisoners were incarcerated rather than put to death; incarceration convinced certain prisoners to pay debts owed to the government or influential individuals and as early as the 1300's, imprisonment itself was used as a punishment for lesser crimes (Johnston, 1973:5).

The early prisons of the world were generally small rooms or cells in castles, or in the underground areas of public buildings. The Mamertine Prison of Rome is the early institution about which historical and written evidences exist. It began in about 640 B.C. by Ancus Martius and consists of a series of dungeons beneath Rome's major sewer: the Cloaca Maxima. In general, places of detention were small, temporary constructions inside enclosed spaces. In his book *The Human Cage: a Brief History of Prison Architecture* (1973), Johnston Norman asserts that contrary to popular belief, dungeons in European and Middle

Eastern countries were originally intended as storage areas rather than places of incarceration per se (Johnston, 1973: 6).

It was only after the twelfth century that prison cells were no more provisional but built exclusively for purposes of incarceration. These cells were to be found in the lower sections of castle towers, whose massive walls were well fitting for this function. When gunpowder came to the western world, castles lost their significance as defensive structures. However, the central locations of castles and their thick, typically windowless walls made them as convenient jails. Capacities were typically low and periods of imprisonment brief (ibid. 7).

Besides castles, prisons as we know them today had beginnings in ecclesiastical structures. Partially, the early Christian practice of granting asylums to criminals and fugitives gave birth to the concept of incarceration as a replacement for death or physical mutilation. Punishment by solitary confinement, which was used widely during the medieval period, was assigned to sinners under church jurisdiction. The aim behind this sanction was not only to put into practice the Christian theory of purification through suffering, but also to create a climate under which penitence would be encouraged. The latter concept is of fundamental importance to the penology of the nineteenth century. For example, the monk who committed a sin could be easily confined by the head of a monastery to his lodge. This practice may be thought as the origin of the concept of reforming prisoners (Johnston, 1973: 8-10).

In their times, church and castle cells, though relatively small in number, had sufficed for the detention of the criminals, but ‘times were changing’. With the end of Feudalism, the number of criminals in the sixteenth century Europe greatly increased; and to deal with them, the workhouse, or the house of correction, was introduced. The aim behind this institution was that the development of regular work habits, it was believed, would lead to rehabilitation.

1557 saw the opening of the most famous example of this type: the London Bridewell, so called for its location at the site of an ancient holy well of medicinal water.

In general, workhouses were like any other large public seventeenth and eighteenth century buildings which were principally in the form of a hollow square with common workrooms and sleeping areas. A few, however, were pioneering: the Juvenile House of Correction of San Michele, in Rome, featured individual cells opening into a large, multi-use room, a design quite like that of many modern institutions. The Milan House of Correction, however, was more sophisticated than that of San Michele. It was erected in 1755 and had incorporated single cells into structure. This institution was about four times the size of the former and had separate wings for the housing of the male, female, and juvenile prisoners (Johnston, 1973:11-13)

At the same time when these Italian prisons had brought fascinating advances in their design and architecture, developments in institutional organization were not far away. In 1772, a revolution in prison management took place when the Flemish government opened its house of correction at Ghent. Ghent brought together the principles of solitary confinement at night, separation of male and female inmates, and additional division on the grounds of age, offense type, and sentence length. Extensive separation of prisoners in this fashion was possible due to the floor plan of the prison "that consisted of a giant octagon formed by eight self-contained trapezoidal units. Each unit was intended to house one particular type of offender." (ibid. 13)

It is worth mentioning that the institutions at Rome, Milan, and Ghent were very unusual and, thus, not representative of the majority of prisons in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Most houses of correction, at that time, basically had large congregate rooms where all types of prisoners were thrown together under awfully overcrowded and

unsanitary conditions. Ironically, the overcrowding resulted in constant depopulation of the prisons due to the spreading of typhus, known at the time as "jail fever" (Johnston, 1973: 15). As Pevsner notes in his book *A History of Building Types* (1976), it was a widespread practice though the 1700s to chain prisoners to the floor or to hold them in a chamber from which escape was considered to be impossible; also, prisoners were regularly tortured, frequently by whipping (1976: 160).

Up till the late 1700s, there was no conscious and truly purposive philosophy of correction. Indeed, prisons merely resembled other civic buildings of similar size. By the publication of Howard's book *State of the Prisons* in 1777, a penal reform movement had begun in England. Howard's book was an account of his observations of prisons and jails of Britain and Europe, bringing to the awareness of the public the dreadful decline of most penal institutions built during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The reform movement spread to Europe and the United State of America, causing the people to consider more seriously the reasoning underlying prison construction. At that time, imprisonment began to be employed regularly as a form of punishment in itself, without recourse to the whip or other instruments of torture. This constituted a rather "innovative usage of prisons; its ramifications were in many ways unknown*"* (Johnston, 1973:16).

Individual cell confinement, at the times of John Howard's investigations, was rarely implemented due to excessive costs; the guard or warden, merely kept a close watch over the prisoners in the common areas. As opposed to the past, prisoners could be protected from each other's injurious and harmful behavior. Howard strongly supported the separation of prisoners in order to guarantee such protection. Furthermore, the reformers focused on improving the hygienic conditions of prisons. Piped water, proper toilet and bath facilities, infirmaries, and good ventilation were strongly claimed (ibid. 17).

According to Howard, then, there were three main types of prison design which were settled upon by European (and later American) architects and prison officials. These designs were: rectangular or H-shaped forms which resemble to eighteenth century church buildings; circular or polygonal forms; and the radial form, which became the most common. Due to certain scientific and technological advances, the use of forged iron became more feasible. Consequently, the "constant surveillance" technique was no more the most important way of detention. This proved "significant in the rectangular designs, whose physical arrangement of rooms prevented proper observation of the prisoners.*"* (Johnston, 1973: 17-18).

It should be recognized, with regard to British and European penal institutions' physical aspects of the 17th and the 18th centuries, that the majority of cells were small and dark. They were lit and ventilated only by a small window. Cells had no toilets or running water. Heat was produced by stoves or furnaces throughout the building, and almost every prison had governor's quarters, workshops, an infirmary, and a chapel (ibid. 26)

Within the American context, penology has realized a lot of achievements and serious advancements which characterized the U.S. penal philosophy. However, it is necessary to look back to the 1600's and the origins of social control in America to get a full perspective on prison practices and configurations in the New World. In the following, a general history of prison in America is provided.

2- General U.S. Prison History

Since its discovery up till the Revolutionary War in 1776, the United States of America hadn't known the existence of prisons in its territories. Indeed, Colonial America began with no prisons and remained mostly prisonless until the times of Revolutionary War. Crimes and felonies brought, as in the Old World, capital punishment, or fines, rather than imprisonment. The majority of crimes were sentenced by extremely harsh punishments that

epitomized the Puritanical morals of the age. In addition, Colonial penology didn't seek the reform of offenders; humiliation, deprivation, and pain were its dominant goals (Hawes, 1979:39).

Though penal institutions, as we know them today, didn't exist at that time, there were instead workhouses and short term gaols which were built generally for holding debtors that owe money to the government. These facilities were brought from Europe by the Pilgrims and other early settlers. The jails were used to hold criminals, who waited for trial, and at the economic level, they proved very lucrative for the administrative staff who ran them; offenders had to pay for their food, drink and other necessities as well. Instead of individual cells, jails had large areas where all different criminals –men, women, children, insane and sane, were thrown together (Nagel, 1973:6). As the American Correctional Association has noted, there were even records for liquor vending bars inside jails of early America (1972: 25)

Historical evidence had shown that Massachusetts was the first American colony to found the semblance of a prison. The other colonies had postponed the introduction of this aspect of social control to the very end of the eighteenth century. In 1632, for example, the Massachusetts Bay Colony had built a small wooden prison in Boston to hold the criminals of that colony. Legislation was passed in Massachusetts's General Court in 1655 calling for the establishment of houses of correction in each county for small or "petty" offenders (ibid. 19).

At the same time when a lot of jails and prisons began to appear, the harsh criminal laws were beginning to shift. William Penn and the first assembly of Pennsylvania had passed in 1682 what was known as "The Great Law", which expressed the Quaker criminal code. The latter was less vindictive than the earlier prevailing English criminal code, but was repealed in 1718. An act was passed in Pennsylvania in 1794 which assigned the death

penalty only to cases of first degree murder and suggested incarceration for other serious offenses (ACA, 1972: 19).

With the end of the Revolutionary war, reforming the criminal law became a recurrent debate and a heightened issue discussed by all Americans. As the public became more insistent, the freshly formed States began to respond. Shortly afterwards, incarceration took the place of capital and corporal punishment. Philadelphia's Walnut Street jail, for example, was one of the most remarkable institutions introduced at this time. The latter was the source from which the Penitentiary was derived; a construct that greatly influenced the penology of the following century (Rothman, 1971: 61-62).

The penitentiary had assumed Quaker principles and began to be used as an efficient means to stop and remedy all the deviant behaviors in the American society. With their main premises such as organizing, controlling, and reforming the criminals, the early penitentiaries were the object of appreciation and public interest. 1787 is seen as the starting point of the modern penal philosophy in the United States when Benjamin Franklin and Dr. Benjamin Rush held a meeting for a group of Quakers and free thinkers in Philadelphia, who became later the original members of the Philadelphia Prison Society. A declaration was presented by Dr. Rush calling for the revision of the society's treatment and attitude towards criminals. Most importantly, he suggested the construction of a prison displaying housing and treatment differentiation according to the nature of the crime. Shortly after, the American penal philosophy had incorporated most of Rush's proposals and the most striking indices of these early concepts were epitomized by Philadelphia's Walnut Street Jail (Gill, 1972: 111).

The Walnut Street Jail was the first state prison in the United States of America and, thus, represented an important part of a large effort to establish an authoritative and centralized State institution (Sheldon, 2001: 162). It was erected in 1776, but in 1790,

however, an act was passed allowing the construction of a new cell block in the yard of the old congregate-room jail building. The inmates of these new single cells suffered from solitary confinement with strict harsh labor.

The Walnut Street was conceived for two types of housing because it was projected for use as a short term jail and a correctional institution as well. This prison held debtors, law breakers, pre-trial inmates as well as new convicts. Accordingly, the last group of inmates were kept in individual cells whereas the rest were assigned to congregate rooms (Mckelvey, 1977: 8).

First set forth in the United States by the Walnut Street Jail, the single cell system formed one of the most important notions in early American prison development. Prisoners were no more subject to corporal abuses by the other inmates. Separating the prisoners at night and grouping them together to work during the day was a practice that the Walnut Street tightly observed. Celebrated as a success, many visitors were attracted by this institution and its program. As a consequence of its fame, however, the jail soon became so overcrowded with new prisoners.

It is worth mentioning that many of those who visited the Walnut Street Jail had started to plan building prisons in their home states based on this fascinating unique design. In addition, there were some leaders who were inspired by this design and started to initiate new designs for houses of correction as it was the case of Thomas Jefferson, who collaborated with Benjamin Latrobe to establish a pentagonal prison in Richmond, Virginia (ibid. 10). By 1800, state prisons had been founded in ten states: Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Virginia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maryland, Vermont, and New Hampshire. Partially, the reason behind this wave of construction was the belief that criminality had strong bases in the

imperfect American legal system and it was thought that modifying this system would weaken crime (Rothman, 1971: 62).

Although new humanistic ideas had emerged within the field of penology, not all of the constructed prisons were of adequate design or function. For example, it is only in 1827 that the State of Connecticut did construct a new penitentiary at Wethersfield and thus cease the use of the Simsbury copper-mine prison which was an abandoned mine shaft. Throughout its thirty years of existence, prisoners slept in niches in the walls of the mine and were held "in slime-covered caverns with water dripping from the ceiling." (ibid. 90)

Other examples may include Maine's prison at Thomaston which was a series of underground pits, seventy six in number, ten feet deep. At first, they were intended for solitary confinement, but due to overpopulation, many prisoners were kept in each cell. This situation had proved to be fortunate for prisoners, since additional cell mates provided necessary warmth which kept them alive during the long winters (Barnes and Teeters, 1945: 527).

The first American prisons resembled oversized houses and ordinary wooden dwellings. For instance, New Jersey's first prison had not shown strong security with a single wall of average height enclosing parts of the property.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century and the remarkable rise of the prisoners' number, prison designers and administrators soon began to be preoccupied by the strength and the efficiency of custody. A maximum security state prison, for example, was built at Charlestown in Massachusetts. The Board of visitors had praised this prison to be outstandingly secure and well built. Ironically, soon after their remarks were publicized, sixteen prisoners escaped (Rothman, 1971: 90). After the occurrence of other similar incidents

like this, a serious debate was initiated by prison planners about the security and strength of prisons.

The principal strategy that the administrators had followed when building prisons in America was to focus upon the rooms in which the convicts slept and spent most of their time (Carter, et al. 1975: 147). Prisoners in this early time period did not enjoy considerable amounts of mobility within the institutions. Behind this practice was the belief that tedious, repetitive cell housing would make labor a welcome distraction in the inmate's eyes: a privilege, not a punishment (Rothman, 1971:146). It turned out, however, that tediousness of the cells frequently led not only to boredom but even to insanity.

Assuming that prison designs were neutral and void of message is totally erroneous. Early nineteenth century prison facades, for example, were often modeled after military or factory designs. Order and regularity were two aims for which physical layouts were designed. Indeed, form the early days of prison reform through the mid 1800s, many penal institutions had resembled medieval fortresses both in 'functional' and 'impressive' purposes (ibid. 107). The idea behind this resemblance in external appearances was that correctional institutions were expected not only economy and security in design, but also to have a deterrent influence upon the prisoners and the public. Said differently, the penal institution was supposed to inspire horror in the observer. As it was believed then, achieving such effect was possible by the use of oppressive weird decorations as bas-relief chains or dragons above the gates (Johnston, 1973: 27).

Overcrowding, inadequate administrative personnel, and poor physical structures of the institutions were but some of the problems that emerged during this time. Affected by this situation, the Walnut Street Jail was closed in 1835. The whole new Quaker philosophy began to be abandoned in favor of the older easier way of punishment.

The period which stretched between 1816 and 1829 had known New York and Pennsylvania as the leaders in innovative prison design and construction. With a critical view on the Walnut Street Jail, each state extemporized upon the notion of individual incarceration and reading the Bible to encourage repentance and, it was hoped, reform the criminal. First, there was the Auburn or congregate system which was implemented in prisons built at Auburn and later Ossining, New York. Its rival was the so called Pennsylvania or separate system that Pittsburg and Philadelphia institutions followed. Just after these two systems were introduced, some states like Massachusetts, Maryland, Connecticut, and New Jersey hurried to build new prisons or to adjust their existing prison structures (Rothman, 1971: 81). The Auburn and the Pennsylvania systems were highly influential since, during the whole nineteenth century, the evolution of prison design depended exclusively on these two separate systems.

With the acceptance of the Auburn and Pennsylvania systems, architecture had been officially acknowledged to be of great importance in determining and developing penal philosophy. Indeed, architects today exercise great influence over correctional ideologies.

According to the penologists of the day when Auburn and Philadelphia institutions known as Eastern State Penitentiary were constructed, the criminal behavior was believed to be the result of three causes. These were: a harmful environment and a bad entourage of a person, a lack of intelligence and aptitude, and ignorance of right and wrong caused by insufficient knowledge of the Bible. The penal philosophy linked with architecture aimed at an edifice that would cease hurtful outside influence, teach the criminal work skills, and give the offender an occasion to learn the meaning of the right and wrong as mentioned in the Bible. Eastern State and Auburn were the products of this ideology (Nagel, 1973: 110). In addition, the isolationist principle followed by the Auburn and Pennsylvania systems was a result of conviction that contact of and communication between offenders would lead to

further crime after release. It was also believed that since evil temptations to crime were rampant in society at large, total separation from others and strict discipline would turn the offender away from crime (Rothman, 1971: 82).

The very existence of different kinds of prisons, as I have demonstrated above, proves that the policy of imprisonment had never stopped looking for better and more efficient techniques which would ensure more control depending, of course, on the targeted objectives. Indeed, reforming prison is tightly linked with the objectives the government tries to achieve. In the following, I try to provide an account of prison reform, the principal prison reformers and the main penological trends ranging from the retributive, incapacitative, deterrent and rehabilitative philosophies, which profoundly shaped the policy of punishment.

4- Prison Reform Movement

Due to the poor prison conditions in England and the refusal of religious freedom in the United States Prisons, the prison reform movement had appeared. Initially, the prison reform movement emerged in England during the 1700s after some thinkers like John Howard, Cesare Beccaria, and Jeremy Bentham had severely criticized the criminal justice system for its inefficiency and arbitrariness. The principle of "less illegibility" represented the core idea form which prison reform draw its intellectual substance. This principle states that the conditions within the prison should never be better than those of the lowest stratum of the working population. Basically, this principle was believed to target the deterrence of both crime and poverty. Individuals were expected to choose to work of their own free will in the open labor market as opposed to committing crimes and going to prison (Shelden, 2001: 159).

John Howard was an ex-prisoner and English reformer who saw firsthand the appalling situation of prisons in England. As an elected sheriff of the Bedfordshire Prison, Howard began to implement some changes. Prison design, disciplinary procedure and

satisfying the inmates' physical needs were the basic points stressed by Howard. In addition to this, he called for the implementation of the process of housing male and female inmates in different facilities, as well as housing juveniles in individual cells. He recommended all cells be ventilated, cleaned daily, and scoured with lime twice a year (Johnson and Wolf, 2003: 184).

Other English prison reformers include Jeremy Bentham and Elizabeth Frye. The former had supported solitary confinement and healthy prison conditions. For Bentham, educating the inmates and obliging them to follow a certain regular regimen of clothing and bathing are effective instruments for making reform. Interestingly, though he opposed prison abuse, Bentham endorsed the use of gagging to subdue inmates, denial of food until a job task was complete, and placement in a strait jacket in response to violence (Cooper, 1981: 677).

Elizabeth Fry, for her part, was a Quaker who visited London prisons and got inspired to reform English prisons through the use of religion. Fry distributed clothing to female inmates and strongly encouraged them to accept Christ in their lives. She established a school within the prison as well as employment opportunities. They were employed in sewing, knitting, and spinning, with the profits of their labor returned to them. For Fry, inmates should intensify the reading of the Bible and their classification should be done according to their character rather than the, as it was common in her times, severity of their crimes, religion, general faith and their ability to perform labor (ibid).

The English penal reform movement significantly influenced the prisoners' rights movement in the United States. The penal reform movement began with concerns for a prisoner's health and well-being, as well as interests over prison architecture, structure, and discipline. The use of discipline to maintain order within the prison, then, was considered to be a new remarkable but a debate raising historical phase.

Generally speaking, the new era of prisoners' rights began in the early 1960s in the wake of Civil Rights movement with the recognition by federal courts that prisoners were individuals with full constitutional rights (Jacobs, 1980: 431). In the United States, the prisoners' rights movement was viewed by many as a sociopolitical movement which made a broad scale effort to redefine the status of prisoners in a democratic society. It was initiated by organized groups who wanted to establish and gain the rights of the prisoners that are viewed as "victimized minorities", since a majority of prisoners were poor and of Afro- American origins (ibid).

For approximately two hundred and thirty years, imprisonment has been the central mode of criminal sanction in the United States. Through time, penal philosophies have developed, competed, waned and constantly been replaced by new supposedly superior ideologies. Noticeably enough, the design of prisons has reflected the developments that occurred in penology. More often than not, the changes in penal philosophy, and therefore prison design, have appeared when prison administrators have realized that the systems and goals of imprisonment existing at that time were not efficient. Consequently, penologists as well as architects have adopted new ideas and tried to implement them to create a prison which serves the predicted purposes of reform.

Among the reasons that led to the changing and the reform of correctional institutions was the great interest that the general public expressed to know what happens inside the penal institutions. Examples about this increasing interest about the conditions of prisons can be seen in the 1780s, the 1830s, the 1880s, and 1930s. The first period of heed (1780s) was due to a prison reform movement started in Europe by John Howard. As far as the next two periods (the 1830s and the 1880s) are concerned, they were closely linked with the introduction of momentous new penal methods that try to cope with the prevailing problems in the field of penology. Interestingly, in the 1930s, Hollywood had noticeably contributed to

the "conscientisation" of the public about the inhuman conditions inside prisons. The "Big House" type movies produced by Hollywood had dramatized the prisoners' stories and produced numerous films about the inside conditions of prisons.

Prison reform, in simple words, corresponds with the different calls that some reformers like Howard, Beccaria and Bentham, among others, had made. Surely, what caused such thinkers to ask for reform is the constant change of the ends of punishment per se. philosophy had accompanied this change and, undoubtedly, shaped what society view as the social ends of imprisonment. My aim in the following is to summarize the most important philosophical traditions that explained and justified imprisonment.

5- Penal philosophy

Through time, many basic purposes of penal institutions have been modeled. They are: retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, rehabilitation (restoration). These objectives are primarily influenced by a society's conception of correction, and its moral-ethical orientation; the perceived value of security as compared to individual rights (Nagel, 1973: 12).

4-1-Retribution

Revenge or retribution, also known as "Just deserts theory", is one of the oldest principles that tried to justify punishment of the prisoners. This equation of punishing the offender according to the gravity of his/her offense finds its inspiration in the Judeo-Christian tradition and the Mosaic laws of the Old Testament that advanced the idea of "an eye for an eye". Regardless of questions of offender culpability or preventing future crimes, offenders under retributive philosophy simply get what they deserve. Justified on its proper grounds, the retributive principle has marked Western history and oriented the public thinking about how justice should be implemented in democratic societies. (Banks, 2005: 96)

The basis of criminal sentencing in the retributive theory was the principle of "let the punishment fit the crime". Punishment, under this philosophy, is oriented generally to fit the moral gravity of the crime rather than the characteristics of the offender. Later, this principle of punishment was modified and started to recognize and take into consideration the fact that some offenders may be less blameworthy due to factors outside their control like those who were immature or mentally confused.

The retributive theory has been criticized at several levels. To begin, strict penalties based only on the nature of the offense are often utterly rigid. Then, the principle of "an eye for an eye" has proven to be of limited applicability. For instance, how to sanction acts like drug use, adultery, prostitution and traffic violation. Finally, to assume that punishment should be proportional to the moral gravity of the offense is invalid in pluralistic societies since it is impossible to establish a public consensus in the rankings of the moral gravity of particular offenses.

4-2- **Incapacitation**

Punishment under this philosophy involves several practices designed solely to make the criminal's physical capacity and his deviant acts less persistent for reducing the offender's subsequent desire to engage in misconduct. Its target is of a utilitarian nature since it focuses principally on the eradication of all the opportunities that individuals may have to commit a crime. To achieve this goal, prisoners' physical capacities are terribly restrained and, needless to say, the conditions of confinement are so deplorable. This deterrent effect, however, is not an essential component in this philosophy of incapacitation in its earliest forms. Said otherwise, some incapacitating practices like confinement in military stockade and some barbarous practices do not lead to later reform in one's behavior whatsoever (quoted in Bosworth, 2005: 463-465).

