

REPRESENTATION OF MADNESS IN FILM: A FOUCAULDIAN
APPROACH

NERGİZ AÇIKSÖZ SENEM
105611001

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
KÜLTÜREL İNCELEMELER YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

Doç. Dr. FERDA KESKİN
2009

Representation of Madness in Film: A Foucauldian Approach

Deliliğin Sinemada Temsili: Foucauldiyen Yaklaşım

Nergiz Açıksöz Senem
105611001

Doç. Dr. FERDA KESKİN :
Doç. Dr. FERHAT KENTEL :
BÜLENT SOMAY, MA :

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : 04/11/2009

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı : 60

Anahtar Kelimeler

- 1) Sorunsallaştırma
- 2) Hakikat Oyunları
- 3) Özne
- 4) Nesneleştirme

Key Words

- 1) Problematization
- 2) Games of Truth
- 3) Subject
- 4) Objectivization

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the reasons and consequences of the possible miscommunication between the psychiatrist as the subject and the patient as the object of psychiatry in the light of Foucault's studies on "The History of Thought". The underlying effort of this study is, therefore, to think over the individual's transformation into a social experience and the constitution of subject as thinking, speaking and acting subject throughout the cinema as a visual and contextual tool. The formations of the object and the subject are examined in two films, *Gothika* and *Twelve Monkeys*. It is argued that the relationship between the psychiatrist and the patient is constituted by "Games of Truth" and both sides have to act and speak within the territories of psychiatry in order to be accepted by society.

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı psikiyatrinin öznesi olarak konumlandırılan psikiyatr ile nesnesi olarak konumlandırılan hasta arasındaki iletişimsizliğin olası neden ve sonuçlarını Foucault'un "Düşünce Tarihi" üzerine yaptığı çalışmalar ışığında ele almaktır. Çalışmanın bu bağlamdaki temel amacı bireyin toplumsal bir deneyime dönüşüm süreci ve öznenin düşünen, konuşan ve harekete geçen özne olarak kurulumunu görsel sanatların bir kolu olan sinema aracılığı ile tartışmaktır. Bu amaçla seçilen *Gothika* ve *Twelve Monkeys* isimli filmlerde bulunan özne ve nesne kurulumları analiz edilmiştir. Tartışılan konu psikiyatr ile akıl hastası arasındaki ilişkinin "Hakikat Oyunları" ile kurulduğu ve iki tarafın da toplumda kabul görmek için psikiyatrinin sınırları içinde hareket etme ve konuşma zorunluluğudur.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferda Keskin for his guidance and encouragements. I would also want to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferhat Kentel and Bülent Somay for their positive attitudes and contributions.

I am grateful to my parents, my sister and my husband who supported me throughout my study.

Lastly, I am very thankful to my friends Betül Ebciođlu, Nihal Memutlu, Veysel Eşsiz and Zeynep Tür who guided me when I was lost and encouraged me to pursue this study.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Theoretical Framework.....	9
1.1. The Formation of Objects.....	13
1.1.1. The Surfaces of Emergence.....	14
1.1.2. The authorities of delimitation.....	16
1.1.3. The Grids of Specification.....	17
1.2. The Formation of Enunciative Modalities.....	18
1.2.1. Who is Speaking?	19
1.2.2. Institutional Sites.....	20
1.2.3. The Position of the Subject.....	22
2. Gothika.....	24
2.1. Session of Chloe with Doctor Miranda Grey – <i>Not Listening</i>	25
2.2. Conversation between two Professionals – <i>Distorted Image</i>	27
2.3. Dialogue between Miranda and Pete – <i>Remembering</i>	30
2.4. Confrontation of Miranda and Chloe as Two Patients – <i>Invisible</i> <i>Now</i>	32
2.5. Meeting with the Attorney – <i>Overwhelming Evidence</i>	33
2.6. Dialogue between Miranda and Pete – <i>There – Dead or Alive</i>	35
2.7. The Ending – <i>Intersection</i>	37