Examples about the early use of the philosophy of incapacitation include the early tribal practice of banishment to the wilderness, the exile of citizens in ancient Greek society and the English system of transporting the convicts to other colonies in the 17th and 18th centuries. In modern times, the practice of political exile finds its inspiration in incapacitation as a philosophy since it involves the physical removal of individuals from their original communities to other places in order to diminish their propensity to wrongdoing. Furthermore, other instruments like the electronic shackles to survey the offenders in open spaces, breathalyzers to prevent drunk drivers from starting their cars, and chastity bells to prevent promiscuity have been inspired by this philosophy of incapacitating individuals.

It is important to mention that while the early principles of incapacitation targeted the reduction of the physical opportunity for crime and deviance, the modern versions of this philosophy are more "forward-looking" since it works for changing the offenders' wrong motivations once they are not physically restrained from committing deviance. Usually incapacitation principles are mingled with other philosophies of punishment and may even serve as crucial premises on which programs of deterrence and rehabilitation would be formulated.

4-3- **Deterrence**

From the verb "to deter" which means to hinder and to discourage. Deterrence as a philosophy that inspired a lot of penologists is interested in the relationship between sanctions and human behavior and, most importantly, tries to find the most effective punishment to make the offender achieve conformity.

Under this philosophy, the concept of conformity is of great importance. To say that punishment has a deterrent effect, it should lead the criminal to conformity within society. In other words, the deterrent value of punishments is connected with the characteristics of those

punishments that should be severe, certain, and rapid. Deterrence either dissuades the "criminal/ offender" who is locked up, or other potential offenders, from engaging in future acts of crime, because they fear the consequences of punishment.

Ihekwoaba states that the philosophy of deterrence is constituted of two types: general and specific deterrence. General deterrence, on the one hand, tries to stop crime among the general population who have not yet committed criminal actions. Examples include the application of the death penalty and the use of corporal punishment. By these practices, it aims to make the population aware of the awfulness of official sanctions and, ultimately, to dissuade them from committing crimes. Specific deterrence, on the other hand, is intended to deter the individual from committing that crime in the future. For example, a drunk driver would be discouraged from drinking when driving because of the disagreeable experience he suffered from when arrested or having his license taken away or his car seized (quoted in Bosworth, 2005).

4-4- Rehabilitation

Behind this philosophy lays the principle which asserts that through the punishment of offenders we reform them. The final aim of the rehabilitative philosophy is to restore the convict's former values and useful place within society through the utilization of some techniques including: education and training. Contemporary appellations like "correctional facilities", "reformatories," and "therapeutic community" probably show to what extent rehabilitation as a philosophy had influenced contemporary penology (quoted in Bosworth, 2005: 831-834)

Contrary to other penal philosophies like retribution which calls for standardized punishments based on the importance of the offense, rehabilitation, on the other hand, focuses on the specific characteristics of individual offenders that require treatment and intervention.

The same crime by two different individuals may receive unequal sentence according to each offender's personal situation.

Basically, therefore, the American penal philosophy has passed through several ideological stages as we have shown in the section regarding general U.S. prison history. From the early times up till the mid- 1800s, the purpose of incarceration was retribution and incapacitation which were implemented first with congregate, then solitary confinement with the bible. By the 1870's, the principle goal of penology was the reformation of the prisoner; confinement with the Bible began to be combined with hard labor under strict discipline. When rehabilitation took precedence in the 1930's, "prisoner classification was instituted in prisons of varying design and prisoner mobility" (Barnes and Teeters, 1945: 641). Rehabilitation and reintegration, at present, are the essential targets of penal policies and institutions.

It should be noted, however, that imprisonment and penology have never succeeded to mind the issue for which they were designed that is, principally, to stop crime. Indeed, as I am going to demonstrate in the following statistics, the United States of America has the rather dubious honor of having the world's largest prison system and paradoxically the most increasing number of criminality (Asatar, 2008: 01).

5- America: The World's Largest Prison System

The United States has built the world's biggest prison system (Lynch, 2007: 1). There are a lot of necessary considerations that contribute to making a prison system better. Being bigger, however, is not automatically one of them. The U.S prison system is ten times larger today than it was in the mid 1970s. Various factors had contributed to making America the number one in terms of prison and prisoners' number.

One of the most outstanding tenets of American culture is the belief the bigger is always the better, big houses, big cars, and big dreams. According to the International Centre for Prison Studies, Americans have the biggest crime and also the world's biggest correctional system with 1709 carceral institutions, followed by Russia with 1010 prisons. This desire for bigness, however, has created in America a big problem as well.

A good prison system is one that has crime suppression effect, or one that reduces the level of crime in society. A heightened debate has arisen in the American academic sphere, therefore, about whether prison and imprisonment leads really to the reduction of crime in society.

On the one hand, some thinkers argue that prison has a direct relation to crime and with a more conservative penal policy the crime rate in society would be remarkably reduced. For example, John Dillulio, one of the leading proponents of prison expansion, published in 1994 an article in the *Wall Street Journal* entitled, *Let 'Em Rot* where he reviews President Clinton's crime control policy. The article discharges, as the source of rising crime rates, the decline of imprisonment in the 1980s, reductions in sentence length, and a general liberalization of crime control policy. After making reference to a handful of supportive studies, DiIulio ends his discussion by noting that "if the president breaks faith with the public on crime, he will be a three-time loser: morally, intellectually and politically" (quoted in Lynch, 2007: 5).

Additionally, in their 1995 report, *Crime and Punishment in America*, the National Center for Policy Analysis (NCPA) argues that a liberalization in the response to crime had caused the rise in crime during the 1960s and 1970s. The same position is maintained by Gary Becker, Nobel Prize winner, arguing that because human beings are rational actors, their behavior is seen as responsive to external conditions such as punishment.

These rational actors, Becker adds, would respond to punishment by avoiding criminal behavior (Becker, 1986: 169-217).

However, to assume that prisons are the absolute and the most effective means for controlling crime seems to be erroneous. Indeed, many researchers have questioned the validity of this theory. In 1998, one of the leading criminal justice policy experts in the United States, Alfred Blumstein, argued that:

> even though incarceration rates increased steadily and are now almost quadruple what they were 20 years ago, most crime rates have remained confined within a fairly narrow range, with no strong trend. Perhaps most strikingly, we have not seen the anticipated downward trend in crime rates that might have been expected as a result of the growth in incarceration. (1998: 127)

Furthermore, the phenomena of criminality's rise won't be reduced only by building a lot of prisons to keep law offenders inside. Crime is the result of many social problems that an individual may encounter in his daily life like employment, drugs and poverty. The following table provides some statistics about the number the prisons and prisoners in the U.S.A.

Year	Number incarcerated	Year	Number incarcerated	Year	Number incarcerated	Year	Number incarcerated	Year	Number incarcerated
1925	91,669 (79)	1941	165,439 (124)	1957	195,414 (113)	1973	204,211 (96)	1989	680,907 (276)
1926	97,991 (83)	1942	150,384 (112)	1958	205,643 (117)	1974	218,466 (102)	1990	739,980 (297)
1927	109,983 (91)	1943	137,220 (103)	1959	208,105 (117)	1975	240,593 (111)	1991	789,610 (313)
1928	116,390 (96)	1944	132,456 (100)	1960	212,953 (117)	1976	262,833 (120)	1992	846,277 (332)
1929	120,496 (98)	1945	133,649 (98)	1961	220,149 (119)	1977	278,141 (126)	1993	932,074 (359)
1930	129,453 (104)	1946	140,079 (99)	1962	218,830 (117)	1978	294,396 (132)	1994	1,016,691 (389)
1931	137,082 (110)	1947	151,305 (105)	1963	217,283 (114)	1979	301,470 (133)	1995	1,085,022 (411)
1932	137,997 (110)	1948	155,977 (106)	1964	214,336 (111)	1980	315,974 (139)	1996	1,137,722 (427)
1933	136,810 (109)	1949	163,749 (109)	1965	210,895 (108)	1981	353,673 (154)	1997	1,194,581 (444)

1934	138,316 (109)	1950	166,123 (109)	1966	199,654 (102)	1982	395,516 (171)	1998	1,245,402 (461)
1935	144,180 (113)	1951	165,123 (107)	1967	194,896 (98)	1983	419,346 (179)	1999	1,304,074 (463)
1936	145,038 (113)	1952	168,233 (107)	1968	187,914 (94)	1984	443,398 (188)	2000	1,321,137 (469)
1937	152,741 (118)	1953	173,579 (108)	1969	196,007 (97)	1985	480,568 (202)	2001	1,345,217 (470)
1938	160,285 (123)	1954	182,901 (112)	1970	196,429 (96)	1986	522,084 (217)	2002	1,380,516 (476)
1939	179,818 (137)	1955	158,780 (112)	1971	198,061 (95)	1987	560,812 (231)	2003	1,408,361 (482)
1940	173,706 (131)	1956	189,565 (113)	1972	196,092 (93)	1988	603,732 (247)	2004	1,433,793 (486)

Table 1: The number of the incarcerated and rates of imprisonment in the United States of America (1925_2004)

The imprisonment rate which is indicated in red designates how many individuals are incarcerated per 100,000.

Data used in this table are extracted from The Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook), and from data maintained by the National Institute of Justice (http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/).

Analysis of table 01

The above table contains data about the number of the incarcerated individuals as well as the rates of imprisonment in the United States of America from 1925 to 2004. By examining the table, one can clearly notice that the rapidly expanding U.S. prison population began in 1973. Shortly after 1973, in 1976 to be exact, the number of the incarcerated grew to reach 262,833 inmates in U.S. prisons, which was twice the number of people incarcerated in 1930.

The mid 1970s is a point of departure of the America's prison population growth. It is shown that over the period starting from 1976 to 2000, imprisonment doubled two more times: By 1982, the number of people incarcerated was twice the number

incarcerated in 1973; in 1992, the number of imprisoned people doubled the 1983 total. What is also remarkable is that the time it took the prison population to double has significantly contracted. Before the 1970s, the prison population doubled once in forty years; since 1973 it doubled during the ten years from 1973 to 1983, and again during the nine years from 1983 to 1992 (Lynch, 2007: 51).

The table, certainly, indicates to what extent the doubling of America's prison population is troubling. Quite clearly, the number of years it is taking for the prison population to double has decreased. Out of the statistics from 1976 to 2003, one would expect the U.S. prison population to double about once a decade. If one takes this rise as an indication of the future, then by 2035, there would be more than 16 million men and women in American prisons! That's a lot of people behind bars, and a lot of money to spend on a crime control strategy of dubious worth (Clear, 1998 quoted in Lynch, 2007: 57).

However, the fact that the number of inmates in American prisons had doubled between 1930 and 1976 is in itself unremarkable if we take into consideration that by 1976 the U.S. population had increased by about 74 percent over its 1930 level. To find a solution for this problem, the rate of imprisonment is introduced which indicates how many individuals are incarcerated per 100,000population in the United States.

I can divide my study of the rates of imprisonment, as indicated in the table, into two periods; before and after the 1970s. First, the period before the 1970s had known a fluctuating rate of imprisonment both in an upward and downward direction. It was maintained between 104 to 108 inmates per 100,000 citizens. During that period, the rate of imprisonment reached a high of 137 (in 1939) per 100,000 citizens. Probably, the large increase recorded in 1939 reflects the dramatically transformed social and economic conditions associated with the Great Depression (Lynch, 2007: 51-54).

In contrast to this former period, the rate of growth in imprisonment after the 1970s was considerably larger. Starting from 1973, the imprisonment rate has never stopped from increasing. One can notice that in only ten years from 1975 to 1985 the rate of imprisonment has terribly doubled (111- 202). Ten years later, the imprisonment rate had again doubled to reach 411 per 100,000 citizens and, unfortunately, still develops.

To conclude, when referring to the data in the table above, one can notice that the rate and number of people imprisoned in the United States can be divided into two large periods: 1925–1972, and 1973 to the present. The first period was marked by upward and downward swings in the use of incarceration, whereas the later period was marked by a continual high rate of growth in imprisonment never seen during the former time period.

Conclusion

The first section of this chapter demonstrated that the time period when Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker* were released (the 1960s and the 1970s) is politically tumultuous. The generic concept of counterculture may summarize such an explosive period. Indeed, different movements, like the Civil Rights and Women's movements, and radically intellectual movements, such as the New Left, have appeared at that period and questioned the dominant discourse.

Through my exploration of the historical development of prison, in the second section, one can easily understand that this institution is merely a cultural construction that developed and became sophisticated through time. Many historical events and philosophical ideas have contributed to make the prison's importance unquestionable to a degree that modern countries like the United States of America are building more and more prisons. Though its function is generally assumed to be that of holding the criminals and protecting society, one should ask the question about the extent to which can we rely on prison to reduce

crime rather than trying to think about the social and economic factors that lead to committing crimes.

The issue of imprisonment to punish individuals, therefore, seems to take another dimension. Understanding the institution of prison and its discourse demands serious commitment and hard work so as to reveal the hidden aims of this institution. Probably, the best example about the thinkers who endeavored in this sense is the French thinker Michel Foucault. In his works, Foucault argues that modern institutions like prisons and asylums are places where power relations manifest themselves and docile bodies are produced. I am going to show in the following chapter the groundbreaking theoretical perspectives that Foucault advanced to argue how imprisonment aims to create docile conforming bodies.

Chapter Two

Presentation of Materials

Introduction

The present chapter is separated into two sections. In the first section, I am going to speak about the adaptation process of Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* (1980) respectively from *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) by Ken Kesey and *Accomplices to the Crime: the Arkansas Prison Scandal* (1969) by Tom Murton and Joe Hyams. In the second section of this chapter, precisely, I am going to present a concise account of the most important theoretical perspectives the French thinker Michel Foucault advanced in theorizing the intricacies of power and punishment. I would explain as well the Foucauldian groundbreaking views about the institutions of prison and asylum in relation with the dialectic of power and knowledge and other related concepts namely: discipline and panoptican, as strategies to produce docile bodies.

Section one: *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *Brubaker*

1-*One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*: from novel to film

> One day, I got a package from California. There was a book inside I'd never heard of but when I started to read I saw right away that this was the best material I'd come across in America
>
> (quoted in Kobesova, J. 2002)

Thus Milos Forman explains his very first encounter with Ken Kesey's novel. The adaptation of Ken Kesey's *One Flew over the Cuckoos' Nest* into a film which has the same title needs to be approached carefully. Generally speaking, the filmed version has retained many of the original novel's themes and motifs. Both dramatize a big outcry to break away from conformity and to favor individual as well as spiritual freedoms. Additionally, the names of the characters and their roles in the novel are kept unchanged by Forman in his filmed version. Indeed, one can notice the presence of approximately all the characters

including the most important ones like McMurphy, Nurse Ratched and Chief Bromden as well as the characters whose role is less emphasized.

In spite of their seemingly overall resemblance, the film, however, differs in several significant ways from the novel. These differences, that I am going to mention later, are probably the result of the dispute between Ken Kesey and the film producers, Michael Douglas and Saul Zaentz. It is even said that Ken Kesey has vowed he will never view this film.

The film, released in 1975, won Academy Awards for Best Picture, Best Actor (Jack Nicholson), Best Actress (Louis Fletcher), Best Screenplay (Lawrence Hauben and Bo Goldman), and Best Director (Milos Forman) and it is nominated for an additional four. Since its release, the film has been rated as one of the Top 100 American Films by the American Film Institute.

To begin with, the story's point of view is the most remarkable difference between the film and the novel. In the novel, Chief Bromden is the narrator through which the story of the symbolic battle between Nurse Ratched and Patrick McMurphy is revealed. Indeed, when we read Ken Kesey's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*, one can notice that Chief Bromden is the central character and the hero who undergoes the most notable changes that occurred in the novel. In his attempt to give details and narrate the events that happened in the mental institution, Chief reveals a lot of biographical information about his own life before his institutionalization. The reader is informed that Chief, a paranoid schizophrenic, a war veteran, and a half Native Indian, is the son of Tee Ah Millatoona; an American Indian whose wife had conspired with the U.S government to emasculate her husband.

The filmed version supplants Chief as the story's narrator. In Milos film, there is no slightest indication as to his personal background. Contrary to the novel, Chief's role, in

spite of his incontestable importance, is downgraded to the second place after McMurphy becomes the film's hero. Furthermore, Chief Bromden, while fully communicative in the novel, is depicted as a very silent character who, along the whole film, mutters only some barley unintelligible sentences.

The novel presents McMurphy as being boastful and an unpredictable individual who can easily use physical violence to achieve his ends. The movie, on the contrary, portrays the same character as a complex person whose sense of humanity and charitable personality are limitless. If McMurphy's greediness is stressed in the novel which describes him as a person cheating the other patients for his own financial profit, the film lessens this point and shows him as only winning some cigarettes from his comrades. The impressions that we get from reading this practice in the novel or watching this scene in the movie are surely different.

What also different from the novel is the fact that at the very beginning of the film, McMurphy declares he was convicted for statutory rape on a teenage girl who lied about her age. While in the film this girl is thirteen years old, in the novel she is only nine years old.

It is also important to mention that some scenes from the novel are completely omitted from Milos Forman's cinematic version. One of these scenes is that of Cheswick suicide when, feeling betrayed by McMurphy, decides to drown himself in a swimming pool that we don't see in the film.

In addition, there is a sequence that was changed by the director Milos Forman. That sequence is the fishing episode. In the novel, we find that it is a planned event that Nurse Ratched repetitively tried to sabotage. McMurphy subsequently succeeds to convince Doctor Spivey to join the group when the prostitute Candy arrives in the car. With the complete

omission of Doctor Spivey, the filmed version portrays McMurphy hijacking an institutional bus and, then, inviting the patients to participate in a symbolic rebellion.

In his article *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest: A Tale of Two Decades,* Thomas J. Slater argues that the differences existing between the novel and the filmed version are the result of two main problems that Milos Forman had faced. First, the majority of the events of the novel are narrated by the paranoid-schizophrenic Chief Bromden who sees things that nobody can see (quoted in Bloom, 2007:123). Second, Thomas J. Slater continues, Forman had faced the problem of making Kesey's liberal early sixties theme of struggling against conformity relevant to the mid seventies. He asserts that Milos Forman had to make the story

> contemporary without losing its essence. He was successful mainly because he gave the novel's unusual narrative perspective to his camera and transformed Kesey's mythic characters and surrealist setting into human beings in a unique but recognizable world. (ibid)

It follows that between the novel and the filmed version of *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest,* there exist some differences and changes. In addition to some technical reasons, these differences are, principally, operated by the director so as to give to the movie another spirit which is convenient for new challenges wider aspirations that appeared during the seventies America.

2- *Brubaker*: from book to film

It should be noted that *Accomplices to the Crime: The Arkansas Prison Scandal* (1969) by Tom Murton and Joe Hyames provides the inspirational source upon which Stuart Rosenberg relies to produce his film *Brubaker* in 1980. Hyames and Murton, who already worked as a superintendent from February 1967 to March 1968, had gathered their efforts and written this biographical memoir to depict to the large public the miserable situation from which the Arkansas State Penitentiary suffered.

Between the book and the film, a lot of shifts had occurred; missing or added scenes can be easily noticed. The problems which appear when adapting a book into a film, which may create a heightened debate about the dangers, worthiness and the originality of the cinematic adaptations, is explained by Susan Hayward saying that:

> film adaptations are both more and less than the original. More not just because they are in excess of the written word (through having both image and sound). But more also because they are a mise-en-abîme of authorial texts and therefore of productions of meaning. *(2001: 6)*

To begin with, one example of these differences is that the book, divided into 25 chapters, opens with giving some details about the trip to join the Arkansas. Contrary to the filmed version, the first chapter "Going In" begins, as its name suggests, by revealing the journey of the narrator from Illinois toward Tucker Prison Farm to take his new work as a superintendent. This voyage, under a thin rain during eleven hours, is a source of desperation and agony to the narrator, leaving his family behind him and marching toward an unknown future as a chief warden of a prison reputed for corruption and extreme violence. (Murton and Hyams, 1969: 1).

The dreary situation of Tucker Prison has been largely documented in the second chapter (Oh, Captain) of the book. Indeed, the writers use some transcripts and tapes recording secretly the beating of inmates by the superintendent Jim Bruton as well as the findings of the Criminal Investigation Division that the governor Orval Faubus ordered in August, 1966. Noticeably, in the film, the spectator, though 'witnesses' it by his proper eyes at the very beginning of the movie, is not informed about the existence of reports about corruption only after the protagonist Brubaker discovered the skeletons. In reading the second chapter of the book, one can find letters written by inmates telling the brutalities and the extortion they suffered from. These letters led to the formation of investigatory commissions which discovered the existence of "the Tucker telephone, teeter board, straps, blackjacks,

knives, whiskey bottles…etc (Murton and Hyams, 1969: 9). It is important to mention that the director, right in the first scene, makes an allusion to the awful and non humanitarian prison conditions that wait for the prisoners by depicting prison guards throwing carelessly a body of a dead fugitive prisoner into a bus. This first scene like the second chapter of the book, aims to depict and denounce the terrible conditions where the inmates of the Arkansas prisons live.

Contrary to the film, where Henry Brubaker enters the prison as an inmate to secretly discover the prisoners' situation, Murton had been escorted by Captain Brown all along the trip and is informed about his duties as a new warden directly after his arrival. This added scene seems to be the result of Rosenberg's creativity to attract the audience and create a feeling of suspense. Undeniably, the director, thanks to such 'adjusted' scenes, gives a touch of suspense to the story with more thrill and less realism as it is the case in the book. The viewers of the film, unlike the readers of the book, are in complete ignorance of Brubaker's real mission which would be discovered only later. The postponing of this reality is a genius trick from Rosenberg to push the audiences, who, at the beginning, would probably question the worthiness of the film itself, to, ultimately, reconsider their arguments about prison and prisoners by wholeheartedly assuming the role of the protagonist Brubaker and his noble mission. Surely, the director achieves his aim by making the audience more committed to the urgency of reforming the prison.

Probably, the most striking difference between the novel and *Brubaker* is the unbalanced chronological order through which the scenes of the film, unlike the events of the novel, are presented. For instance, from the very beginning of the book, one can read that the narrator Tom had discovered on Cummins Prison Farm the skeletons of three prisoners, he says:

> my story which was to reach its grim climax eleven months later in January, 1968, when I discovered on Cummins Prison Farm the

> skeletons of three prisoners who had been murdered there. (Murton and Hyams, 1969: 3)

In the film this detail, which constitutes the climax of its narrative, is delayed until later in the film plot. This discovery, as portrayed in the novel, represents the starting point that leads to the collapse of the main character, Brubaker. Indeed, from the moment when Brubaker, in the film, and Tom Murton, in the book, discover the skeletons, their troubles begin to intensify. Out of their sense of duty and responsibility, the investigation had been intensified despite the governmental refusal to carry on the researches and the public revelation of the findings. Ultimately, whether in the book or the filmed version, the result is having Murton and Brubaker fired.

In terms of the general idea, both works discuss the theme of torture. Like the detailed narration of the prisoners' persecution in Arkansas prisons by Tom Murton, Rosenberg, through the movie, depicts the inmates endure terrible sufferings that the "trusties" inflict upon the prisoners. Lots of methods are used to torture the incarcerated including rape, violence and scarcity of food. Surely, the audience would be profoundly influenced when seeing the Tucker Telephone, which Rosenberg doesn't forget to describe, but, purposely, uses a whole scene to show this terrible instrument that, usually attached to the prisoner's big toe and genital, causes terrible pains. However, one can read in "The Freeworld missionaries", the eight chapter of the book, that "the only men in Arkansas with experience as prison guards were ex-inmates […] I decided to hire former inmates as officers" (ibid: 64). This point shows dissimilarity from the filmed version where Rosenberg depicts Brubaker hiring instead prisoners who are still doing their sentences.

Probably, the major difference that distinguishes Rosenberg's *Brubaker* from Murton and Hyams' book is the total change of the names as included in the book. Indeed, the names of the Governor Rockfeller, Tom Murton and his assistant Herman Melton…etc are

completely omitted and replaced by other fictive names. Murton and Rockfeller, for example, are known in the film respectively under the names of Brubaker and Senator Hite. Despite these differences, the book and film have common characteristics and discuss the same theme which is torture in Arkansas prisons as well as the attempt to reform penal system.

Generally speaking, one can say that compared to Forman's adaptation of Ken Kesey's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest,* Rosenberg's adaptation of Murton and Hyams' *Accomplices to the Crime: The Arkansas Prison Scandal* is a less faithful one. The reason for this is that, while Forman relies heavily on the original novel, Rosenberg keeps the general theme but considerably changes the structure of the original work and follows his creativity. To understand this point, I should discuss further the strategies and the process of adaptation.

Adaptation is understood as the re-casting of a work in one medium to fit another, such as the re-casting of novels and plays as film or television scripts (Cuddon, 1989: 8). From the beginning of cinema, adaptation was not meant merely to attract huge numbers from the middle class to this cheap entertainment but also as a means of implementing a pedagogical value by teaching any given nation about its classics and cultural background.

Adaptation creates a new story which is not identical to the original. It is believed that though they are based on the original work, characters, events and the narrative become independent and take a new life in film; a life that is shaped by the directors objectives and style. Susan Hayward explains that there are three types of literary adaptations: first, the traditionally known notion of adapting a literary classic; second, adaptations of plays to screen; and finally the adaptation of contemporary texts not yet determined as classics but subscribe within the canon of popular fiction. Of these three, she continues, it is the second that remains most faithful to the original (Hayward, 2001: 4).

It is important to mention, however, that the differences, which one can notice between some novels and their filmed versions that happen along the process of adaptation, are due to "the synergy and the desire for sameness and reproduction*"* on the one hand, and "the acknowledgment of difference*",* on the other hand. Adaptation, Susan continues, is, principally, based on "elision and deliberate lack and at the same time in the privileging, even to excess, of certain narrative elements for strategies over others." (Hayward, 2001: 6).

Due to some political and economic considerations, filmmakers operate some changes when adapting a given work of literature into screen. As is the case with Stuart Rosenberg when producing *Brubaker***,** it is more appropriate to use fake names and to avoid the use of real ones. By doing so in a fictive way, the director was able to avoid political complications and, at the same time, succeeded to transmit his message about the urgency of reforming prisons by brilliantly discussing the theme of torture and punishment.

In the following, I try to clarify Michel Foucault's theoretical perspectives about punishment and his examination of the institutions of prison and asylum as efficient means used by the government to control society and create "docile bodies" through a set of strategies namely power/knowledge, discipline and surveillance.

Section two: Foucault, power and the creation of docile bodies in prison

Because my work tries to study the themes of power, punishment and docile bodies in Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker* through a Foucauldian approach, I provide, in the following, a concise explanation of Michel Foucault's ideas in general, and about prison and asylum in particular, as two institutions of punishment where power is exercised to produce docile bodies.

Jurgen Habermas commented in 1984, that "within the circle of the philosophers of my generation who diagnose our times, Foucault has most lastingly influenced the Zeitgeist" (quoted in Olssen, 1999: 01). Quite different readings of Foucault's biography were written before and after his death. In some standard versions, his academic success is emphasized. One can read that Foucault, a son of a successful doctor, was a brilliant student at the Ecole Normale Superieure. His groundbreaking works as well as his engagement in a series of provocative dialogues and questionings of what had previously been considered as self evident made Foucault the philosopher of the modern times par excellence. He is considered to be a major figure in every humanistic and social scientific discipline (Gary, 2005: 01).

However, there is another equally plausible version of Foucault's biography. Indeed, one can read that Foucault was a brilliant but emotionally troubled son of an authoritarian physician. Because of his homosexuality, while at Ecole Normale Superieure, he attempted suicide several times. His visits to other countries all over the world are interpreted as being attempts to run away from the French society. In spite of his remarkable intellectual success, his life was spent in seeking extreme sensations or, as he called them, "limit- experiences", from drugs and sadomasochistic sex, and, at the age of 60, he died of AIDS, possibly contracted at San Francisco bathhouses (ibid. 02).

If there is disagreement over the life of Foucault, his contribution to all disciplines is unquestionably important. In general, he was not only to become France's most prominent post-war philosopher but, as David Macey (1993: xi) has observed, "he successfully crossed the great divide that separates the purely academic world from the broader cultural sphere." The focus should be placed on his works by trying to understand his major theoretical arguments and exanimation of the technologies that make the individual a docile body.

Because the present paper deals with power and punishment in Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker* and tries to show how patients and prisoners are controlled and made docile, I need to provide an elaboration of Michel Foucault's position vis-à-vis punishment in prison and asylums that he considers as cultural products which developed through history and become characteristics of the modern societies.

Foucault's studies about madness, crime and sexuality are most often read in terms of the notion of 'govermentality'. Indeed, it would be impossible to understand the notions of power and punishment in the two movies, unless we situate these notions within the broader sphere of govermentality. The latter concept has constituted the major problematic and the analytical theme that Foucault tries to analyze within his works especially in the course of the 1970's. Barry Smart, in his book *Michel Foucault (1988)*, explains that the notion of 'govermentality' is used to describe specific ways of administering and governing individuals notably in the case of modern Western societies with their liberal and neoliberal political technologies to direct and manage the conduct of individuals. (1988: xiv).

The term govermentality is a combination of the words govern and mentality, and is commonly defined as the "art of government" or governing. The problematic of government, in the Foucauldian thinking, has moved from its rather limited scope to include not only the technologies of governing others but also the technologies of self-government. Govermentality, thus, has acquired a rather challenging meaning, as it comes to denote the analysis of how a set of truth obligations like self examination come to be associated with the constitution and transformation of the self. In other words, the Foucauldian notion of 'govermentality'

> addresses the question of how our conduct and that of others is formed, directed, and regulated by means of a series of practices and an associated succession of different forms of rationality. (Smart, xv: 1988).

Governmentality, said in simple words, includes the practices of government as well as the way people govern or conduct themselves. Several terms may be used to further understand the concept of govermentality namely technologies of power and technologies of the self. By technologies of power, Foucault means the resources and the different strategies used to help develop good behavior with the idea of creating positive attitudes and avoiding negative ones. Technologies of self, on the other hand, turn around the capacity of the individual to control and therefore govern themselves by the restriction of their "negative conducts" while promoting the "good ones". Both technologies overlap and work together, helping to define and fix the roles of the government, as powerful and dominant, and the governed, as docile conforming bodies, in a particular society.

Modern institutions like prisons and asylums are perfect examples where power relations operate to control individuals. Knowledge, discipline and observation are strategies used not only inside these institutions but even outside their walls. Inside such institutions, as I shall demonstrate later in this work, power is exercised to produce docile conforming bodies. In the following, therefore, further illustration is provided to clarify what Foucault means by power and how the latter produces docile bodies by the use of different strategies namely discipline and too much observation.

1. Power

In Foucault's thinking about the relations between society, individuals, groups and institutions, the power problem figures as a central issue. He investigates this problem from a critical viewpoint in books such as: *The Birth of the Clinic* (1963), and in *Discipline and Punish*. As Sara Mills argues in her book *Michel Foucault* (2003), the most important idea emerging from all these works is that the privileged place to observe power resides in the different relations between the individual and the society, especially in its institutions (2003: 36). Foucault, therefore, tries to study how various institutions exert power on groups and

individuals, and how the latter impose their own identity and resistance to the effects of power.

It is wrong, Foucault argues, to consider power as something that the institutions possess and use repressively against individuals and groups. Foucault tries to move the analysis far from viewing power as the oppression of the powerless by the powerful (quoted in Beratni and Fontana, 2003: 31). His aim is to examine how power operates in day to day interactions between people and institutions. Foucault, indeed, assumes that power, as I shall clarify in my study of doctors/patients and trusties/ prisoners dialectics, is a set of relations which are dispersed throughout society rather than located within particular institutions such as the State or the Government. In an interview entitled *Critical Theory/Intellectual Theory,* Foucault states:

> I am not referring to Power with a capital P, dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body. In fact, there are power relations. They are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations or within an institution, or an administration.
>
> (quoted in Mills, S. 2003: 35)

Usually, power is conceived as the capacity of a powerful agent to impose his will over the will of the powerless, or the ability to force them to do things against their wish. As such, power is understood as possession, as something owned by those in power. But in Foucault's works about madness crime and sexuality, power is not something that can be owned, but rather something that acts and manifests itself in a certain way; it is more a strategy than a possession.

Mark G.E. Kelly (2009) adds that there are other features that Foucault discussed in his works. First, power is coextensive with resistance; it is productive, it causes positive effects and, because it implies resistance, the relationship between individuals can't be reduced to master-slave or oppressor-victim relations. Second, it is ubiquitous i.e., it can be

found in "any type of relation between the members of society, being a possibility condition for any relation" (2009: 142). Contrary to the Marxist conception then, Foucault believes that power should be viewed differently than repression which forces individuals to obey. As far as the productivity of power, Foucault writes:

> We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. (Foucault, 1991: 194)

The aim of this present section, therefore, is to assert that the most important concept that Foucault advanced in his writings is power. Contrary to other thinkers, Foucault theorizes power as having three characteristics. These characteristics are: 1- power as a relation rather than a possession, 2- the omnipresence of resistance to the status quo, and 3- power as productive rather than repressive. Principally, what power tries to do is to produce docile bodies, bodies that do not only do what the government wants but do it precisely the way the government wants (Foucault, 1991: 138). The production of docile bodies, as I will study further in relation to the two movies, happens through some precise strategies. Probably, the most striking strategy that Foucault studies in *Discipline and Punish* is through the correct training of individuals. The correct training of individuals implies the use of three practices. These three practices are presented below:

A/ **Hierarchical observation** (Foucault, 1991: 170) refers to the sites where individuals can be observed, such as: hospitals, schools and prisons. These institutions are designed in such a way as to facilitate observation of those within them. The old simple arrangement of confinement and enclosure – thick walls and a heavy gate to prevent people from entering or leaving – began to be replaced by the "calculation of openings, of filled and empty spaces, passages and transparencies" (ibid: 172). The notion of Panoptican, that I will discuss later in the third and fourth chapters in relation to the asylum and prison, is of great

importance in the functioning of such sites that basically need a rigid discipline and too much observation as well as a suitable architectural design likely to make surveillance efficiently possible.

B/ **Normalizing judgements** (ibid. 177) refers to the fact that the actions and attributes of each individual are compared with the actions of others. Individuals are assessed and measured, which permit a norm to be established. There are numerous judgers of 'normality', such as psychiatrists, social workers and nurses. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault writes:

> Like surveillance and with it, normalization becomes one of the great instruments of power at the end of the classical age… In a sense the power of normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialities and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another. (Foucault, 1991: 184)

C/ The Examination (ibid. 184) is the third instrument of disciplinary power. It combines the other two instruments mentioned above. Through the examination, the individual can be assessed, classified and corrected. Examinations result in "epidemiological" information, which allow standards to be generated against which individuals can be assessed.

Michel Foucault's general idea, therefore, is to demonstrate that prisons and asylums, like other modern institutions, rely on enclosure and visual (Panoptic) surveillance for their successful operation. To produce docile bodies, as I have already mentioned, the three above characteristics are needed. These three practices help to produce a nuanced system of power relations inside the institutions. These power relations, as I shall demonstrate later in my study of the setting of the two movies, are unjustly unfair. To maintain such unjust relations and control over the patient and the prisoners, the administration imposes on them a rigid discipline inside the institutions. Discipline is a generic term which needs further elaboration. In the following, therefore, I demonstrate what discipline is according to

Foucault. And how it helps to produce docile bodies, which is a very crucial concept that informs this research.

2-Discipline

Discipline is a very important concept which informs my present investigation of how docile bodies are produced inside asylums and prisons. Discipline is a strategy of power that controls the behavior of the individual. It controls by tightly organizing the space, the time, and people's activities. Discipline, as Foucault notices, should not be understood as power. Rather, discipline is one way in which power can be exercised.

The appearance of prison, as the ultimate form of punishment for the different crimes, grew out of the development of discipline in the 18^{th} and 19^{th} centuries. Foucault is interested in the development of highly refined forms of discipline which are concerned with the smallest and most precise aspects of a person's body. Discipline, for Foucault, is a strategy that constructs, manipulates and controls individuals and their bodies via complex mechanisms of surveillance and documentation.

Discipline, Foucault suggests, had developed a new economy and politics for the bodies. Modern institutions required that bodies must be individuated according to their tasks, as well as for training, observation and control. Soldiers are no longer chosen according to some physical traits as was the case before, but rather, as Foucault argued, everyman can be a soldier by constant and rigorous training and under continuous surveillance. In *Discipline and Punish***,** Foucault declares that:

> Our society is not one of spectacle, but of surveillance; under the surface of images, one invests bodies in depth; behind the great abstraction of exchange, there continues the meticulous, concrete training of useful forces; the circuits of communication are the supports of an accumulation and a centralization of knowledge; the play of signs defines the anchorages of power; it is not that the beautiful totality of the individual is amputated, repressed, altered by our social order, it is

> rather that the individual is carefully fabricated within it, according to a whole technique of forces and bodies.
>
> (1991: 217)

Discipline then is of form of power that developed starting from the early 19th century. For Sara Mills, Discipline consists of

> a concern with time-keeping, self control over on one's posture and bodily functions, concentration, sublimation of immediate desires and emotions – all of these elements are the effects of disciplinary pressure and at the same time they are all actions which produce the individual as subjected to a set of procedures which come from outside of themselves but whose aim is the disciplining of the self by the self.
>
> (2003: 43)

It follows that discipline is a very important strategy through which power is exercised. It consists of different strategies that function to control the individual. Time, space and activities' control of this individual help to produce and make him a docile body par excellence. Discipline per se, therefore, is a way not only to punish the patients and prisoners' bodies but also to adjust their souls.

3- Prison and the different strategies of punishment

In this section, further clarifications are provided to make Michel Foucault's ideas about prisons and the different strategies of punishment clearer. Surely, this would help us to understand how and why prisons emerged as institutions of punishment and how the concept of punishment, per se, changed in the end of the 18th century its target from the body to include the soul of the punished individual.

As I have shown in the first chapter, imprisonment was not employed as the primary mode of punishment until the eighteenth century in England and the nineteenth century in the United States. Prisons were not intended as penal instruments but as places of detention prior judgment. The actual modes of punishment that existed were attacks against the physical body

of the convict, whether in the form of torture, banishment or death. Michel Foucault is clear in arguing about these forms of punishment in *Discipline and Punish* that he starts by setting out the detailed account of a 1757 execution of François Damiens, convicted of attempted regicide. In this book, Foucault shows that the general public watching the convict being tortured was the constituent element of the penalty (1991: 33). Variations of crime, at that time, were simply reflected in variations of torture and death. The reconstitution of a "momentarily injured sovereignty" (ibid. 48) was the most important aim that the sovereign tries to achieve. Said in other words, the spectacle of the public practice of torture and death was designed not only to mirror the crime in the body of the convict itself, but also to recover the state's power that was damaged by the convict when he dared to break the law.

It follows form this practice that not only is the immediate victim of the crime avenged, but also the law and, therefore, the sovereign's authority, itself, is restored. Foucault writes that the convict's offence attacks the sovereign personally, since the law represents the will of the sovereign; and attacks him physically as well, since the force of the law is the force of the prince (ibid. 48). To break the law, therefore, is to touch the very person of the king. To execute the law-breaker has a juridico-political function. Even though this practice does not reestablish justice, it adjusts and reactivates power relations. This practice belongs to the "dissymmetry between the subject who dared to violate the law and the all-powerful sovereign who displays his strength" (Foucault, 1991: 49)

Discipline and Punish, therefore, is an attempt to study punishment in its social context. Before the 18th century, the punishment of the criminals was, basically, a corporal one by torture and execution in public rituals. In this century, however, various calls for reform appeared. These attempts to reform punishment, for Foucault, were not meant to provide a humanistic less violent environment for convicts but rather to punish better and to make power relations function more efficiently. Indeed, the target of punishment changed

from the body (monarchical punishment) to the soul (disciplinary punishment). Modern societies do not only punish the convict but also supervises and directs him.

For Michel Foucault, prisons had emerged starting from the modern era. Though it is proved that prisons existed quite before the modern era, their function, Foucault thinks, is quite different. The prisons of the modern era emerged as "technico-disciplinary" (1991: 233). These prisons functioned as more than detention centers that restricted individual freedom. They focused on a "reformatory function, with the final goal being the recording of existence of any inmate that was incarcerated" (Foucault, 1991: 236). Said in simple words, therefore, prisons, in modern societies, are, as I shall prove in my analysis of Wakefield State Penitentiary, the setting of Rosenberg's *Brubaker*, more than detention centers but have a reformatory function. By the use of three principles, prisons, indeed, try to transform the convicts into docile conforming bodies.

The principles that would guide the transformation of the prisoners into docile bodies include: 1- the principle of isolation, for more reflection and individualized punishment, 2- the principle of obligatory work, a love of work and the order it vehicles, and 3- the principle of the modulation of penalties, the ability of prison officials to modulate the sentence and the inmate's conformity to a reformed life may reduce the sentence (ibid. 244). In this way, Foucault argues that a system of power relations evolves as:

> The carceral apparatus has recourse to three great schemata: the politico-moral schema of individual isolation and hierarchy; the economic model of force applied to compulsory work; the technico-model of cure and normalization.
>
> (ibid. 248)

It follows that the prison seems to be no longer a place where liberty is removed from a criminal. Rather, it is something more. As such, the prisoners are put into a system

composed out of a constant rigid discipline and too much observation so as to make them docile bodies.

Conclusion

I have provided in the first section of this chapter a summary of the two movies under study namely Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* and the most important changes that are made when these two movies are adapted respectively from Ken Kesey's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Hyams and Murton's *Accomplices to the Crime: the Arkansas Prison Scandal.* I have argued that the changes that one may notice between the filmed versions and the books are, principally, due to some technical reasons.

Indeed, when adapting a book into a movie, the director is forced to make some changes, since the way the plot and the message are told is different. While the writer of a book targets the reader through words, the director of a movie makes appeal to different senses of the spectator namely his sight, ear, and his cognitive ability to understand a certain language. Both writer and director try to stimulate the audience and get them involved in a certain cause. The second reason that explains the changes between the books and the movies I am studying is related to time-period and historical considerations. Indeed, the directors Forman and Rosenberg try to include in their movies, as different from the books written in the sixties, some other new sociopolitical challenging issues that occurred in the seventies and, as such, make their movies relevant to the period of their release.

In the second section of this chapter, I have tried to highlight the relevance of Michel Foucault's works to carry out my investigation of power and punishment in the two movies. I have attempted to offer a concise account of the principal ideas that Foucault advanced in relations to the institutions of punishment. The Foucauldian generic concept of

power would surely help us to understand what is behind the relationship of doctor/ patient and trusties/ prisoners in the two movies and, subsequently, how docile bodies are produced through other strategies of power namely discipline and observation.

Chapter Three

Correct training and Docile Bodies in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975)

Introduction

In the present chapter I am going to discuss the themes of power and punishment and docility in Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*. For this, I will appeal to Foucault's idea of power and his theoretical perspectives about punishment inside asylums. My objective is to highlight the unjust nature of power relations inside the asylum where strategies of punishment are implemented by government to produce docile conforming bodies. It should be stated from the beginning that the production of docile bodies can be explored by the use of two Foucauldian approaches. The first approach is through "Correct Training" of individuals, while the second turns around the "Prison's Reformatory Function".

In the course of my analysis, I try to use the first approach, namely correct training of individuals, so as to demonstrate how the "patients" in the asylum are transformed into docile bodies. Correct training, in simple words, embodies three practices that the government exercises to adjust and train individuals to become less anarchists and more conforming. These practices, briefly, are: hierarchical observation, normalizing judgments, and examination. As I shall explain later in this chapter, these three practices contribute to make institutions like asylums sites where arbitrary power relations manifest and docile bodies are produced.

The intricacy and the omnipresence of power, in the Foucauldian sense, can be exemplified by reference to different elements of Milos Forman's movie including the plot, characters and the setting…etc. In the following, I shall begin by studying the kind of relationships that exist between the "patients" and administrative staff inside the asylum and how these relationships are based upon the Foucauldian dialectic of power and knowledge.

1_ Power relations in the asylum

At a more general level, psychiatry, as a form of discipline, is erected upon an arbitrary dialectic of power and knowledge. Indeed, this discipline rests on the idea that some individuals do not have the required mental abilities that would permit them to live in harmony with others, and should, therefore, be kept in separate supervised places to receive adequate care from some trained agents called "Psychiatrists". The latter hold enough knowledge about the 'mad' and, consequently, a legitimate right to keep the former under supervision. This seemingly precious knowledge gives these agents a power that manifests in their relationship with the "patients". The announced aim is, of course, to cure the "patients" from the mental illness they suffer from.

One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest deals with the relationship between the "patients" and the psychiatric board. This relationship is represented, and, as such, can be studied by the use of several themes. Probably, the most important one is the dialectic of reason and unreason. In the movie, a symbolic fight is led by two fronts: reason and unreason. On the one hand, one finds the administrative staff, and most remarkably, the nurse Ratched representing "reason", and, on the other, it is the protagonist McMurphy and the other "patients" who symbolize "unreason". At the first glance, this distinction is quite acceptable. Indeed, it is needless to say that a common viewer would not find difficulties to understand that the film depicts a socially accepted idea which says that "madmen" should be confined inside asylums under the supervision of psychiatrists. Surely, this mode of thinking is the product of the discourse which says that "madmen" had lost their reason and constitute a danger for society. Certainly at this stage, lots of images come to one's mind when starting to watch the movie. Because of their "unreason", a sentiment of exclusion and disgust, therefore, would be

systematically arisen against the protagonist, who is held for sexual abuse over a child, as well as the other “patients”.

Approached from a Foucauldian perspective, however, the above distinction is very problematic and takes another quite different meaning. Because Foucault signals the difficulty of the very process of understanding “unreason” by the use of the language of “reason”, a scrupulous analysis of the movie is more than important. Indeed, the division between the “patients”, as symbolizing “unreason”, and the psychiatric staff, as representing “reason”, is subject for questioning and, thereby, a potential reconsideration.

As the plot of the movie unfolds, the spectator is left to discover that Nurse Ratched, the symbol of the administration, exercises an exceeding power over the patients. It seems from the movie that the only objective of Ratched is to solely guarantee a total control over the “patients”. For this, the means she uses are utterly scornful. Her behavior towards the “patients” clearly shows her disrespect for them. In many scenes, she is depicted trying, consciously or not, to deprive the “patients” of their manhood. Her attitude towards Billy Bibbit, for instance, exemplifies her oppressive dictatorial attitude which is confirmed on multiple occasions.

After promising McMurphy that, if he accumulates the majority of patients’ votes, she will permit him to follow the Baseball World Series on television, she ultimately does not keep her promise; a thing which causes a revolt among the “patients”. Indeed, it is not difficult to understand that the ongoing trauma for which the “patients” are exposed is basically caused by Nurse Ratched.

If the Nurse Ratched is sought to be the symbol of "reason”, her behaviors and attitudes, however, confirm her “unreason”. The opposite would be said in respect of the “patients” who never stop to speak the truth by questioning the system quo and aspiring to be

free. Logically speaking, it is the Nurse Ratched who stands for "unreason", while the "patients", in regard to their aspirations, truly symbolize "reason". Therefore, it seems that, as Foucault, remarks, madness, at essence, does not exist but only follies exist; human forms of madness (Foucault, 2001: 23).

It is plausible to say that madness is not an unchanging rigid phenomenon in itself. It is rather linked with societal interpretations of individual deeds. Said in other words, it is the dominant discourse in a given society at a specific time period that structures and identifies what madness is. The protagonist McMurphy, therefore, is judged to be "mad" because he does not conform and vehicle the same aspirations that the American government wanted to spread during the sixties and the seventies.

Indeed, free thinking, antigovernment views which deepen rebellion and non-conformism are the last qualities that the United States of America need during a period when internal and external factors threatened the very existence of the country. As I have shown in the first chapter where, under the generic concept of counterculture, tumultuous ideas and historical events, like the Hippies and the Cold War, had characterized America during the 1960s and 1970s. The negative attitude of the asylum to McMurphy and the other "patients" informs us about how the U.S. federal government reacted against some ideas both at the national level, like Hippie's, and the international one, like the spectre of Communism and the Cold War. McMurphy stands for all avant-gardists who, in a period of fear and terrible conformism, have dared to rise their voices questioning the status quo. If by "mad", we mean a dangerous nonconformist person who should be excluded, the word "mad", during the sixties and the seventies in America, seems to be any person with countercultural ideas. Therefore, madness in general, as Foucault writes, is not attached to "the world and its subterranean forms, but rather to man, to his weaknesses, dreams, and illusions". (ibid. 23)

The conflict between two modes of living or cultures is too apparent in the movie. As what happened in the late fifties and sixties America, two distinctions of the concept of culture have been stressed, 'high' and 'popular' cultures. On the one hand, one finds the Nurse representing the 'high' culture as shown, for example, in her choice of classical music. On the other hand, McMurphy is depicted to vehicle the characteristics of popular culture through his special countercultural tastes in music and clothing. Further analysis of how counterculture is to be considered as a means of resisting the dominant culture is provided later in the section of the Strategies of Resistance.

Madness is one of the most important themes around which the doctor and "patient" relationship revolves. Indeed, it is through madness that criticizing reality is made possible, since the director tries to convey a certain message by the use of madness as an instrument. By the theme of madness, or what is commonly considered as being 'unreal', reality per se is criticized. Throughout the movie, the protagonist McMurphy represents the free unbound voice which dares to express openly his thoughts. Indeed, the movie turns around McMurphy's attempt to symbolically annihilate the system and the psychiatric authority by faking madness.

To understand the above idea, reference should be to Foucault's principal idea in *Madness and Civilization* that madness is not a natural, fixed thing, but rather depends on the society where it exists. Likewise, one can find different conceptions of madness from the Middle Ages to the modern period. Madness in the Middle Ages, for example, was linked with dark secrets and visions of the end of the world. This entails that mad people in a way or another had a form of wisdom since, unlike others, they are allowed to live the limits of reason, thus, had a forbidden unattainable knowledge. In the Classical period (from the mid 1600s to the end of the 19th century), however, madness had taken another meaning. At that period, mad people were to be confined along other social types of deviants like prostitutes

and criminals. In the depths of the age of reason, society began to confine and completely separate mad people in newly created institutions like workhouses.

Madness, it was believed, is a moral error. It means that, like prostitution and vagrancy, madness is a free choice that madmen had chosen. Therefore, it is the job of the newly created institutions like, as already stated in the first chapter, the workhouses through a scrupulous program of punishment and reward to make the mad reverse their choices and gain back their reason and role in society. Under the light of these ideas, one can understand Forman's movie as best analyzing madness and its complexity through his purposeful use of McMurphy as the protagonist. The latter raises several emotions on the viewer starting from repulsion ending with pity, understanding and even admiration and total respect especially when seeing him sacrificing himself, as Jesus Christ did, for the good of others.

Indeed, though madness, commonly speaking, is considered as a disease from which one should take distance, throughout the movie, it is given another completely different turn. Indeed, the genius of the movie lies in the fact that the audience are left to be overwhelmed by lots of feelings including pity, and revolt or strong revulsion not towards the "patients", but rather against the administrative staff. Therefore, the unjust nature of the relationship between the "patients" and the psychiatric board starts to be clarified.

Milos Forman chooses special techniques to make the audience understand to what extent the doctor and "patient" relationship is an oppressive one. Relying on the insights of Gilles Deleuze, who notes that the "frame teaches us that the image is not just given to be seen. It is legible as well as visible" (quoted in Villarejo, 2007: 36), I think that the best argument that can be given to clarify how the director depicts the unfairness of the doctor and "patient" relations is by speaking about the nature of the shots as well as the frames he uses as the following examples show.

Shot 01. (00:02:04) **Red Light as the Demarcation of two Worlds.** The first shot where the Nurse Ratched appears, for example, is a long one. At this initial stage, the director does not want the spectator to have a specific idea about the nurse apart from that of neutrality, but he suggests for the attentive spectator to have a slight idea about what is to come in the story. This kind of prediction would be probably possible in consideration to some cinematographic clues like the inclusion of the shining red light which is stuck on the wall. The spectator cannot overlook the importance of this red light because it is recurrently framed. What attracts the attention of the spectator in this shot is this red light rather than Ratched who is dwarfed by the background or the plan of the shot.

Commonly speaking, red light symbolizes danger and warning. Therefore, the most plausible aim of this shot is to make the audience associate the red light to the danger that patients personify, and, when combined with the rigid fence, create in our mind the impression that these are the limits which demarcate two different worlds vowed to be separated from each other forever.

However, the majority of shots that depict Ratched are medium close ups where we can clearly see her from the chest up.

Shot 02. (01:11:13) **Ratched's Speechless Face.**

As one can remark in the following shot, special attention is given to show Ratched with no facial expression. Indeed, her face does not convey the

impression of flexibility or empathy, but rather it is the incarnation of order and strictness. Even in situations or scenes of confusion and disorder, her face remains "unspeakable". Remarkably enough, Ratched is represented as the fervent enemy of the "patients". One can clearly notice that the camera, most of the time, moves from depicting Ratched giving orders and, then, portraying the patients' reaction. In terms of montage, juxtaposing two shots aims to present two clashing points in dialogue over righteousness. As such, the fact that shots of Ratched are often juxtaposed with those of the "patients" helps us to understand that there is distance and disagreement between them.

Following Roland Bogue who remarks that the more information that fills the framed image, the more it may be said to be 'saturated'; the less information, the more 'rarefied' the image becomes, until it reaches the limit of the empty black or white screen" (quoted in Villarejo, 2007: 37), one can say that almost all the shots in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* are "saturated" ones. Indeed, lots of details should not escape our attention. For example, the fact that the majority of the shots where Ratched is framed, a small blackboard, where instructions and orders calling for respect are written down, is suggestively included. This detail hints at the dictatorial attitude of the Nurse. Seen from another perspective, however, the ability of Louis Fetcher (the Nurse Ratched) to create in the spectator such impressions of rigidity and dictatorship demonstrate her outstanding skills as an actress, a skill for which she wins the Oscar.

It is important to mention that in terms of soundtrack, the director had not used any remarkable sentimental music to push the spectator to have a feeling of compassion over the "patients". Indeed, Forman had just shown us the stark reality of how society refuses to tolerate nonconformity. In addition to this, the choice of the setting affirms that the director wants to give his film, as much as possible, a touch of realism. Truly, his decision to shoot the movie in a real psychiatric institution, namely the mental hospital in Salem, Oregon, is not a

spontaneous one. He believed, however, that it is very essential to make the film as realistic as possible.

Moreover, another fact that the spectators may not realize is that all the psychiatrists as well as the majority of the nurses in the movie are played by actual psychiatrists and nurses from the Oregon Institution where the movie is filmed. The other remaining actors, on the other hand, had spent a considerable period of time observing real "patients" to get a profound firsthand knowledge about their attitudes and to get a clear perception about what it is like to live in a mental hospital.

In *General Systems Theory and Psychotherapy: Beyond Postmodernism* (2003) Vorster identifies three kinds of relationships that may exist between the psychiatric staff and the "patients". They are:

1- The complimentary relationship. In a complimentary relationship, one partner is in a one-up position and the other in a one down position (leader and follower).
2- The symmetrical relationship. In this kind, similar behaviors are set against each other, which is essentially a struggle (usually unsuccessful) to obtain an equal position in the relationship.
3- The parallel relationship. This is relationship between equals.

(quoted in Miller, 2010: 40)

Under the light of the above distinctions, one can say that the doctor and "patient" relations in Salem hospital, the setting of the movie, are a combination or rather a fight between the three types at the same time. Indeed, at the very beginning of the movie, it is basically the complimentary relationship that is overwhelmed. Complete obedience to the psychiatric administration is actually achieved. Worse, there is even a wish from the Nurse to make the "patients" become completely dependent on the system. With the "Acutes",

"patients" who voluntarily demanded to be hospitalized like Billy Bibbit and Dale Harding, dependence seems to be already achieved. No single effort is deployed in order to make them conformist, since, outside the imaginary world of conformism, it seems that they (the Acutes) feel lost.

However, another type of relationship appears in the movie. Actually, it is the symmetrical relationship that characterize most *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Constant fights are launched between the Nurse and the "patients". Indeed, after the arrival of the new inmate (McMurphy), things considerably get changed. Unending questionings of the Nurse's authority have been formulated not only by the protagonist but also from all the "patients". A detailed explanation of the "patients' quest for more equal relations, freedom and affirmation would be found in the third point of discussion in this work under the title of "Strategies of Resistance".

It would be sufficient at this stage to say that the relationship between the nurse Ratched, the symbol of the psychiatric administration, and McMurphy, the character who represents "patients" as a whole, is evocative of the tumultuous sixties and seventies America and the government /people relationship. This relationship may be summarized in two key words: distance and disillusionment. Further analysis is required to understand how the movie, in general, stands as representative of the period of its release and how protagonist McMurphy, for example, stands as the spokesman of the secular and countercultural ideas and movements like the hippies of the sixties and seventies, while the Nurse Ratched, on the contrary, represents the bourgeois order and its firm attitude towards such movements.

Exactly like the Hippies, McMurphy, with his remarkable clothes, tastes and attitudes in general, preaches the rejection of dominant values and blind conformism. Indeed, McMurphy is the Hippie character par-excellence. As such, he advocates free sexual relations

and extending use of alcohol and drugs so as to reach exiting experiences in such a miserable setting. The scene that depicts McMurphy organizing a party with the presence of Candy Starr and her friend, the two prostitutes, and different sorts of alcohol may illustrate the protagonist Hippie attitude. In this scene, conservative and religious traditional values like chastity are attacked and sexual liberty is favored over the virginity of Billy Bibbit.

McMurphy's free and rebellious spirit is shown in the scene when he escapes from the asylum, accompanied with the other patients, to have a fish trip inboard of the "HAYAK". In this respect, the movie discusses the theme of sexual freedom versus clamped down sexual instincts personified by the Nurse. It is totally plausible to argue that McMurphy stands for the diverse protesting movements as the African American, Native American, the white ethnic offspring of the new immigration as well as the Latinos uprisings that happened during that period asking for radical reform. This is justified by his constant endeavor to question the status quo, oppression and bad treatment.

Moreover, the issue of Women's Movement is discussed in the movie. The women's lack of identity in America during the sixties and seventies or what Betty Friedan, an American feminist writer, describes in her book *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) as 'the problem that had no name' (1963: 11) is made implicit by the kind of role which is reserved for women in the movie. Indeed, the female characters in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* can be separated into two broad categories: machine-likes and prostitutes. The former is represented by the Nurse Ratched, Billy Bibbit's mother as well as Harding's wife as castrators. These women try to dominate men by emasculating them, while the prostitutes Candy and Sandy are reserved solely for pleasure and doing what they are told. Milos Forman' aim, though expressed implicitly, is to criticize the patriarchal American society where women gained recognition only through the achievements of their husbands and children.

To summarize, the doctor and "patient" relationship in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* can be said to be a controlling and an oppressive one. This is because no meta-communication is present in the asylum. For example, at no time does the Nurse comment on, or give considerable feedback on the communication with McMurphy's group. She rather keeps on giving orders. The "patients" do not feel that the Nurse understands them, as she orders them to comply. The distance that characterizes this relationship is highly suggestive of the electrified climate that reigned in America during the politically explosive sixties and seventies. Indeed, this distance between the doctor and the "patient" epitomizes the wide abyss between the government and the population's aspirations, the very reason why violent manifestations and radical movements asking for more social equality had appeared including New Left thinkers, the Student and Women movements. The movie speaks about a period when the government became an increasing powerful force in people's lives and the dangers that may result from this. Forman's movie then is an allegory of what happens when too much power is ceded to the government. In the Watergate atmosphere of the Nixon administration, this idea resonates forcefully.

It appears that the "patients" are caught in a serious dilemma. If he (the patient) accepts his role as "patient", it proves that he is truly ill and implies that he should be hospitalized indefinitely. If he resists the role as "patient", this confirms that he is really mad and, in that case, he necessitates further hospitalization until he does admit the role. Probably, the most suggestive scene that explains such complicated state, is the scene where Dr. Spivey asks McMurphy to be honest with him as to whether he is just faking madness or not. If McMurphy says he is, Dr Spivey is suspicious that he is really just trying to avoid hospitalization, but if he says he is not faking madness; Dr Spivey is going to be suspicious that he just is trying to avoid imprisonment.

It follows that whatever McMurphy chooses as an option, Dr Spivey has a prior judgment and knowledge. This confusing state suggests that the doctor is knowledgeable, and, therefore, more powerful than the patients. This idea leads us to study the Foucauldian dialectic of power and knowledge to understand further the intricacy of the doctor and "patient" relationship in the movie.

2- **Power and knowledge in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest***

Power and knowledge, in the movie, are presented as two sides of the same process. Indeed, in order to neutralize the "mad", knowledge is clearly required: knowledge of the "patient's life and of the reason for which he is confined. For these reasons, the asylums, Foucault thinks, become a site in which knowledge is constituted: a scientific knowledge of the mad and madness. This knowledge becomes what we commonly call "psychiatry". From the very beginning of the movie, it is mentioned that McMurphy, the principal actor, is sent from the prison to the mental hospital to be subjected to study and analysis by psychiatrists who would say whether he is really mad or not. It is shown in the scene, where McMurphy is brought to see Dr Spivey, that the psychiatric administration he presides has already received a file containing crucial information about the protagonist as the following dialogue witnesses:

Dr. Spivey: Randall Patrick McMurphy.
38 years old.
What can you tell me about...why you've been sent over here?
McMurphy: Well. l don't know.
What's it say there?
Mind if l smoke?
Dr. Spivey: No, go right ahead
Well, it says several things here.
lt said you've been belligerent.
lt said you've been belligerent.
You've been resentful in attitude
towards work, in general. That you're lazy.
McMurphy: Chewing gum in class.

Dr. Spivey: The real reason you've been sent here is because they wanted you to be evaluated.

To determine whether or not you're mentally ill.
This is the real reason.
You've got at least five arrests for assault. What can you tell me about that?
You're going to be here for a period, for us to evaluate you.

As the above dialogue makes clear, McMurphy's confinement is a mere experience that would allow psychiatrists to confirm whether he is mad. The other "patients", on the other hand, are already judged as unable to live in the world outside. The genuine technique that supports this idea in the movie is the classification of the patients into "Acutes" and "Chronics"; the former are considered curable. Their stay at the hospital is voluntary; while the latter are other "patients" that would stay in the hospital forever. Seen from another perspective, the difference between the Acutes and the Chronics is merely the extent to which knowledge about their lives and careers is detained, held and controlled by the Nurse.

The "Acutes" namely Billy Bibbit, Martini, Ruckly and Ellis are shown accepting the regime and policy of the asylum. Apparently, they need the help of the Nurse to feel better. The fact that they, willingly, asked her help is the first step towards dependence and unbalanced power relations. It is shown in the movie that the Nurse is well informed about these "patients." Worse, she even uses this knowledge to control them. Said differently, knowledge implies control. Lots of scenes can demonstrate the validity of this idea. For example, the fact that the Nurse is knowledgeable about Billy Bibbit, a thirty one year old man, and his personal life has given her more power over him. One can understand in the movie that Billy's Achilles' heel is his mother. He is terribly dominated by her to the extent that he is still virgin. In the asylum, it is the Nurse who plays the role of Billy's mother. The Foucauldian assertion that knowledge produces power explains the behavior of the Big Nurse, who, due to her accumulated knowledge about Bibbit, is not satisfied by Billy's full

compliance, but is eager to emasculate by threatening and recalling him about his sexual problems as well as his dictatorial mother as the following shows:

Nurse Ratched: Aren't you ashamed?
Billy:(*without* stuttering)No, I'm not.(More applause)
Nurse: You know Billy, what worries me is how your mother's going to take this.

Another example about the dialectic of power and knowledge in the movie includes the protagonist McMurphy. Indeed, the power that the protagonist exhibits in his relationship with the psychiatric board is, principally, drawn out of his knowledge of the system. McMurphy is described as a conscious person who, unlike the other "patients," refuses to be subdued. The knowledge of the protagonist in this case resides in the fact that he is conscious, a thing which gives him considerable advantage to resist and question the status quo. Moreover, the meetings that the Nurse organizes with the "patients" to talk have, as an agenda, the "patients' personal development to ultimately gain control over them. Within such meetings, disciplinary power is exercised to produce docile bodies.

To understand the concept of docile body, I need to further the investigation and study the Foucauldian theoretical perspectives about the means of correct trainings through which docile bodies are produced in relation to the movie. Michel Foucault, as I have shown in the second section of chapter two, identifies three practices that disciplinary power uses to produce docile bodies, bodies that not only do what the government wants but do it precisely the way it (the government) wants (1991: 138). These practices are: hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment and examination.

By hierarchical observation, Foucault means the different techniques by which individuals are observed and kept under thorough surveillance. It is a mechanism that coerces by means of observation (ibid. 170). In *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*, the "patients' slightest behaviors are observed. Needless to say that the observation is implemented by the

psychiatric staff in the one –up position over the "patients" in the one-down position. This observation takes both direct and indirect ways.

The direct way to observe the "patient" is to be physically with him. As one can see in different scenes, there is a strong presence of the nurses to observe the behaviors of the "patients" and to remind them about the rules as well as the norms of the asylum that they should literally respect. It is by depicting the simultaneous presence of the nurses and the patients that the director is able to portray the differences that exist between them (the "patients" and the nurses).

The indirect way to observe the "patients' behaviors, on the other hand, is to use technological means like cameras. Despite the fact that the nurses are not physically present with the patient, the latter's behaviors and gestures are completely observed. Contrary to prisons, asylums, most of the time, use the direct observation rather than the indirect one. The architecture of the asylum, as what I shall demonstrate later in this investigation, helps to make the observation of the patients easy and remarkably effective at the same time.

Normalizing judgments that, according to Foucault, mean the different techniques and practices through which the actions of the individuals are measured, assessed and compared. By this process, norms are established (1991: 184). "The power of the norm", Foucault adds, "is apparent within a system of formal equality" (ibid. 184). In other words, the power of the norm lies in the fact that it both individuates and homogenizes. It individuates in the sense that it makes each "patient" aware of the rules and responsible for his acts, and, at the same time, it homogenizes through the imposition of this norm on the whole asylum.

What makes the detection of normalizing judgments a little bit difficult is the fact that they are so widespread in institutions to an extent that individuals seem to, terribly, normalize

them. Salem hospital, the setting of the movie, presents lots of examples that can be studied in regard to this idea.

First and foremost, it is important to mention that the unbalanced power relations in the movie are basically drawn from the fact that normalizing judgments are put into practice. As such, the protagonist is confined because he does not respect the norms that were prevalent at that moment. Having nonconformist ideas such as sexual freedom and free thinking made McMurphy, for instance, an 'unwanted' man. As far as the other "patients" are concerned, it is their inability to cope with dominant discourse, values and norms that caused their incarceration. It is believed that society is like a perfect body that should be protected from such 'perverts'. If the word 'pervert', in psychiatry, takes the signification of mentally disordered individuals, in the 1960s and the 1970s America, however, this word seems to imply some intellectual orientations like that of the Hippies. It is understood, therefore, that any person who disrespects the different norms of society, is going to be excluded. Said in different words, as Foucault puts it in *Discipline and Punish*, the large arbitrary domain of non-conforming is punishable; the soldier commits an offence if he does not reach the level required; and the pupil's offence is not only when he commits a minor infraction, but also when he is unable to carry out his tasks" (1991: 178_179).

The third instrument of disciplinary power, that Foucault highlights in *Discipline and Punish*, is the examination (ibid, 184). The latter concept combines hierarchical observation and normalizing judgments. By examination, therefore, the individual's behaviors and performances are watched, assessed, classified and, ultimately, corrected.

Probably, the best example that can illustrate this idea in the movie is the meetings that the Nurse Ratched holds with the patients. During these sessions, the Nurse, with her neat tight costumes, one of the elements of mise-en-scene, stands in front of the patients as a sign

to both declare her panoptic position and affirm the differences between them. Basically, it is the camera through its movements as well as the special techniques Milos Forman uses that creates this impression. Lightening, for example, helps to tell more information about the character and directs the attention of the spectator to a given detail. Indeed, the light that is used to shot the Nurse Ratched, most of the time, is not naturalistic, but rather expressionist. Visibly, the aim is to make her domineering character more apparent and less obscure.

During these groups of talks, therefore, the Nurse supervised the continuous development of the "patients". She assesses their behaviors and corrects them according to certain norms. In one of these sessions, she declares that the "business of these meetings is therapy". Techniques of gratification and punishment are combined to attain her goal. Sometimes she encourages the "patients" to speak out and, in other times, she threatens to punish them. Generally speaking, the norm that is settled by the Nurse, simply said, is docility. Because the protagonist preaches against this norm, he becomes the asylum's major threat. The urgent procedure to be taken is the immediate separation of the "patients" not only from external factors but even from themselves but especially from McMurphy. In this sense Simon During, paraphrasing Michel Foucault, says that one of the modes by which individuals are made to be subjects is through "a process of division either within themselves or from others" (quoted in During, 1992: 2).

To summarize, the Nurse Ratched, who represents the system as a whole, resorts different practices so as to make the "patients" conforming docile bodies. These practices, seen from a Foucauldian approach, may be categorized under the three techniques where disciplinary power is implemented. These three techniques include hierarchical observation, normalizing judgments and examination. It is important to mention, however, that these three techniques function hand in hand with what Michel Foucault calls "Discipline". In the following section, therefore, I try to study further the concept of discipline in relation to the

movie so as to clarify how the “patients”, through a well studied schedule, are aimed to be docile bodies.

3_Discipline in *One Flew over the Cuckoo’s Nest*

Because we have not only internalized but even normalized the existence of discipline, criticizing it would seem a little bit strange. Paradoxically though, its detection would be easily done. In *One Flew over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, lots of examples can be stated to clarify how discipline is used by the psychiatric board to control and neutralize the “patients”. Probably, the best example that I can provide in this sense is the Nurse Ratched and her very remarkable way to deal with the “patients”.

From the very beginning of the movie, one can understand and even predict that Nurse Ratched is the character who would implement discipline over the “patients”. Time control is the most striking strategy through which discipline operates. In the movie, one can clearly see how time is tightly controlled. The “patients” are allowed to have their meals at specific times and places. Even the activities of entertainment, it is Nurse Ratched who decides how and when they should be done and what kind of music they should listen to as well as the persons to whom they can speak.

The best example that may demonstrate to what extent the “patients” in *One Flew over the Cuckoo’s Nest* are under constant rigid surveillance is, probably, the scene of the therapy meeting when McMurphy begs Nurse Ratched to rearrange the "carefully worked out schedule" so that the inmates can watch the opening of the 1963 World Series baseball game (at Yankee Stadium) on television. He, ironically, adds: "a little change never hurt huh? A little variety?" She answers saying : "Some men on the ward take a long, long time to get used to the schedule. Change it now and they might find it very disturbing."The Nurse proposes a vote to decide the matter - "let majority rule" - already knowing that authority and

power are on her side against the mindless and compliant “patients.” Only three votes support McMurphy's request and he can't believe it "What is this crap? What is the matter with you guys? Come on! Be good Americans."

The architecture of the asylum is well studied and it is divided into levels according to the danger the “patients” represent and their chances to be cured. In other words, it is the “patients”’ docility and conformity to the system that would determine how they would be treated. The institution of asylum is divided into two blocks. One can find a block which is reserved for the “patients” and another for the psychiatric board. Special measures are taken to make these two blocks separated. It is needless to say that the block which is reserved to the psychiatric staff is totally forbidden to the “patients.”

As depicted in the movie, the implementation of a strict discipline manifested mainly through two distinct but complementary ways, direct and indirect ones. The direct way is principally through Nurse Ratched instructing the “patients” in a dictatorial voice explicitly targeting the body of the “patients”. The latter’s body, therefore, is the focus of this kind of discipline, since a whole process is launched by the Nurse to observe, control and adjust the bodies of the “patients” according to her wishes. The indirect one, on the other hand, targets the soul of the inmates. Different sorts of medications are used to assure the ultimate victory and the complete adoption of discipline within the asylum.

With Michel Foucault’s notion of Panoptican in mind, one can understand how and why the “patients” are closely watched by the Nurse. Though the “patients” do not agree with all of the administrative’ decisions and oppressive policy, the Nurse’s constant watch makes them obey. Everyone is terrified and unable to utter the slightest sound of refute in fear of the punishment they might receive. The mental hospital in this film is no longer a hospital but a panoptic “heterotopic” place where the Nurse Ratched watches the “patients” and trains them

to become more conformist. Indeed, it is through the panoptic surveillance of each behavior that she runs such great number of "patients."

Noticeably, Nurse Ratched's strategy is to make the "patients" repeat the same activities and behaviors until their bodies not only internalize but even normalize them. Respecting orders and conforming to the rules are the most targeted aims. To achieve these goals, Ratched follows two techniques. On the one hand, she discourages the undisciplined actions by such practices as the lobotomy that McMurphy endures for his rebellious attitude and, on the other, she encourages disciplined attitudes. The acceptance of the Acutes like the fully obedient Billy and the effeminate Mr. Harding in the hospital, as well as her good treatment for them, seem to be a strategy to persuade the other less conforming "patients" to be docile. The Acutes vehicle different characteristics ranging from docility to complete dependence on the psychiatric board. The Nurse Ratched, through the movie, tries to foster and generalize these characteristics among the other inmates. Getting confessions is another point that Ratched wanted to foster and normalize in the soul of the inmates. As clarified in the following dialogue between McMurphy and the Nurse, she overtly encourages McMurphy when he decides to express his inner thoughts declaring

Ratched: So who would like to begin today? Mr. McMurphy?
McMurphy: l've been thinking about what you said about you know, getting things off your chest. Well, there's a couple of things that l'd like to get off my chest.
Ratched: Well, that's very good, Mr. McMurphy. Go ahead.

Therefore, it is clear that the different techniques and programs that the asylum uses are not neutral. It means that their goal is not only a therapeutic one by curing the "patients." Rather, its aim is to foster conformity within these "patients." Discipline, within the asylum, therefore, is not set to merely organize but to train these 'perverts' to be more docile. To control and dominate the patients, not only their physical body but even their souls, is the ultimate aim of the Nurse Ratched who stands for the psychiatric system in general.

Despite the fact that lots of "patients" are made docile bodies, as I have shown in the above discussion, many forms of resisting the system in the movie have appeared. Bracketed by Michel Foucault's thinking, it is totally predictable to see forms of resisting power for whenever there is power, there is resistance. In what follows, a further elaboration of the different strategies that the "patients" use to resist the system is provided.

4_ Strategies of resistance in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*

One of the omnipresent entities that accompany power, according to Michel Foucault, is resistance. Lots of examples can be stated to illustrate this Foucauldian concept in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest.* To begin, the movie itself subscribes to the idea of resisting power. This is because this movie falls within the genre of what is known as countercultural movies that present the "unsaid" of a given society by criticizing its very fundamentals and shaking its commonly believed ideas. For criticizing the Vietnam War, for example, the character "General "is used by the director. The fact that General is described as a handicapped docile patient who can't even speak shows clearly the director's criticism and hatred of warfare.

The most striking character who personifies resistance is undoubtedly the protagonist McMurphy. Seemingly, transgressing the societal laws is his favorite job; raping a girl first, and, second, disrespecting the warden's orders by refusing to work. Once in the asylum, his nonconformist resisting spirit begins to sharpen. McMurphy's resistance against the unjust power relationships in the asylum manifested through different forms: satire, mockery, embarrassing questions, laughter, stressing his high sense of humanity in a dehumanized society, mentoring and rising the consciousness of others. Indeed, on multiple occasions, he challenges Nurse Ratched's coercive action and authority and his courageous assertion of his individuality wins him the hearts and the minds of the inmates.

The movie is full of scenes depicting McMurphy's resistance to authority in general. Faking madness like Shakespeare's Hamlet who feigned madness to escape his uncle's punishment is, at essence, a way to resist the power of the system. A lot of scenes can be stated to exemplify his satirical thrust at Nurse Ratched, as a way of resisting her. While the other 'patients' accept to take their medication, McMurphy has never swallowed a pill because of his knowledge that this medication would be of no importance to him. He starts to question the Nurse's choices of music, television programs, and dares to speak his personal ideas; a thing which is considered as being unconceivable by the other "patients", as the following dialogue witnesses:

McMurphy: Do you think it might be possible to turn the music down so maybe a couple of the boys could talk?
Nurse Ratched: That music is for everyone, Mr. McMurphy.
McMurphy: l know, but do you think we might ease it down a little

In addition to his questionings of the routine, he suggests to change the TV program to watch the World Series saying:

McMurphy: What l'd like to suggest is that we change the work detail tonight so that we can watch the ball game.
Nurse Ratched: Well, Mr. McMurphy, what you're asking is that we change a very carefully worked-out schedule.

McMurphy: A little change never hurt, huh?
A little variety?
Nurse Ratched: Well, it's not necessarily true, Mr. McMurphy.
Some men on the ward take a long, long time to get used to the schedule. Change it now, and they might find it very disturbing.
McMurphy: Fuck the schedule! They can go back to the schedule after the Series. l'm talking about the World Series, Nurse Ratched. Well, anyway, this is no way to proceed about this. How would it be if we had a vote and let the majority rule?

Another scene that may illustrate McMurphy's resistance to the Nurse is when he calls the 'patients' for rebellion saying: "God Almighty, she's got you guys comin' or goin'. What do you think she is, some kind of a champ or something." By so doing, McMurphy stirs up the consciousness of the inmates by demonstrating for them that they have been denied their

freedom of will. He, overtly, defies Ratched's authority when he says "I bet in one week, I can put a bug so far up her ass, she don't know whether to s—t or wind her wristwatch". However, his endeavor to liberate the "patients" from their yoke is undermined when he discovers that most of them are voluntary and self committed to the asylum. To mock the psychiatrist in general, he questions the patients' attitude saying:

McMurphy: What do you think you are, for Christ's sake, crazy or something? Well, you're not! You're not! You're no crazier than the average asshole out walking around on the streets and that's it
Nurse: Those are very challenging observations you made, Randall.

The most important strategy that McMurphy, like the other "patients", uses to resist the unfairness of the asylum's power is, to use Michail Bakhtin's words, through laughter and carnivalization. Bakhtin defines carnival as "the second world and the second life outside officialdom "or "people's second life, organized on the basis of laughter" (Bakhtin, 1984: 6). Carnival, in simple words, is festive life (ibid. 8). By officialdom, he means a serious culture, a world marked by the prevailing truth of an established order with its hierarchal rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions (ibid. 10). Through the whole movie, the protagonist is depicted to live in a "second world", and as in carnival, he satirizes and mocks the system. The party is organized inside the asylum with the other "patients" is probably the most striking example that shows his carnivalesque attitude against "officialdom".

Throughout the movie, the power of laughter is used so as to criticize the system. McMurphy's laughter is the first laughter to be heard in the asylum. He notices that among the things that are bizarre in this asylum is that none of them are able to laugh; they can only smile behind their hands. For McMurphy, laughter is a powerful defense against the insanity of society, and anyone who cannot laugh has no chance of surviving. By the end of the fishing trip, the "patients" are all finally able to have a real remarkable laughter, a sign of their physical and psychological recovery.

Satire is another technique that McMurphy uses to resist the authority by ridiculing the Nurse and the psychiatric board in multiple occasions. For instance, in the scene when he is taken to be electrified for the first time exemplifies his resistance, as the following dialogue shows:

McMurphy: Take a cigarette break, boys. Easy. l'll be fine.
The doctor: Would you sit up, please?
McMurphy: -l'd love to.
-Atta boy.
There might be a little fluid in them boots, you know what l mean, boys?
Just a little leak.
A light shine, boys, and send the specimen to Nurse Ratched

One can notice the protagonist's mockery from the techniques of punishment employed by the asylum saying:

Billy: How's it going, Mac?
McMurphy: Perfect, billy boy, absolutely perfect
They were giving me 10,000 watts a day. You know, and l'm hot to trot.
The next woman who takes me on will light up like a pinball machine and pay off in silver dollars!

Between Foucault's principal ideas in *Madness and Civilization* and the movie lots of ideas and symbols are shared. Indeed, there is a strong possibility that Forman or rather Ken Kesey, who wrote the novel, is knowledgeable about Michel Foucault's ideas. This hypothesis is very plausible since both writers had lived approximately at the same period and, by their ideas, adopted the same countercultural and postmodernist movement.

The best scene that makes us think about Foucault's works covering madness and civilization is the depiction of McMurphy, with the company of other "patients", escaping from the asylum, boarding a ship in a fish expedition. In *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault speaks about the "zero point" (2001: xi) in history when madness was constituted as a disease. Right in the first chapter "SULTIFERA NAVIS", Foucault speaks about the delightful yet horrible way that Renaissance men developed to deal with their mad citizens: they were put on a ship and, most of the time entrusted to mariners or pilgrims, and sent into foreign

countries. While some of these fools find cure in this experience of being alone far from society, others died alone away from their families (2001: 1-35). A strong similitude exists between Foucault's idea of the "ship of fools" and McMurphy's trip aboard a ship with the other "patients". McMurphy's trip aboard "HYAK" symbolizes Foucault's "SULTIFERA NAVIS". Lots of similarities can be found between them. For example, like the fools in "SULTIFERA NAVIS", the fate of "patients" is completely unknown. Indeed, "HYAK" is left to be navigated by Cheswick who never boarded a ship in his life. Therefore, the danger seems to be imminent. In addition to this, if there are some lunatics in the "ship of fools" who, out of this experience of isolation in the sea, would gain their sanity, one can notice the same thing in McMurphy's trip where the "patients" had not only enjoyed their time but became more and more conscious about the exterior world and, in one sense, had regained their identity and freedom even for a short time.

It should be noted here, however, that, apart from the protagonist, there are other actors in the film who vehicle, though in a different way, the Foucauldian concept of resistance namely the Chief Bromden, Billy Bibbit...etc. Chief Bromden is able to deceive the administrative staff by pretending to be deaf and dumb. Milos Forman presents the Chief as the only Indian who is confined in the asylum. What draws the attention of the audience, however, is that all along the movie, the Chief, except in some scenes where he only mutters a few words, is totally voiceless. Chief Bromden's muteness is very evocative. It can be explained as his astonishment or rather his disgust of the society around, a thing that he tries to overcome through being silent.

The final scene of the movie ending with the Chief's escape and rush towards free nature after having strangled McMurphy is highly suggestive. This escape suggests that the director, in his endeavor to describe and criticize the American psychiatric system of the sixties and seventies, awkwardly fails to find a cure to such terrible situation. The fact that

Chief returns to nature rather than facing society implies his final defeat by the system. Therefore, his escape is no longer a free choice but rather the society's one. As the reserved fate for the mad during Renaissance Europe, the Chief is excluded from society. Indeed, the Chief is like the mad who, confined on the ship, is delivered to

> the river with its thousand arms, the sea with its thousand roads, to that great uncertainty external to everything, he is a prisoner in the midst of what is the freest, the openest of the routes, bound fast at the infinite crossroads. (Foucault, 2001: 09)

If silence is the strategy that Bromden uses to answer back and resist the arbitrariness of the power relations in the asylum, Billy Bibbit, on the other hand, follows a radical technique to express his resistance to Nurse Ratched; the symbol of authority. First, he transgresses the Nurse's orders and decides to sleep with McMurphy's girlfriend, thus, regaining his complete manhood. Second, the final act that he performs is to put an end to his life of obedience and fear from the Nurse by tragically committing suicide. Therefore, Billy's resistance to the system is expressed through his preference for death rather than docility.

Cheswisck, the first patient who adopted McMurphy's rebellious attitude, is another example where resistance and the questioning of Nurse Ratched's domineering approach are shown. His rising rebellious attitude is attested in the following dialogue:

Nurse Ratched: Sit down, gentlemen!
Sit down, gentlemen! Sit down!
Cheswick: Rules?
Piss on your fucking rules, Miss Ratched!

Nurse Ratched: Sit down. Will you?
Cheswick: l want you to know something right here and now!
l ain't no little kid! l ain't no little kid!
What, are you going to have cigarettes kept from me like cookies?

At the technical level, director Milos Forman uses lots of cinematographic techniques to emphasize and make clear for the audience the intricacy of the power relations that operated within the asylum. The importance of Forman's style lies in his use of highly

expressive and precise shots to demonstrate, for instance, the characters' resistance to the psychiatric power. The different manifestations of the characters' resistance, therefore, are dramatized through the use of well studied shots for transmitting the message to the audience. In the following, some shots are provided to show how the director depicts the "patients' resistance to the system.

Shot 03. (1:02:49) **The "Patients" aboard the HYAK**. A long shot which depicts the "patients" in board of the "HYAK" standing in a straight position, and, proudly, showing their fish to the completely shocked doctor Spivey and the other gazers. This is a way to show their resistance to the psychiatric power and its discourse which tries to deprive of from their capabilities. This shot can be interpreted as a sign that the "patients" began to regain back their confidence and became emancipated from the authority of the doctor and the nurses.

To question the very idea of madness, the "patients" are shown wearing normal clothes and putting a lifebuoy, a sign that they are fully aware of the dangers they run at sea. Therefore, it demonstrates that, when outside of the asylum, they aren't fools who are completely dependent on the psychiatrists. By the end of this fishing trip, the patients are described to have a real thunderous laughter, a sign of their physical and psychological recovery.

Shot 04. (1:33.26) **A Symbolic Profanation of Ratched's World.** A medium shot which frames McMurphy with his girlfriend Candy inside the nurses' room.

McMurphy mocks the nurses by taking their microphone, the symbol of the administration and the means through which Nurse Ratched gives her orders to the "patients". He grotesquely announces, as the nurses used to do, the "medication time". It is, therefore, a temporary suspension of hierarchy and order. Through this shot, the director depicts McMurphy in a clearly visible defiance to the nurses and in an absolute transgression of the asylum's rules. It is a highly representational "profanation" of the psychiatric authority, since two "deviants", McMurphy as a "mad" and Candy as a prostitute, are shown as symbolically overthrowing the power of the administration.

Shot 05: (1:51:34) **The Radical Transformation of Billy**. A close-up depicting Billy Bibbit's face. Generally speaking by a close up, filmmakers aim to attract the attention of the audience and push them to think about something changing in the character. In this shot, Forman tries to create an emotional impact on the audience by concentrating the camera on Billy Bibbit's face when he defies Nurse Ratched telling to her, in complete defiance, that he is not ashamed about what he did. This close-up represents the radical change that happened in Billy's individuality. This shot represents for the first time Billy rebelling against the Nurse, and this is a radical change from docility to defiance and resistance.

Shot 06: (1.56.53) **McMurphy Strangling the Nurse.** A long or full shot, where Forman is depicting the protagonist McMurphy strangling the Nurse Ratched. Right after seeing his favorite friend Billy committing suicide, McMurphy blows up at the Nurse and, in a very daring act, he firmly holds her neck and tries to strangle her. The director chooses a long shot as well as a special soundtrack to dramatize this action and aims to have a deep effect over the audience. This aim is surely attained, since it is for the first time that the spectator sees McMurphy in a physical contact with the Nurse with his complete body over the Nurse trying to kill her. This act, however, represents the tragic flaw that caused the ultimate downfall of the protagonist.

Shot 07 : (2:05:48) **Bromden as the American Adam**. A long shot, since the Chief Bromden is barely distinguishable and remain dwarfed by the background. By this shot, the director depicts the Chief escaping from the asylum and running towards the free world which is symbolized through the setting. First, the place is free nature since neither fence nor boundaries are depicted but only free limitless horizons. Second, the time that is chosen is dawn and the clouds in the sky begin to disappear. His escape as well as the fact that he strangles McMurphy announces that Chief begins to abhor society and, out of his rising consciousness, he prefers wilderness rather than society. This scene, however, suggests the failure of Forman to find a serious solution for the terrible situation of the American psychiatric system in the sixties and seventies.

The death of McMurphy as well as the Chief's escape, leaving the other "patients" to face the same old bad treatment, suggest that there is failure to understand and rekindle the relations between the government and the Americans. As I shall demonstrate in the coming section under the title of "Tragedy", there was a wide abyss and disillusionment in America during that period. Indeed, in the context of the aftermath of the Vietnam War, Watergate and the Cold War, the American people were increasingly disillusioned with the government and their democratic institutions in the 1970s. The Cold War, the Vietnam War, and Watergate considerably damaged Americans' faith in their government and in their leaders. Therefore, the strategies of resistance that appeared in the movie stand for the different social reactions that appeared in America including, as I studied earlier in this work, the Civil Rights Movement, the Women's Movement…etc to protest against the over domination, the policy of exclusion practiced by the government over the Americans. Said in other words, the 1960s and 1970s were decades of protest and reform. Young Americans protested against the Vietnam War. African-Americans demonstrated for civil rights. Women called for equal treatment. Exactly like McMurphy, the society's hero, at that period, was believed to be the person who helps others and sacrifices himself for them.

To summarize, because resistance accompanies power, one cannot understand the doctor and "patient" relationship in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* as being a complimentary one; that of doctor in a one-up position dominating the "patient" in a one-down position. Indeed, the "patients" in the asylum, through different ways, have shown their resistance to the Nurse Ratched who personifies the system in general. The resistance of the status quo and the struggle to ensure equal position are basically vehicled by the protagonist McMurphy. However, McMurphy and the "patients' resistance to of the asylum's power is an unsuccessful one. Indeed, McMurphy, as a punishment, gets lobotomized by the nurse and becomes, to use a Derridean concept a kind of undecidable; he is neither dead nor alive but a

zombie like. The Nurse wins more power and succeeds to dominate the "patients." This situation is evocative of the sixties and seventies America.

In the following section, a further analysis is provided concerning the issue of tragedy and how it is discussed in the movie and, ultimately, how power is productive rather than repressive. Therefore, the aim is to show how the downfall of the social system in America at that time is dramatized by Milos Forman throughout the film.

4_ Tragedy and the Productive Nature of Power in *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*

Tragedy in Milos' *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* can be discussed by reference to some principal themes and characters in the movie like the protagonist McMurphy and his death, the Chief Bromden and his escape, Billy Bibbit and his suicide...etc. Interestingly, these examples can be seen, according to Michel Foucault, as being related to the productive nature of power.

Indeed, before studying how the tragic events in the movie reflect or vehicle a message about the tragic period in the American history namely the sixties and seventies, it would be suitable to study such events leaning to one of the Foucauldian characteristics of power namely its productive nature.

As I have argued in the second chapter of this work, Michel Foucault stresses that, besides being a relation rather than a possession and that is frequently followed by resistance, power is productive rather than repressive. For example, one can notice that during the seventies America, there was a discourse against what was considered as 'perverse' sexuality and, therefore, children were controlled and surveyed from this phenomenon. It means that power, at that period, tried to repress 'perverse' sexuality, and eradicate it. The result,

however, is the complete opposite. Repression had seemingly resulted in a remarkable increase in the rate of gays and lesbians.

In Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest,* a lot of examples can be used to speak about the productive nature of power and its counter effects. Indeed, if power in the asylum is meant to help the "patients" regain their mental abilities and cure the symptoms of this deviance, one can see that madness is not eradicated at all but rather aggravated. Therefore, the asylum not only fails in its mission but produces and aggravates the very reason for which it is supposed to find a cure.

To begin with, the protagonist McMurphy shifts from sanity to insanity, since it is shown in the movie that he willingly fakes madness to escape imprisonment. McMurphy is not mad but is forced to be mad. It follows that this asylum is represented as a place where even reasonable persons might lose their reason and become mad. As such, the asylum, through its rigid oppressive discipline, seems to produce and proliferate the very problems it is supposed to eradicate. Therefore, McMurphy's sanity, symbolized by his open laughter, open sexuality, self-confidence, stands in contrast to the very insanity of the asylum.

The above claim would be confirmed further if one considers the case of Billy Bibbit. Indeed, it is mentioned in the movie that the reason for which Billy enters the mental hospital is to protect himself, by the use of psychiatry, from committing suicide. Said in other words, it is for staying alive that Billy enters the asylum. Paradoxically, due to the oppressive nurse and her unendurable domination, Billy commits suicide.

The reason why the "Acutes" have committed themselves to the asylum is their belief that, in the asylum, they would learn how to be independent and to live again in society. Nevertheless, what they learn is to be more and more dependent on the system. Their aim to find a cure in the asylum is crashed down. Their disillusionment from the psychiatric

administration is manifested at multiple occasions. However, it is the theme of resistance to the Nurse (the system) that principally proves their disillusionment.

Moreover, despite the fact that the audience ignores neither the real reason why Bromden is confined in the asylum nor his aspirations, it is easily understood that being a murderer is the last thing that Bromden wants to be. Indeed, the Chief is depicted, throughout the movie, as being a peaceful giant person who prefers to watch and keep silent rather than participate with the other "patients." In the final scenes of the movie, the neutral and uncommitted attitude of Bromden radically changes. After seeing McMurphy losing his rebellious character and becoming a docile body par-excellence, Bromden prefers to tragically suffocate McMurphy. Though this tragic act is done to liberate McMurphy from his sufferings, Bromden, however, becomes in the eyes of psychiatry and society in general a person who lost his logic and his mental abilities, and, therefore, should be confined and excluded.

It is deducible from the examples provided above that power in the context of the asylum leads not to eradicate madness and perversities but rather it produces and aggravates such phenomena. These tragic events that are depicted in the movie, however, have another deeper message to transmit. Indeed, what makes the movie brilliant in its genre is its capability to critically speak about the social reality of Americans in an allegorical way. Probably, it would be terribly superficial and even narrow minded to understand the movie as simply a fight between a patient and a nurse which ends by the death of the former.

The historical context wherein *One Flew over the cuckoo's Nest* was released informs us about the main issues it tries to discuss. Released in 1975 and based on a 1962 Ken Kesey's novel, the movie dramatizes the countercultural era and its major issues that the Americans had witnessed at that time. Indeed, the movie has a powerful anti-psychiatric

message in regard to different aspects. Probably, what best validates this idea is the symbolic use of the dictatorial oppressive Nurse as the character who personifies the psychiatric system and her failure to make the "patients" regain back their sanity.

Seen from this approach, the movie speaks about the tragic failure of the American psychiatry and genuinely dramatizes the anti-psychiatric sentiment shown by different movements at that time. The Psychiatry Survivors Movement, a group of ex-patients, for example, arose out of the Civil Right Movement of the late 1960s and the early 1970s to denounce forced treatment, discrimination and the dreary situation of the American psychiatric system and often to promote the "patients' rights.

Seen from another general approach, however, the movie's message is not limited only to the failure of the psychiatric system in America but it also suggests the failure of the social system and the tragic disillusionment that Americans knew at that period. This disillusionment, resulted from many factors, and it has created an electrified climate in the relationship of the Americans with their government. This distance in the relationship is portrayed in the movie by stressing the distance, and the striking differences between the "patients" and the Nurse Ratched.

The movie was released in a decade known for disillusion, cynicism, bitterness and anger. This claim would be totally legitimate, if one examines this decade in the context of the aftermath of the Vietnam War, Watergate and the Cold War. Surely, these incidents damaged Americans' faith in their government and their leaders. Indeed, the American people were terribly disillusioned with the government and its democratic institutions.

Added to this political disillusionment, American society at that period was suffering from an economic decline and decreasing standards of living. The movie, therefore, argues about this tragic decade that many critics know as a period of confusion, frustration and an

overwhelming feeling that America had lost its direction as the American Dream was becoming harder and harder to achieve. The Americans, in the 1970s, were faced with pertaining problems which threatened their existence including economic stagnation, increasing poverty and the crash down of the cultural values.

Among the indicators that suggested the tragic failure of the social system in America in the late sixties and the seventies were increasing divorce rates, growing breakdown of the family, the rise in juvenile delinquency, increase in drug-use, rising crime rates, rising couples living outside marriage, increasing presence of gays, lesbians and bisexuals, religion is abandoned, joblessness and increasing women and children were in poverty. As a result of these changes, many Americans lost their faith in the American Dream, their society, and their future.

The real tragedy of that period, it is believed, was that because Americans lost their faith in their government, they did not believe that the government could solve these problems. People asked why their government didn't try to do something about what many considered as the decline of the American culture, society, and economy. It is these sentiments of distance, disillusionment, and over dominance that *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* depicts. The director makes the tragic assassination of the McMurphy to be a suggestive scene implying the Americans losing hope in their government to improve their miserable situation.

By way of summary, by portraying the wide abyss between the "patients" and the psychiatric administration, *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* is an allegory of the multi-dimensional crisis that the Americans had witnessed in the sixties and the seventies. It follows that the director's principle aim is to argue about the failure of the social system in America and the urgency of reforming the system. The movie, therefore, ends implicitly calling for the

reform of the social system in America. The theme of reforming the system is brilliantly discussed in Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* that I am going to analyze in the coming chapter.

Conclusion

I have tried in the present chapter to demonstrate that the power relations that exist in Oregon psychiatric institution, the setting of Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*, are unfairly oppressive. Indeed, between the "patients" and the administrative psychiatric staff namely the Nurse Ratched, there exists a wide abyss and a considerable distance. This is justified because no meta-communication exists between them. The patients' psychological problems are neither lessened nor cured by the nurse but rather aggravated and used as means to control the "patients" themselves. Indeed, the fact that the psychiatrists hold knowledge about the patients gives power and enables them to have a one up position, controlling and adjusting the "patients" in a one down position.

I have attempted to explain how the "patients", inside the asylum, are controlled by the Nurse Ratched using different power strategies namely discipline and observation. One can easily notice how the "patients' time and activities are organized and disciplined by tightly controlling the slightest details. It is not only the physical bodies of the "patients" that are controlled. Even their souls are targeted. Though the resistance that these "patients" expressed, especially McMurphy, it is the Nurse (the system) who wins at the end causing the tragic murder of McMurphy, the symbol of resistance, secularism and free individuality against the status quo. The "patients" are observed and their behaviors are watched, studied and, most importantly recorded. This theme of observation indicates how the American government exercised much power, hegemony and dominance over the people so as to produce docile bodies that obey and conform to mainstream discourse.

I have shown that Forman's movie reflects the decades of the sixties and seventies, the time period of its release. Indeed, one of the most important ideas that are discussed in the movie is the dangers that may happen when too much power is ceded to the government. This idea sounds in the context of the Watergate scandal in Nixon's presidency. Also reflected in the movie are the different countercultural ideas and movement like the hippies by the use of McMurphy.

In this movie, the director dramatizes the American psychiatric system failure, as what numerous movements denounced at that time. In addition, the death of the principal character suggests the tragedy that happened in the American society during the sixties and seventies. This sense of the tragic is reflected by the Americans losing confidence in their government and the very bad social and economic conditions that they lived. By dealing with this tragic situation, the movie calls for the urgency of, radically, reforming the American social system.

Chapter Four

Prison's Reformatory Function and Docile Bodies in *Brubaker* (1980)

Introduction

In this chapter, I study the themes of imprisonment, punishment and prison reform in Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* (1980) from a Foucauldian perspective. The aim of this investigation is to show how power, in the Foucauldian sense, operates in the movie to produce docile bodies. I shall study the three characteristics of power including power as a relation rather than a possession, resistance as an omnipresent entity and finally its productive nature in relation to the movie. In addition, I shall argue about making the prisoners docile conforming bodies through the principles of isolation, obligatory work, and that of the modulation of penalties which, together, constitute the 'reformatory' function of prisons.

The analysis of *Brubaker* from a Foucauldian approach implies the use of Michel Foucault's theoretical perspectives about punishment and prison reform to demonstrate how prison functions as a setting where power operates to create docile bodies. Power, therefore, seems to be the concept which most informs my analysis of *Brubaker*. Before studying the circulation of power in the prison as depicted in the movie, I think it is worth beginning with discussing the reformatory function of prison according to Foucault, and how the prison administration of Wakefield State Penitentiary, the setting of *Brubaker*, tries to reform the convicts into docile bodies.

1-**The Reformatory function of prison at Wakefield State Penitentiary**

Contrary to the old view which dictates that prisons are fixed institutions whose function is merely to keep convicts far from society, Michel Foucault argues in *Discipline and Punish* that we should no longer consider prisons as neutral institutions but rather as complex heterotopic places where power relations manifest themselves. Prison, for Foucault, is not static but rather dynamic self evident capable of being transformed. This self-evident character of prison is based on the simple form of deprivation of liberty (1991: 232). Indeed,

in a society where liberty is considered as a good which belongs to all and to which each individual is attached, it seems to be normal that depriving someone of his liberty, through imprisonment, is the penalty par excellence.

As I have shown in the first chapter in my exploration of prison through history, forms of prison have surely existed at any given point in history. Imprisonment, though slightly different from the modern understanding, has existed from the very beginning of humanity. In the modern society, the status of prison, as a very important institution that we cannot substitute, has not changed. Prisons, for Foucault, are ever present in that one cannot see how to replace them. They are the detestable solution, which we seem unable to do without (ibid).

However, the fact that criminals were detained prior the late 18th and early 19th centuries does not change the fact that prisons, in the Foucauldian sense, only emerge as "technico-disciplinary" in the modern era (ibid. 233). It is important to mention that these prisons, exactly like Wakefield State Penitentiary, as depicted in *Brubaker*, functioned as more than detention centers that restricted the freedom of individuals. Starting from the early 1800s, prisons were focused upon a reformatory function, with the final goal of the "recording of existence" of any convict that was incarcerated (ibid. 236).

The principles that guide the reformation of the inmates include: 1- isolation: for reflecting on the offense and stressing individualized punishment, 2- penal labor: to foster in the convict love for work and order, 3- the ability of the prison officials to modulate the sentence as an effective measure to control and assess inmate conformity to a reformed life for which his sentence may be reduced (ibid. 248). These principles that form the prison reformatory function of making the convicts docile bodies may be discussed in relation to Rosenberg's *Brubaker* and his depiction of Wakefield State Penitentiary's policy.

1-1- **The principle of isolation and Wakefield State Penitentiary**

One of the techniques that prisons use for achieving their reformatory function is the isolation of inmates. The convict, it is believed, should be isolated from the external world and all the external factors that fostered criminality in his spirit. Isolation is a very efficient means of punishing the inmate. It pushes him to reflect upon his crime, to face and hate his deviant spirit. In some cases, convicts should be isolated not only from the external world but also from each other inside the same prison.

It is clearly shown in *Brubaker* that the isolation of prisoners is used as an effective means of punishment. The convicts in the movie are shown to be isolated from the whole world. Before Brubaker (Robert Red Ford) reveals his real identity as the new warden, the policy of the prison administration is to keep the prisoners far from the exterior society. The director Stuart Rosenberg depicts Wakefield Penitentiary as a closed society in itself. This claim resonates forcefully in the context of "Convicts Policing Convicts" system.

Indeed, during the sixties and seventies America, a political climate had reigned in some states like the state of Arkansas where, due to some challenging economic factors and political instabilities, the Convicts Policing Convicts system was applied. This system calls for the decrease of the prisons financial budget by having the convicts rule themselves. As such, under the name of "trusties", some prisoners are appointed so as to guard and policy other inmates. As depicted in *Brubaker*, this system greatly contributes to the aggravation of violence and corruption within the prison.

It is true to say that it is due to an economic recession that the State of Arkansas, as mentioned several times in the movie, has recourse to such a system for lowering its spending on prisons. Yet, another interpretation may sound plausible in regard to the sociopolitical policy that the American government followed at that time. Faced with internal uprisings

namely the Civil Rights Movement and external factors like the Cold War and the Vietnam War, the very existence of the American government had been severely questioned both at the national and international levels. In such an atmosphere of instability, neither the public opinion nor the Federal Government, especially in the early sixties, were inclined to better the prisoners' conditions by spending much money on the carceral institutions. The government was actually busy with finding solutions to more acute problems, the American involvement in Vietnam, the communist threat and the protests caused by such a climate. Therefore, despite the fact that there were some calls for reform, the process of improving the penitentiary conditions was terribly slow. Making the prisoners rule themselves was resorted to in some States. What should be mentioned, however, is that, by such system (CPC), the idea of totally excluding prisoners from society has been strongly stressed.

Making the prisoners ruling themselves by themselves seems to be an institutional implementation of the belief which says that convicts should not be in contact with society but rather confined in remote places far from public concern. The Wakefield State Penitentiary is depicted in the movie as a small independent society per se. In the very beginning, this idea of isolation is stressed by the director who, to make the spectator aware of the limits of the prison, moves his camera to picture the high gothic military-like surrounding fences of the prison. It is needless to say that escaping from these limits is totally forbidden. If happened, such a deed is sentenced by further punishment. Being a prisoner seems to be like being a leper. The role of the prison is to keep the American society far from this plague of leprosy.

As the movie begins, the new inmates including the protagonist Brubaker, in their way to the prison, see by their proper eyes the fate of a miserable convict who tried to escape from the prison. Such incident, surely, makes the new inmates remember the principle of isolation that is imposed upon them.

The strategy of isolating inmates as depicted in *Brubaker* is implemented not only from the society outside but, in some cases; it includes isolating them from the other inmates in very small dirty closets. Walter (Morgan Freeman), a black convict, represents one of the inmates who are punished by individual isolation. By isolating him, the prison aims at reforming Walter into a docile conforming body. Being in isolation, the convicts would surely have enough time to reflect on himself and the crime that he committed. Placed alone in the presence of his crime, Foucault argues, the convict learns to hate it, and if his soul is not yet blunted by evil, it is in isolation that regret will come to assault him (1991: 237). The prisoner Walter seems to be in the initial stage of the process to become a docile body since, as the scene where he tries to murder Budden shows, he feels bitter hatred for himself. Because of being isolated, Walter loses his mental abilities and becomes controllable.

The reason why Walter is put in solitary confinement is his unpredictable behavior and uncontrollable personality. Walter is portrayed as a strong black inmate who dares to question everything. Despite the fact that Walter is depicted only in a few scenes, his role is very important. In these few scenes, this convict is represented as a person who tries to live his proper American dream. The short dialogue that he has with Brubaker is very meaningful in two ways. First, it is this dialogue that pushes Brubaker to finally reveal his real identity as the new warden. This scene, therefore, is the starting point that radically reorients the plot of the movie. It represents the end of Brubaker's fake and the wakening point of the American society's consciousness and will to reform the prison. Second, by a meticulous analysis of this scene, one would surely understand that its meaning is more complicated than simply Brubaker deciding to reveal his real identity. Indeed, Walter is formulating the hopes of a whole American generation of peaceful and middle class Black citizens. He naively asks to see the "man", the warden of the prison to denounce the terrible living conditions. When

Brubaker plays the role of the "man", Walter demands so that this place would be painted by yellow, a picture window, some liquor and a TV but, most importantly, he asks for respect.

What Walter demands falls into two categories; tangible and intangible things. On the one hand, one can find that Walter asks the warden for material goods including liquor, a TV set, a picture window and yellow paint for his "place". On the other hand, Walter makes clear that he wants respect from the prison staff. He pronounces the word 'respect' many times and in different tones. He uses violent and less violent tones to express his anger and wish for better conditions. He represents both Malcolm X violent and Martin L. King Junior's less violent movements.

In addition, it seems that Stuart Rosenberg makes of the Black convict Walter a symbol and a spokesman for all the oppressed Blacks in America. The argument which supports this claim is the very nature of what Walter asks for. Indeed, during the sixties and seventies America, Blacks have formed organized groups like Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) to protest against racism and the bad living conditions they suffered from. By asking for skylight and a picture window, Walter epitomizes the Afro-American's struggle for hope, freedom and a better America. The society where they live, because oppressive and domineering, is symbolized by a disgusting setting. If Walter cannot move freely is this closet because it is too narrow, Blacks feel terribly limited in a society where Jim Crow laws, as suggested in the movie, are still in vigor. Therefore, to ask for liquor is probably to get drunk and forget about the bitter reality, whereas demanding respect shows to what extent the Blacks were treated as inhuman.

It is should be noted here that Wakefield State Penitentiary has its penological origins in the old American penal system namely that of Auburn and Philadelphia systems. As shown

in the first chapter, Auburn and Philadelphia system were based principally on the isolation of the convict because of their belief that the criminal behavior is the result of some causes namely the lack of knowledge of the Bible but most importantly a harmful environment and a bad entourage of a person. It seems, therefore, that Wakefield State Penitentiary, as depicted in the movie, is inspired by the early 19th century American penology.

As shown in the first chapter, two phases characterize the American penal system. The first phase stretched from the creation of the first penal institution in America at the end of the 16th century up to the mid 18th century. This phase is characterized by the orientation of the penalty towards the body of the condemned. The second phase roughly began in the early 1800s to the modern times. What is targeted in this phase is the soul of the convict to reach his complete reform.

This shift in target from the body to the soul is indicative of the change in society's economic and political situations. Indeed, the most striking thesis in *Discipline and Punish* is that the shift from the brutal Monarchical punishment to the gentler Disciplinary punishment is not to punish less but to punish better (1991: 82). In Wakefield State Penitentiary, it is the Disciplinary punishment that is applied. One can clearly understand that the government wants to break any rebellious spirit among the convicts and to reach a more intrusive psychological control. In order to this goal, a strict and total discipline, surveillance and control, as I shall study later in this work, is implemented.

In addition to the isolation of the inmates from the exterior world, and in some case separating the prisoners from themselves, the reform of these convicts into docile bodies is not be efficient unless they are forcefully taught to love work. In what follows, further illustration is provided to the second principle that prisons use to reform the convicts and create docile bodies.

1-2- **The principle of obligatory work in Wakefield State Penitentiary**

Obligatory work is the second strategy that is used inside prison for making the inmates forget their rebellious behavior. Apart from isolation, work in prisons may be defined, according to Foucault, as an "agent of carceral transformation" (1991: 240). Committing crimes is explained by lots of approaches. One of them views criminality as the result of joblessness. This claim is to be found in the mid 18th century when punishment began to be oriented towards the criminal rather the crime and the concern of the law was centered not so much on what criminals have done as what environmental, heredity, parental actions that led them to commit a crime. Foucault argues that linking crime with joblessness is to be found as early as the code of 1808 which states that

> although the penalty inflicted by the law has its aim the reparation of a crime, it is also intended to reform the convict, and this double aim will be fulfilled if the malefactor is snatched from that fatal idleness which, having brought him to prison, meets him again within its walls and, seizing hold of him, brings him to the ultimate degree of depravity. (Foucault, 1991: 240)

In Wakefield State Penitentiary the principle of obligatory work is strictly followed. The prisoners are depicted as slave workers. Their day begins early in the morning. As soon as they have their breakfast, they are sent to do different hard jobs. As already said above, the director depicts this prison as a closed society. This means that it has to produce almost all its needs and to minimize its dependence on the government. While some prisoners are asked to work in the factory of wood, the others are sent to work the hard surrounding lands where crops are cultivated. No exception is made for prisoners whatever their health state conditions. As depicted in the scene where the character Bullen, the convict who always carries his black glasses, even though seriously hurt by the "Tucker Telephone", he is sent to deal with "the sanitation detail".

It should be noted here that work inside prison has created in America a whole debate about the negative impact on economy outside the prison. Indeed, it is noticed that the products produced inside prisons, unlike the factories outside, are cheaper and often better in quality. Because of such considerations, some critics view prison work as destroying the economy of society. For such allegations, Foucault answers that penal labor, with its too limited extent and low output, cannot have a general effect on the economy (1991: 242). What makes work inside prisons intrinsically useful not as an activity of production but rather by "virtue of the effect it has on the human mechanism" (ibid). Foucault adds that penal labor must be seen as "the very machinery that transforms the violent, agitated, unreflective convict into a part that plays its role of regularity*"* (ibid). For the question of why penal labor is important? Foucault answers saying

> not [for] profit. Nor even the formation of a useful skill; but the constitution of a power relation, an empty economic form, a schema of individual submission and of adjustment to a production apparatus. (ibid. 243)

Indeed, what interest penologists in prison labor is its role as a disciplinary strategy since it engraves in the soul of the inmate the respect of hierarchy, regularity, and order. It is common knowledge that, contrary to idleness, work helps us to feel less agitated to cause problems and, therefore, easily controllable.

One can easily notice that the prisoners in *Brubaker*, because of hard labor, seem to be unable to question the oppressive rule of the "trusties". Despite the fact that they are in majority young fellows, the inmates' voices, especially in work, are barely heard. They are depicted in the movie as being 'silenced or rather inactive' both physically and spiritually. Such a state of passivity results principally from the very tough work they perform. As Foucault notices in *Discipline and Punish*, making the convict occupied, therefore, leads not only to inculcate habits of order and obedience, but also stifle aspirations of freedom and

imagination (1991: 242). It is shown in the movie that the convicts' imagination or aspiration for a better future is barely inexistent. They have surrendered to and accepted the prison's situation and, being conscious that they will die in this prison, do not bother themselves in thinking about the world outside and the potential achievements they may do once outside.

It is believed that if the prisoners don't accept to work like slaves, they are going to be a heavy burden on the government. This belief elevates labor to the place of the mainstream religion of the prison. Wakefield State Penitentiary is not an exception of other prisons. Michel Foucault, quoting Lucas, writes that the utility of remuneration of penal labor lies in the fact that it imposes on the convict the moral form of wages as the condition of his existence since wages inculcate in him the love and habit of work (ibid. 243). What probably makes Wakefield different from other prisons is probably the fact that it obliges convicts to work without remuneration. This fact aggravates the situation of the convicts who don't even dare to ask for wages. They rather accept their slave-like status.

In an industrial machine-like society which is erected upon capitalism, Wakefield State Penitentiary of Arkansas, through the principle of obligatory work, aims to create mechanical individuals. Such individuals would be beneficial to the American government by their work and, most importantly, by their conformism to the dominant discourse.

So far, I have discussed two principles that prisons use to reform convicts into docile bodies. These two principles, however, would not be totally efficient unless enforced with another third principle that functions as a strategy the prison administration uses to control to what extent the two above principles are respected. This principle is that of the modulation of penalties. In what follows, argumentation is provided to explain the importance of the principle of the modulation of penalties to achieve docility among the inmates.

1-3- **The principle of the modulation of penalties in Wakefield State Penitentiary**

This principle implies that the institution of prison has the ability to modulate the sentence of the prisoner by increasing or decreasing its length. The duration of the penalty must be adjusted according to the convicts' transformation and conformity. It follows that the right duration of the penalty must be calculated "not only according to the particular crime and its circumstances, but also to the penalty itself as it takes place in actual fact" (Foucault, 1991: 245).

The principle of the modulation of penalties is one of the principles through which convicts are made docile bodies. In Wakefield State Penitentiary this principle manifests itself in an indirect way. Abraham, the Black convict that informs Brubaker about the graves in the prison yard, is the character who can be used to explain this principle. It is mentioned in the movie that Abraham is incarcerated for a murder. For this, the court sentences him for thirty five years imprisonment. However, because of the corruption of the prison ward, Abraham spends thirty-eight years and six months. Basically, the reason why his sentence is increased is that Abraham is not yet completely transformed into a docile body.

The above claim is plausible since being a docile body implies complete allegiance to the established order. As one can understand in the scene where he decides to reveal to Brubaker about the two hundred corpses in the prison farm, Abraham, by following his proper intuitions, transgresses the warden's orders. Indeed, Abraham will be a complete docile body if he succumbs to the warden's wish not to reveal the corruption that happens inside the prison. However, Abraham's decision to follow his proper way and "clean his consciousness" proves that the federal administration has not succeeded to transform him into a docile body. As a punishment for not being docile, the trusties decide to modulate his sentence, not by increasing it, but rather by killing him. If the principle of the modulation of penalties aims

principally to assess the convict and the extent to which he is docile, Abraham fails in this examination and, as such, gets murdered.

To kill the convict Abraham simply because he decides to "clean his consciousness*"* is highly suggestive and indicative of the kind of reaction that the American government holds to punish those who dare to transgress the mainstream discourse. The case of the Black leader Martin Luther King Junior and the president J.F. Kennedy with their enigmatic assassinations may illustrate the point. One similar characteristic is, undoubtedly, shared between these remarkable leaders with Abraham in the movie. This similitude can be summarized in the fact that these popular voices are vehicles and symbols of hope and progressive change for a whole generation of Americans, a reason why they were assassinated.

It is important to stress the fact that the principle of the modulation of penalties can be operated differently. As already mentioned, the significant role of this principle lies in the fact that it makes sure that transforming the convicts into docile bodies fulfilled. By extension, this principle would include punishment in its physical and non physical dimensions and the different strategies which aim to adjust the behavior of the convict whenever necessary for an assured transformation. In the same sense, Foucault, paraphrasing Lucas (1836), speaks about three areas where this principle takes form. This includes a trial area for prisoners in general, a punishment area, and a reward area for those who are engaged on the way of reform (Foucault, 1991: 245).

In simpler words, the principle of the modulation of penalties includes punishment and its different strategies because their aim is to control individuals, reward those who conform and punish those who do not. The very institution of prison draws its existence from this philosophy of punishment. Indeed, prison lies on the principle that individuals who haven't obeyed the mainstream discourse should be punished. History is full of examples about

philosophers, thinkers, and political activists who are imprisoned because of their nonconformist views that challenged the prevalent discourse. In the movie, one can see on multiple scenes how prisoners are punished because they have transgressed the laws. Budden, for example, is punished by "Tucker telephone" because he tried to murder one of the trusties. The trusties, on the other hand, are promoted to this place because they implement, or rather personify, the government' wish to control the convicts and institute a climate of dissuasion necessary for convicts' reform. This system of punishments and rewards, Foucault adds, is not only "a way of gaining respect for the prison regulations, but of making the action of prison on the inmates effective" (ibid. 246).

With these three principles in mind, one can understand that punishment of the prisoners, as depicted in *Brubaker*, is far from being a neutral practice but rather follows a precise plan to radically transform the convicts into docile bodies. This is because the target of punishment is not only the body of the condemned but, most importantly, his soul. What interests the prison's warden of Wakefield State Penitentiary is to transform Brubaker and his fellow inmates into docile bodies who would obey the laws of Arkansas and America, in general, once they are released.

Commenting on the very existence of these three principles, Foucault argues that a nuanced system of power relations evolves as the carceral apparatus has recourse to these three great principles (1991: 248). In other words, these principles contribute making the prison the locus where power relations evolve. One can, therefore, easily deduce, out of this study of the reformatory function of prison, that prison is no longer a place where liberty is removed from a criminal. Rather, it is something more; a total institution whose function is to produce docile bodies through the help of power strategies such as observation, discipline and knowledge. Indeed, it would be impossible to make the convicts docile bodies, unless they are closely observed, disciplined and made subjects to power and knowledge.

Before studying these power strategies and how they contribute making the inmates docile in Wakefield State Penitentiary, I shall start by studying the kind of power relations that exist between the prisoner and the prison's administrative staff (those who personify the government).

2- **Power relations and resistance in prison**

From the first scenes of the movie, one can understand that power relations between the inmates and the guards are unfairly oppressive. The prison guards, relying upon their authority and knowledge of the prisoners, has forced them to accept the inequality of their status. Of course, the guards are in the one –up position and the convicts in the one-down position.

Brubaker, actually, is a portrayal of the unfairness of the prisoners and guards relationship. Indeed, it seems that Stuart Rosenberg's aim in this movie is to show to the public how the convicts are entrusted by the government to control other inmates and how they use unimaginably cruel methods to torture these convicts. The trusties, who are supposed to guard the prisoners, personify the 'unrevealed' side of the American government and humanity in general. Left barely without considerable surveillance form the outside world, the trusties have full authority and power to do whatever they want with the prisoners. The warden of Wakefield is the only character who comes from the free world. However, this warden, because he lives in such a corrupted and corrupting place, loses his ethics and becomes involved in affairs of corruption.

In this film, probably, the best idea that can summarize the guard and prisoner relationship is that of the convict as the "other" of the guard. The concept of "other" may have different uses. Its principle is that all what is not me is the "other". The "other" of man is woman and vice versa. The concept of "other" implies speaking about the most intrinsic

characteristics that constitute one category of individuals as different from others. Thereby, the "other" of the non-deviant individuals is the deviants and the criminals. In the context of Brubaker, lots of scenes can be used to show how the prisoners are considered to be the "other".

To begin with, the prison lies on the principle that some individuals are too dangerous to live in the outside community, and should, therefore, be confined in closed places far from society. The prisoner seems to be the synonym of an 'unwanted' person. Regardless of the conditions that pushed him to do the offense, the prisoner is seen as a person who is different from other individuals. This difference that exists between the prisoner and other individuals carries out a sentiment of exclusion and rejection. In this respect, Larson Doran, in *Toward a Prison Poetics* (2010), writes that

> S/he [the prisoner] is also discursively fixed as the "othered" subject" in public debates on law, order, and national or local security- a discourse carried out by politicians, administrators, and private citizens at the federal, state and local levels. (2010:145)

In *Brubaker*, the sentiment of exclusion, whether conscious or not, is apparent. For example, in the scene where the protagonist holds a meeting with the federal administrative staff to discuss Wakefield's conditions shows the way the prisoners are considered. In this meeting, one can notice lots of images of inmates as bloodthirsty, dangerous and bestial people who do not even deserve to live. For example, the majority of the persons in the meeting strongly oppose Brubaker's decision to abolish "leather strap" and his less violent methods to control the inmates. Contrary to Brubaker, the other wardens think that the inmates are lost causes who deserve all kinds of torture. In this conversation, it is clearly shown that the wardens feel strong hatred for the inmates. Their judgment over the inmates is not an objective one. When these convicts are dead, even their families are not informed.

Exactly like animals, prisoners in Brubaker are shown to endure utter sufferings without even complaining.

Undoubtedly, Stuart Rosenberg's use of special and well studied cinematographic techniques creates in the spectator the image of the prisoner as an "unwanted" excluded person. In terms of costumes, for example, the director chooses old torn clothes which barely protect the inmates from the cold gives a more profound effect on the spectator. Special scenes are used to make the audience emotionally involved with the prisoners' cause. For example, to show in which extent the inmates suffer from bad nutrition, the director moves his camera to shoot a very disgusting earthworm in Brubaker's meal and juxtaposing it with the trusties' neat and good food. The fact that the inmates are depicted as being not astonished by this stark reality shows that they have endured this situation for a long time and, thus, normalized it. In addition, what would be the best way to show that the inmates have normalized their "otherness" than the purposeful idea of depicting them (the prisoners) as completely shocked at seeing Brubaker, the new warden, seemingly, accepts them as 'true human' beings.

Other cinematographic techniques show the director's endeavor for attracting the audience' emotions to make them think about the conditions of the prisoners. The fact that Rosenberg prefers to shoot the scenes when he finds the skeletons in the prison yard in a rainy day is not a spontaneous one. Probably, it would be true to think that this scene is used to create special impressions on the spectator suggesting the strong determination of Brubaker to fight not only the government but even nature itself. Taking into consideration the period of the movie's release and, because rain is frequent in Vietnam, one can understand that this scene is a critique to the war in Vietnam where many soldiers were killed.

It follows that the relation of prisoners and trusties (who personify the government) is like a master and slave relationship. The trusties are, indeed, in the position of masters who dominate and torture the prisoners. Indeed, the theme of torture can be seen as one manner through which the unbalanced prisoner/guard power relations manifest themselves. Lots of methods are used to torture the prisoners in Wakefield State Penitentiary including rape, physical violence and scarcity of food. Some techniques are invented for the sole aim of making the convicts' lives terribly awful. Of these instruments, the "Tucker Telephone" figures in the first place. It is because of this device that Bullen and Abraham's rebellious character are smashed down.

It is important to note that, despite the fact that prisoner and guard relationship is an unbalanced one as well as the different techniques that the guards have employed to foster docility in the inmates, the latter have, on multiple occasions, demonstrated their resistance to the system.

The character that best embodies resistance to the system in the movie is undoubtedly Brubaker. Brubaker's (the protagonist) entry to Wakefield as a prisoner rather than declaring his real identity as the new prison warden, for instance, illustrates his transgression of the prison's rules and the official reports. For being able to investigate the real conditions of the inmates, he doesn't choose the administrative way by directly revealing his identity, but rather prefers to avoid "officialdom" and an indirect way to reach his goal. The whole movie turns around the idea of Brubaker's resistance to the power exercised upon him by the Federal Government which tries to make him a "docile body". Indeed, one can understand from this film that the governor as well as his administration want to make Brubaker, first by persuasion and later by force, conform to the system and obey the administrative rules by doing exactly what the governor wants.

Brubaker's strong determination to resist the governor appears through different scenes. Probably the best one is when he decides, against the wish of the governor, to continue digging and to search for the graves inside Wakefield prison. Ultimately, his decision to follow the search had revealed that the prison board had committed a lot of crimes by killing prisoners and then burying them in the prison yard.

The protagonist's resistance is manifested in many forms and shapes including irony, mockery, and satire. For example, when the president of the administrative board asks Brubaker about his plans as a new warden saying: "I wonder what his first order of business will be" and Brubaker replies: "Blow the place up. Start from scratch*"*. The dialogue between the protagonist and the State Senator Hite affirms best the rebelliousness of Brubaker when he declares that his job is to reform the prison and "he does not work for any political party or the state or the governor", thus, announcing that he owes nothing to the government and he won't be one of its subjects.

Concerning the other inmates in the movie, especially before Brubaker reveals his real identity, they rarely presented acts of resistance against the system. Apart from some occasional fights and outburst that show their hatred for the "trusties", the prisoners had completely succumbed to the power practiced upon them. In the Foucauldian terminology, it seems that the "trusties", the symbol of the administrative power, had produced a certain reality about the inmates, as the 'other', that they (prisoners), seemingly, had accepted through their "docility".

However, things get changed when Brubaker becomes the new warden. Indeed, the inmates' consciousness and their acts of resistance begin to rise. For example, Bullen, the first character to adopt Brubaker's rebellious attitude against the government, decides to help this new warden in his quest to investigate about corruption inside the prison and to find out the graves. The same thing can said about Abraham when he decides to recover his manhood by

revealing, in spite the trusties' wish, the information that he knows about the places where the skeletons are buried. Ironically, however, all the acts of resistance that Brubaker and the other prisoners performed failed. Indeed, it is the power of the government that finally wins this symbolic battle and, in different ways, annihilates the symbols of resistance namely Brubaker being fired and Abraham murdered.

At this stage, one would surely ask how such unbalanced power relations between prisoners and trusties in Wakefield State Penitentiary continue to exist. How it comes that the trusties are able to firmly hold and control the inmates? In short, how the inmates are made docile subjects? The answer for such question is through observation and a rigid discipline. In the following section, I try to explain further how the inmates are made conforming subjects through observation and discipline.

3- **Observation and discipline in prison**

The observation of the prisoners in Wakefield State Penitentiary is a very important means to ensure the transformation of the convicts into docile bodies. Observation implies that there is an observer and an observed. The function of the former is to observe the movements of the convict. The observer records the slightest details and constitutes knowledge about this convict. This knowledge gives more power and advantage to the observer over the observed inmate. Indeed, in Wakefield State Penitentiary prisoners are made subjects of study and analysis, their personal information are recorded and kept in administrative files. Their behavior, once in prison, is observed, documented, and reports are made. In short, each prisoner becomes a "case" (1991: 191) about whom a dossier is formed. As what happens in other prisons, the movie depicts Wakefield State Penitentiary's policy of collecting information from the inmates as soon as they arrive. Indeed, the new inmates are photographed, and given numbers replacing their proper names. Brubaker, for instance,

becomes simply prisoner number 29450, and his whole identity is reduced to a serial number with which he should present himself to the guards and the other prisoners.

In Wakefield State Penitentiary, it is the trusties who observe the inmates. This observation takes two forms; direct and indirect ones. The direct way to observe the convicts is by placing some armed trusties in highly elevated towers. These places give the trusties an advantage to better see the inmates. The indirect way, however, is by infiltrating the convicts and forcing some inmates to secretly gather information and record all the details and gestures that the inmates make.

The process of observation as depicted in *Brubaker* is a very complicated one, since everyone observes the other. Basically, it is the government which observes the inmates so as to control them. In the movie, nevertheless, the government's presence is unnoticed. It has not employed guards from the outside to control the prisoners as other prisons usually do. Because recruiting agents from the outside is judged too expensive, some American States like Arkansas have resorted to the prisoners themselves to rule the prison. Therefore, it is, initially, for economic considerations that the Convicts Policing Convicts system is justified. However, by making the inmates observe the other inmates, other goals are targeted. Indeed, under this system, more control is assured. This is because the trusties, contrary to normal guards, are more knowledgeable about the prisoners' stuffs and are ready to torture the inmates to extract information and manipulate them. Therefore, the fact that the government divides the prison's staff into the general warden, trusties, and prisoners fits what Michel Foucault calls "Hierarchical observation" (1991: 177) where everyone observes the other. Hierarchical observation is based on the idea that people can be controlled simply by being constantly watched.

The observation is both a punishment and a disciplinary strategy. On the one hand, it is a strategy of punishment because the prisoner would never feel or enjoy his limited liberty inside the prison. Indeed, being under constant surveillance, the inmate would surely feel a psychological burden which leads to the crash down of his individuality. On the other hand, the trusties' constant gaze over the inmates makes the latter feel a state of anxiety and disturbance that leads them to self discipline. Because they feel under constant surveillance, the inmates, for fear of being punished, would discipline themselves by themselves, and, as such, become docile bodies par excellence.

It is shown in the movie that inmates follow a strict discipline. The prison warden, for example, declares explicitly that "he is a fervent believer of discipline". The inmates' day begins by getting up early in the morning. To put in order their beds, wear homogenized cloths and have their breakfast. The trusties classify and send them into work farms and factories. At midday, the prisoners have the right to a small portion of disgusting food. When the few minutes that are reserved for having lunch come to an end, the prisoners return to their work until sunset. After having dinner, the light is switched off, and "time to sleep" is announced. Michel Foucault's appellation of such schedule is "time table" (1991: 07). By time table, what interests the authorities is to punish the body and the soul of the inmate by tightly regulating his time and behavior.

The aim of a time table punishment is to destroy the individuality of the inmate and to transform him into a docile body who has internalized the rules of self discipline. Indeed, it is suggested in the movie that the prisoners have learnt by heart the rules of the prison. The new arrived prisoners including Brubaker, contrary to the old ones who do not even dare to question the authoritative rule of the trusties, naively ask questions about the discipline that reigns inside the prisons simply because they are not accustomed to such a situation of regulation and control. On the other hand, because they have endured such a rigid discipline

for a long period of time, prisoners like Bullen and Abraham seem to not have only accepted this regime but even internalized it. Said in simpler words, discipline inside this prison is a mechanism of power that tries to adjust the inmates' behaviors by regulating the organization of spaces (like architecture), of time (timetable) and their activities and behavior (movements and exercises). Wakefield's prison, therefore, is a miniature and a perfect prototype of a disciplinary society.

The relation between observation and discipline is a relation of cause and effect. Indeed, by observation of the convict's body, his soul would be disciplined. As already discussed, observation leads to self discipline which is one of the characteristics of docile bodies. One can easily notice how the prisoners, being too much observed, have adopted self policing and, therefore, become conforming bodies. Indeed, despite the fact that they live in very bad conditions under the oppressive rule of the trusties, the inmates, except some relatively insignificant attempts, have not struggled to overthrow this situation, but rather accept and try to cope with this situation.

To permit the trusties to gain more efficient control over the observed inmate, Wakefield State Penitentiary is designed in such a way so as to facilitate this process. Indeed, the architecture of this prison helps the trusties and gives them advantage to observe the prisoners. Wakefield's architecture plays a very important role to express the privileged status of those in power. Therefore, Wakefield's architectural design should not be taken for granted but, seen from a Foucauldian lens, it is a practice of which function is to express to the viewers the magnificence (the ostentation of places) and affirm the power of the government to hold and transform the convicts (the geometry of fortresses) (1991: 172).

According to Foucault, the ideal architectural form which shows how disciplinary power functions in the modern societies is Jeremy Bentham's panoptican. The panoptican is a

form of institutional edifice that Bentham designed. It is designed, as its name suggests to observe (-optican) all (pan-), so that the watchman in the "tower" could constantly watch over the inmates inside their cells whose walls are only some fences to facilitate the surveillance operation. In *Brubaker*, it is the "trusties" who play the role of panoptic "tower", observing all the behavior of the inmates. For Foucault, the major effect of the panoptican is to

> include in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that is the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that is the architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers.
>
> (ibid. 201)

The architecture of prison, either its general layout or the very smaller scale features like the form of the windows and doors in Wakefield State Penitentiary, has a great effect over the prisoner and his psychological status. Some social scientists argue that the architectural design of men's prisons through history has been based on the belief that male criminals are dangerous and aggressive; therefore, no weaknesses may be apparent in the construction of the institution, and the whole must represent enduring strength. Wakefield's prison, therefore, fits Erving Goffman's concept of "total institution" that he defines as

> a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life ... its encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to departure that is often built right into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, water, forests, or moors. *(2001: xiii-4)*

Additionally, to demonstrate to what extent observation combined with a rigid discipline in prison affects the psychology and personality of the inmates, as it is the case in Rosenberg's *Brubaker* with the majority of prisoners, the researchers Philip Zimbardo, Craig Haney, W. Curtis and David Jaffe had conducted one of the famous psychological studies

ever done, the Stanford Prison Experiment. They had transformed a whole section in the basement of Stanford University's Psychology Department into a mock prison. They took off the doors of laboratories and replaced them with bars, turning them into cells. A closet became "The Hole" for solitary confinement.

Twenty four healthy, intelligent, middle class males have been selected to take part in this experiment for $15 a day. They were randomly divided into two groups; "inmates" and "guards". The experiment began with the surprise arrest of those designated as "inmates". They were brought in squad cars, booked, read their rights and fingerprinted. Once in the mock jail, they were stripped naked, deloused, issued prison uniforms and taken to their cells.

What happened in the following days shocked the researchers. The "prisoners", on the second day, protested about the treatment they received. As a response, the "guards" had violently subdued the rebellion. They stripped the "inmates" naked, removed the beds from the cells, and put the ringleaders into solitary confinement. Continually, the "guards" harnessed and intimidated the "prisoners". Phil Zimbardo, one of the experimenters, described what happened saying

> every aspect of the prisoners' behavior fell under the total and arbitrary control of the guards. Even going to the toilet became a privilege which a guard cold grant or deny at his whim. Indeed, after the nightly 10:00 p.m. lights 'lockup,' prisoners were often forced to urinate or defecate in a bucket that was left in their cells. On occasion, the guards would not allow prisoners to empty these buckets, and soon the prison began to smell of urine and feces—further adding to the degrading quality of the environment.
>
> (quoted in Elsner, 2006: 31)

Lots of these "guards" seemed to be peaceful who even described themselves as Vietnam War doves. As the days passed, however, their cruelty increased. They forced the "prisoners" to clean toilet bowls with their bare hands, had them do push-ups until they were tuckered out. They apparently relish the power they had suddenly been granted. In the end of

the experiment, the guards had intensified their abuse of the "prisoners" in the middle of the night when they thought the researchers were not watching. They did not know their every action was being captured on film.

When she visited the experiment, Christina Maslach, Zimbardo's girlfriend and later his wife, reported her terrible shock when she sees Zimbardo and says that

> out of uniform, he was a charming, funny, smart young man. In uniform, he was transformed. He began talking in a southern accent. He moved differently and the way he talked was different, not just in the accent, but in the way he interacted with prisoners. It was like Jekyll and Hyde.
>
> (ibid. 31)

One can easily understand the above story's allegorical meaning. The prison is a place where unbalanced power relations can be observed. The bad inhuman treatment the inmates receive and the constant surveillance cause them to lose their selves. Also understood from the story is the idea that even the guards, due to the prison discipline, are potential victims of self and humanity loss. Thus, both prisoners and prison guards in Brubaker are docile bodies controlled by the government.

To recapitulate, one can say that by constant observation and a rigid discipline, convicts are likely to be docile bodies that obey and internalize the rules. One can understand that Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* is not only a portrayal of what happens in Wakefield State Penitentiary. Released in 1980 and based on Murton and Hyams' 1969 book, this movie epitomizes a special period in the American history where everything is observed, a period when agencies like CIA and NSA devoted their efforts to observe, discipline, and control individuals inside and outside America. The movie, therefore, is an allegory of the panoptic American society during the sixties and seventies when the American government had endeavored to make the citizens docile bodies that do not question the dominant discourse.

In the following, more analysis is provided to study the theme of prison reform as vehciled in Rosenberg's *Brubaker*. Basically, my study of prison reform in *Brubaker* is done from a Foucauldian approach. I try to demonstrate how prison reform in the movies tries not to better the conditions of the prisoners but rather to protect a capitalist system by transforming them into docile bodies.

4- *Brubaker* and Prison Reform

The issue of prison reform is widely discussed in *Brubaker*. I have already mentioned in the second chapter that this movie is based upon Murton and Hyams' book *Accomplices to the Crime: the Arkansas Prison Scandal* (1969). Tomas Murton, like Brubaker in the movie, is a university teacher of penology sent by the federal government to occupy the post of the warden. This is because, as shown in the movie, repetitive scandals, evidence of widespread violence, rape and abuses of human rights in general appeared. Stuart Rosenberg's movie dramatizes, therefore, the real events that happened for Tomas Murton and his experience as a new superintendent.

In the movie, the theme of prison reform in Wakefield State Penitentiary is vehicled by the principal character Brubaker. Actually, it is his mission to reform a prison where corruption is widespread. The movie mirrors a very remarkable period in the history of Arkansas prison system when public interest was oriented towards penal institutions, and pressure was put to reform prisons. The appearance of the issue of prison reform in Arkansas State starting from the 1960s is not an exception reserved to this State. Indeed, if reforming prisons in the United States of America can be divided into old and new eras, it is the period of the 1960's that demarcates these two periods. It is not until the 1960s, with the wake of the Civil Rights movements, that the Federal Courts finally recognized that prisoners are

individuals with full constitutional rights and their movement as a sociopolitical attempt to redefine their status (Jacobs, 1977: 431).

Because the prison, commonly speaking, is considered as an autonomous separate institution from society, the effort to reform this institution is viewed as not demanding other fundamental transformations in the structure of society as a whole. This perspective is certainly appealing, since it enables the reformer to focus his energies on a narrow problem without having to worry about larger social and political issues. This view is to be found among liberal thinkers. On the complete opposite, however, radicals, like Michel Foucault notably in *Discipline and Punish*, consider prisons as intimately linked with the class and power structure of the society as a whole.While the liberal perspective on reform is that fundamental changes in the prison system are possible without any change in the rest of society, the radicals state that prison reform can be reached only through radical changes in the society itself. To discuss this question in relation to the context of the United States in general and Wakefield State Penitentiary in special, it is useful to consider one very important issue involved in prison reform which is the social ends of punishment.

To provide a single and absolute answer for this question seems to be impossible. The reason for this is that, as studied in the first chapter of this work, there are many penal philosophies that explain and justify imprisonment and its ends. While deterrence, for example, aims to discourage the convicted from committing another crime, retribution, inspired from the Judeo-Christian and Mosaic laws of the Old Testament, aims basically and solely to punish the offender for transgressing the laws. Generally speaking, however, one can say that, especially in modern times, the sole task of prison is seen as simply to protect society. The question that should be asked here, as Michel Foucault thinks, is how the prison exist to protect rather a particular society and a specific pattern of social institutions.

The American society adheres, as a matter of fact, to a liberal-capitalist system. Prisons and other forms of punishment, thus, are repressive means to protect this particular capitalist society, including its structure of power and distribution of wealth. Whenever an individual decides to commit a crime, especially a property crime, there is a factor that he considers at least briefly, but surely. This factor is the possibility of punishment. Although this possibility probably would not deter him from committing that criminal act, it definitely influences the target he chooses for his crime and the manner in which he executes it. Punishment protects a particular society by strictly defining "what are high risk and low risk crimes, and, as such, it reorients criminal activity toward low risk crimes (Erick, 1973: 314).

To say that prisons, directly or not, protect a liberal capitalist social order does not mean that prisons punish only crimes committed against the capitalist class. On the opposite, most crimes that result in imprisonment are committed against the poor by the poor. As Michel Foucault analyses in *Discipline and Punish*, the protection of social order is reflected not in the intrinsic characteristics of those acts which are punished, but rather in the social and political consequences of punishment. One of these consequences in the American society when delimiting high risk and low risk crimes, as I already mentioned, crime is directed against poor people. Two main consequences may result from this. First, it means that property of the wealthy is protected. Second, it means that crime becomes void of any political signification. The highly symbolic image of a Robin Hood who robs from the rich and gives to the poor is a persuasive and very dangerous sign of social protest, adding certain legitimacy to crime. Because it lacks this element of social justice, crime committed against the poor by the poor is much less menacing to the conventional order (Erick, 1973: 315).

As depicted in *Brubaker,* at no time are the prisoners mentioned as having committed a crime against rich people, but rather against poor people and the majority of these prisoners belong to minorities. Abraham, for example, is imprisoned because he had killed his brother,

while Bullen is incarcerated for breaking a toilet. As far as the other prisoners, it is clear that, from their clothes and physical situations, they are poor. Otherwise, they can buy everything in this prison.

Another consequence of this policy of delimiting high and low risk crimes is that punishment is not limited in directing crime against the poor but at the same time it makes the poor dependent upon the state for protection against crime. The police, however ineffective may they be in preventing violence and crime, become the only organization to deal with robbers and criminals, thus the public reclaim them. Because they have something to lose, even if it is little, the working poor class would ask for the rigorous enforcement of law, thus, the expansion of the power of the police seems in their interests.

The fact that Brubaker, the character who vehicles reform and change, is fired by the Federal Government suggests that the latter do not really try to better the prisoners' conditions. In the movie, one can distinguish two approaches towards reforming prison. On the one hand, one can notice a humanistic sincere and less violent one represented by Brubaker. On the other hand, there is another perspective which considers inmates as "other" that should be adjusted and transformed into docile bodies by the use of all imaginable means. The first perspective seems to be too naïve and utopian to be true. Indeed, in a capitalist society where the survival is for the fittest, prisoners are considered as being perverts who threaten the social dynamics and principles upon which the capitalist society is based namely conformism. The government, finally, decides to smash down this revolution-like if prisoners' consciousness by simply firing its symbol, Brubaker. The same thing is done for Tom Murton who, after revealing his findings proving the rumors about terrible corruption inside the prison, had been fired by Rockefeller's administration.

The government's aim, however, seems to be the creation of docile bodies that conform to the capitalist system. To reach this aim, the Federal Government is ready to do everything. Oobservation and a rigid discipline may be of great importance to make the inmates' individualities broken down and formed again according to a certain agenda.

Conclusion

Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* is studied in analyzed in this chapter using Foucault's concepts of power, discipline and panoptican. We have attempted to highlight that, inside Wakefield State Penitentiary, the setting of the movie, power relations are activated. In this prison, it is the trusties who mainly personify the government and carry out its wish to control the convicts.

The Foucauldian concept of prisons' reformatory function is explained and applied to show how Wakefield State Penitentiary transforms prisoners into docile bodies. For this, we have relied on three Foucauldian principles namely the principle of isolation, the principle of the modulation of penalties and the principle of the obligatory work. It is shown that the federal government, in general, and the state of Arkansas, in special, endeavored to make this prison like a closed society by isolating the prisoners from the world outside. Also shown in this chapter is the idea that the policy of the prison is to transform the prisoners into docile bodies. In other words, this work has validated the thesis which says that prisons are more than detention centers.

I have shown how power operates in Wakefield State Penitentiary to make the prisoners docile bodies and the strategies that are used to achieve this goal. Discipline and the observation of the prisoners by the trusties are proved to be not neutral strategies. They are implemented so as to make surveillance and the control of the inmates more efficient.

Because of these strategies as well as the existence of the three Foucauldian principles, which together form the reformatory function of prisons, inmates are transformed into docile bodies. *Brubaker* is a dramatization of period in the American history (the sixties and seventies) when citizens were meant to be docile and easily governed subjects. Also clarified in this chapter is the fact that the humanitarian less violent attempt to reform prison by Brubaker fails against government's power. Such a failure, surely, proves the real intentions of the government and its attitudes towards prisoners in a time period where prisoners' conditions are not really the public issue number one.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

Milos Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker* are two movies that were released respectively in 1975 and 1980. Some differences may appear between these two movies. While Forman's movie, by using "patients" trapped and controlled by the system namely McMurphy and Bromden and their final surrender, though in different ways, stresses the fact that the psychiatric system in America has failed. It suggests, at the same time, the urgency of reforming the social system as a whole. Rosenberg's film, on the contrary, discusses the attempt of reforming the penal system by making use of an agent from within the system itself. This makes the dialectic of governor/governed in Brubaker less obvious and more complicated.

The most striking difference between the two movies is in the setting of their events. Whereas Forman's movie happens inside Oregon Psychiatric Hospital, Rosenberg's film occurs inside Wakefield State Penitentiary. To compare an asylum and prison, bracketed by Foucault's ideas, is to highlight what Foucault calls the religious aspect of mental hospitals and the military dimension of prison. While asylums were believed to be sites where purification is achieved, prisons were seen as places where control, force and domination are aimed at.

On the other hand, however, one can notice a lot of similarities between these movies. In terms of genre, for example, both films can be categorized in what is commonly known as countercultural movies. They are countercultural because of the nature of themes they discuss. Adapted from books that were written during the tumultuous and politically explosive sixties in America, they depict an American society under too much control and observation by the government and the dangers that may result from such a situation.

What best makes these movies countercultural is the fact that they dramatize popular outbursts against the dominant discourses of their respective releases. Indeed, Forman uses the principal character McMurphy as the symbol and the spokesman of the avant-garde thinkers of the sixties and the seventies America who dared to express openly their refusal of the dominant discourse and its marking notions such as elitism, high culture, and conformism. Forman makes McMurphy the symbol of countercultural movements like the Hippie movement and he contrasts him with the Nurse Ratched, the symbol of the psychiatric administration and the system as a whole. This movie portrays a symbolic fight between free individuality, secularism, free sexuality, unlimited free thinking and the blind conformism, conservatism, the clamped down sexual instincts, docility...etc

Exactly like Brubaker, in Stuart Rosenberg's *Brubaker*, it is the principal character that is used as the symbol of resistance against blind conformism to the system. Therefore, both movies depict a battle between free individuals against the government. To transmit this idea and to have a profound effect over the audience, both directors have used their principal characters namely McMurphy and Brubaker as Christ figures.

Indeed, these two characters vehicle a lot of qualities that make us think of the Christ. One of these qualities is the fact that both McMurphy and Brubaker have, though in different ways, sacrificed themselves in order that their fellows would live in better conditions. Brubaker, for example, had not accepted to be corrupted and to close his eye about the very miserable situation in which the prisoners in Arkansas' prison lived. If Jesus Christ had faced his society to preserve and preach his Christianity, Brubaker had confronted the governor Winthrop Rockefeller who stands for the conservative policy held by the American government.

The fact that Brubaker proves compassion towards individuals that society incarcerated, rejected and excluded, reminds us about Jesus' message that teaches the virtue of having compassion towards all the people regardless of their deeds and social status. The prisoners see in Brubaker their savior. He came from a remote place to mend the prison's situation, and improve its life conditions. He represents a kind of a mentor for them whom they loved and stood with him in hard times. Because, like Christ in the beginning of his prophetic mission, he was met with too much enmity and a lot of conspiracies were organized to overthrow him .

As far as *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* is concerned, one can mention a lot of examples that establish a link between Jesus and McMurphy. While McMurphy, at the first glance, is depicted as a Dionysian rather than a Christian figure, since he emphasizes gambling, womanizing and drinking over spirituality, his charitable humanistic qualities appear all along the film. His most important achievement is to raise the consciousness of the other patients by severely criticizing the administrative staff. He even managed to secretly take the patients out of the hospital in a fishing trip and organize a party that they enjoyed too much. McMurphy is neither interested in self-improvement nor anxious about escape because the outside world is a prison-like place for him as is the prison itself. Also shared between these movies is that fact the patients and the prisoners had lost their fight against the system. These movies represented unjust treatments undergone by individuals considered as being 'dangerous' and 'unwanted' , who should be excluded and confined in asylums and prisons.

The major issue of this dissertation is to study to what extent asylums and prisons are not neutral institutions whose only role is to protect society by simply confining these 'unwanted' individuals. I have tried to highlight the unjust nature of power relationships that exist between the patients and doctors in the asylum, as well as between the prisoners and trusties in the prison. I also clarified in this work the extent to which these relationships are

based on the dialectic of power and knowledge. Indeed, the patients and the inmates are tightly controlled because knowledge about their weaknesses, problems and lives is established. This knowledge has given the psychiatric staff and the trusties more power over the patients and the inmates.

By focusing on the development and the circulation of a web of power relations inside these two institutions and by analyzing the Foucauldian concept of power in the two movies, this investigation has shown how docility is fostered among the patients and prisoners. In Forman's movie, I have used Michel Foucault's strategy that he names 'correct training of individuals' and its three principles namely: hierarchical observation, normalizing judgments, and examination. This work has uncovered how the Nurse Ratched implements the above three principles to transform the patients in general, and the principal character McMurphy in special into conforming subjects.

In Rosenberg's movie, the three principles that, together, form what Foucault calls the reformatory function of prison are used by the administration. These three principles are: 1- the principle of isolation, 2- the principle of obligatory work, and 3- the principle of the modulation of penalties. Many examples have been provided in his study to demonstrate how the prisoners are made docile through these principles.

It is clear, therefore, that by the use of different techniques, the patients and the inmates are tightly controlled. These strategies include rigid discipline and observation, which lead to control those who are confined inside these institutions. Indeed, by discipline, the patients as well as the inmates are meant to internalize different social norms namely order and respect of hierarchy. The observation that is practiced over the patients and the convicts is overwhelming. It concerns their slightest behaviors, activities, and lives and aims to make them feel that they are constantly watched to discipline themselves by themselves. In such a

context, the target of punishment is not only the bodies of the patients and the inmates but, most importantly, their souls.

The asylum's and the prison's architectural design, as shown in this dissertation, are not neutral but are constructed in such a way as to make the control of those inside less expensive in terms of charges but remarkably efficient in its aim to control. Indeed, the institutions' special design leads to facilitate the surveillance of the confined bodies that, out of fear of being watched, start to correct and discipline their behaviors. In simple words, because of the nature of their institutions' architecture, both patients and prisoners have become docile bodies par excellence.

It follows, therefore, that asylum and prison, as depicted in the movies, are no longer neutral institutions for society, but rather panoptican establishments where everything is controlled to make the production of docile bodies possible. Consequently, because they vehicle this theme of the panoptican, Forman's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* and Rosenberg's *Brubaker* are, in my view, striking examples that scholars should use if interested in studying the period that stretches from the sixties to the seventies in America and how the government reacted against movements such as that of the Hippies.

These two movies reflect the historical period of their time of release by critically dramatizing the major issues that American society had known during this period. Other themes including the failure of the social system and the urgency of its reform are brilliantly revealed in the movies. It is by depicting the relationship between patients/doctors and prisoners/trusties as being distant, based upon the dialectic of power/knowledge and by leaning on such powerful cinematographic elements including special shots, make-up, soundtrack…etc that the directors Milos Forman and Stuart Rosenberg could successfully transmit their messages.

Selected Bibliography

Selected Bibliography

Primary Sources

Brubaker (1980) Film. Directed by STAUART ROSENBERG. USA: 20th Century Fox.

One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest (1975) Film. Directed by MILOS FORMAN. USA: United Artist.

Secondary Sources

Books

Asatar, Bair P. (2008), *Prison Labor in the United States: An Economic Analysis*. London: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1984), *Rabelais and His World*, Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Banks, Cyndi (2005), *Punishment in America*, Denver: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Barker, Chris (2004), *The Sage Dictionary of Cultural Studies*, London: Sage Publication, Ltd.

Barnes, Harry E. and Negley K. T. (1945), *New Horizons in Criminology*, revised edition. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bernstein, Lee (2010), *America is the Prison: Arts and Politics in the 1970s*, New York: UNC Press Books.

Bertani, Mauro and Fontana, A. (eds.) (2003), *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976*. Trans. Smith, Sheridan A. M. New York: Picador.

Bloom, Alexander and Breines, W. (eds.) (2003), *Takin' it to the Street*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bloom, Harold (ed.) (2007), *Ken Kesey's One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*, New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bosworth, Mary (ed.) (2005), *Encyclopedia of Prisons and Correctional Facilities*, California: Sage Publication, Inc.

Carter, Robert M. R. et. al. (1975), *Corrections in America*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

Cuddon, J. A. (1989), *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory,* London: Penguin Books.

Elsner, Alan (2006), *Gates of Injustice*, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Ltd.

Erik, O. Wright (1973), *The Politics of Punishment. A Critical Analysis of Prisons in America*, New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Foucault, Michel (1991), *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Trans. Alan Sheridan, London: Penguin.

----. (2001), *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, Trans. Richard Howard, London: Routledge.

Friedan, Betty (1963), *The Feminine Mystique*, New York: DELL PUBLISHING Co., INC.

Fuckuyama, Francis (1992), *The End of History and the Last Man*, London: Penguin Books.

Goffman, Erving (1961), *Asylums*, Chicago: Aldine.

Gutting, Gary (2005), *Foucault: a Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayward, Susan (2001), *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Hawes, Joseph (1979), *Law and Order in American History*. Port Washington, N. Y.: Kennikat Press.

Hollowel, John (1977), *Fact and Fiction: the New Journalism and the Nonfiction Novel*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Jacobs, James (1977), *Statesville: the Penitentiary in Mass Society*, London: the University of Chicago Press, Ltd.

Johnson, Herbert A. and Nancy, W. T. (2003), *History of Criminal Justice*. 3rd ed. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Johnston, Norman (1973), *The Human Cage: A Brief History of Prison Architecture*, New York: Walker and Co.

Lynch, Michael L. (2007), *Big Prisons, Big Dreams*, London: Rutgers University Press.

Macey, David (1993), *The Lives of Michel Foucault*, London: Hutchinson.

Mark, Kelly G. E. (2009), *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*, London: Routledge.

McKelvey. Blake (1977), *American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions*, Montclair. N. J.: Patterson Smith.

Miller, Toby and Stam, Robert (eds.) (2004), *A Companion to Film Theory*, London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Murton, Tom and Hyams, J. (1969), *Accomplices to the Crime: The Arkansas Prison Scandal*, London: Michael Joseph, Ltd.

Nagel, William G. (1973), *The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison*, New York: Walker and Company.

Olssen, Mark (1999), *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education*, London: Bergin and Garvey.

Pevsenr, Nikolaus (1976), *A History of Building Types*, Princeton. N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Rothman, David J. (1971), *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*, Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Sara, Mills (2003), *Michel Foucault*, London: Routeldge.

Shelden, Randall G. (2001), *Controlling the Dangerous Classes: A Critical Introduction to the History of Criminal Justice*, Neddham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Smart, Barry (1988), *Michel Foucault*, London: Routeldge.

Simmons, J. A. and Marshall, C. J. C. Charles, B. R. (eds.) (1995), *A Philosophy and Public Affair Reader: Punishment*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Villarejo, Amy (2007), *Film Studies: The Basics*, New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

Wilson, D and O'Sullivan, S. (1985), *Images of Incarceration: Representation of Prison in Film and Television Drama*, Winchester: Waterside Press.

Articles

American Correctional Association. "Development of Modern Correctional Concepts and Standards*"* in *Correctional Institutions*. Robert M. Carter, Daniel Glaser, and Leslie T. Wilkins, (eds.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co, 1972.

Becker, Gary S. (1986), "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach" in *The Journal of Political Economy* 76, 2, pp. 169-217.

Blumstein, Alfred (1998), "U.S. Criminal Justice Conundrum: Rising Prison Populations and Stable Crime Rates" in *Crime and Delinquency* 44, 1, pp. 127–135.

Cooper, Robert A. (1981), "Jeremy Bentham, Elizabeth Frye, and English Prison Reform" in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42.4, pp. 675-690.

Gill, Howard B. "Correctional Philosophy and Architecture" in *Correctional Institutions*, Robert M. Carter, Daniel Glaser, and Leslie T. Wilkins, (eds.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co, 1972.

Larson, Doran (2010), "Toward a Prison Poetics" in *College Literature* 37.3, pp. 143 – 166.

Matthew, Meskell W. (1999), "An American Resolution: The History of Prisons in the United States From 1777 to 1877" in *Stanford Law Review* 51.4, pp. 839-865.

Web sites

American Movie Classics Company LLC, (2014) *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) [Online] Available from: http://www.filmsite.org/onef.html (accessed on February 15, 2014)

Hough, Matt, (2013) *Brubaker* Bluray Review [Online] Available from: http://www.hometheaterforum.com/topic/323531-brubaker-blu-ray-review/ (accessed on October 27, 2013)

Perring, Christain, (2003) *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* [Online] Available from: http://w.centersite.net/books/books.php?type=de&id=1849 (accessed on January 27, 2013)

Kobesova, Jana (ed.) (2002) *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest* [Online] Available from: http://milosforman.com/en/movies/one-flew-over-the-cuckoos-nest (accessed on February 11, 2014)

Résumé

Cette thèse a étudié les thèmes du : pouvoir, punition et corps dociles dans les films, *Un Vol au-dessus d'un Nid de Coucou* (1975) de Milos Forman et *Brubaker* (1980) de Stuart Rosenberg en s'appuyant sur l'œuvre philosophique de Michel Foucault. En analysant ces deux films comme deux œuvres artistiques que Hollywood a, très probablement, réalisé pour mettre en scène une période remarquable dans l'histoire Américaine connue pour son instabilité politique sur l'échelle nationale et internationale, cette thèse montre les relations injustes de pouvoir entre docteur/ patient dans l'Hôpital Psychiatrique d'Oregon et celle entre prévôts/ prisonniers dans le Pénitencier d'Etat de Wakefield. Ce travail explique comment ces relations ne sont, en fait, qu'une reproduction cinématographique de la relation que les Américains avaient avec leur gouvernement durant une période marquée par l'hégémonie totale du gouvernement sur le peuple. Cette thèse a démontré comment des stratégies telles que la discipline, la surveillance, et l'observation sont implémentées dans des institutions comme la prison et l'asile pour créer un climat panoptique par lequel les patients et les prisonniers sont transformés en 'corps dociles'. En bref, j'ai expliqué le clash symbolique qui existe dans les deux films entre la pensée libre et sa volonté de réformer et de critiquer le statu quo d'une part et les aléas d'une vie ajustée et contrôlée d'autre part. Ce clash même qui symbolise la distinction entre deux discours déjà existant en Amérique. Un discours conservateur et pro-gouvernemental appelant les Américains au conformisme et à une totale allégeance au gouvernement et, dans un sens opposé, un autre discours qui dénonce le conformisme aveugle et appelle à des améliorations et à des reformes radicales dans la société Américaine. En s'appuyant sur les idées et les théories de Michel Foucault sur les institutions de punition, de confinement et d'emprisonnement, cette thèse, démontre à travers ses quatre chapitres que les films, *Un Vol au-dessus d'un Nid de Coucou* et *Brubaker* sont deux Ouvres artistiques d'une portée idéologique et politique très élaborée. Ces deux films sont d'une grande pertinence quant à leur contribution à notre compréhension de l'histoire Américaine. Et ce en mettant en scène une histoire des idées et de mouvements intellectuels bien déterminés aux Etats Unies en particulier et en civilisation humaine en générale.