3. Twelve Monkeys.....	38
3.1. The subject of the future world – <i>the “volunteer” and an opportunity.....</i>	39
3.2. Meeting with the psychiatrist – <i>Baltimore 1990.....</i>	41
3.3. Meet the Madmen - <i>The Deluxe Mental Hospital.....</i>	42
3.4. Who is Crazy? - <i>Colonies for Everyone.....</i>	44
3.5. Criticism by Superiors – <i>Bad Judgment</i>	45
3.6. The doctor analyzes her patient – <i>Going after Jeffrey</i>	47
3.7. Accepting the Diagnosis – <i>You are my Insanity.....</i>	50
3.8. The Reason – <i>I Want to Stay Here.....</i>	51
3.9. The Final – <i>Full Circle.....</i>	53
Conclusion.....	54
References.....	60

INTRODUCTION

*I have not tried to write the history of that language, but rather the
archeology of that silence.*¹

Michel Foucault

The above sentence is written by Foucault in the “Preface” of *Madness and Civilization* in order to explain the aim of his book. Throughout his study, Foucault aims to analyze the reasons of “the distinction between reason and non-reason [and] reason’s subjugation of non-reason”.² The ‘silence’, that Foucault mentions, does not refer to a total muteness, but to a restriction of reason over the speech of the madman. This restriction prevents the communication between the madman and society.

In *Madness and Civilization* Foucault explains the formation and consequences of this silence as follows:

In the serene world of mental illness, modern man no longer communicates with the madman: on one hand, the man of reason delegates the physician to madness, thereby authorizing a relation only through the abstract universality of disease; on the other, the man of madness communicates with society only by the intermediary of an equally abstract reason which is order, physical and moral constraint, the anonymous pressure of the group, the requirements of conformity.

¹ Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization; A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, (London: Routledge, 1995) p.xiii

² Ibid, p.xi

As for a common language, there is no such thing; or rather, there is no such thing any longer; the constitution of madness as a mental illness, at the end of the eighteenth century, affords the evidence of a broken dialogue, posits the separation as already effected, and thrusts into oblivion all those stammered, imperfect words without fixed syntax in which the exchange between madness and reason was made. The language of psychiatry, which is a monologue of reason about madness, has been established only on the basis of such a silence.³

The silence begins when the madman enters into the domain of psychiatry as a mental patient. Although the patient has a right to speak, his/her speech is not considered independently of the discourse of psychiatry. Hence the control of the speech does not belong to the patient but to the rules of the science. Additionally, psychiatry does not only control the speech but also regulates the acts and behaviors of the patient. This is because madness becomes the object of psychiatry.

The “broken language” that Foucault mentions in *Madness and Civilization*, is established by transforming the madman into a mental patient. By assuming the rights over mental illness, psychiatry also takes the madman into the discourse of psychiatry as the object. Then the question is, how a person becomes the object of a discipline? How has psychiatry achieved the rights over the madmen? In *The Archeology of Knowledge* Foucault explains the importance of investigating the object as follows:

³ Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, pp.xii - xiii

What, in short, we wish to do is to dispense with ‘things’. To ‘depresentify’ them. To conjure up their rich, heavy, immediate plenitude, which we usually regard as the primitive law of a discourse that has become divorced from it through error, oblivion, illusion, ignorance, or the inertia of beliefs and traditions, or even the perhaps unconscious desire not to see and not to speak. To substitute for the enigmatic treasure of ‘things’ anterior to discourse, the regular formation of objects that emerge in discourse. To define these objects without reference to the ground, the foundation of things, but by relating them to the body of rules that enable them to form as objects of a discourse and thus constitute the conditions of their historical appearance. To write a history of discursive objects that does not plunge them into the common depth of a primal soil, but deploys the nexus of regularities that govern their dispersion.⁴

As Foucault argues, the objects are formed by a discourse through certain rules and regulations. A particular discipline cannot define ‘things’ or ‘beings’ as its object unless it has the necessary devices for regulating them. Hence the segregation of the madman from the “rational” man is established by a set of rules proper to psychiatry. These rules identify the qualifications of an object. Foucault suggests the study of the rules and regulations in which the object is established, ordered and controlled:

Now as soon as it is a matter of studying, through these practices, the various modes of objectivization of the subject, the important role that the analysis of power relations has to play becomes clear. It is obviously not a matter of interrogating “power” as to its origin, its principles, or its legitimate limits, but of studying the devices and techniques that are used in different institutional contexts to act on the

⁴ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 47 - 48

behavior of individuals taken separately or in groups, to shape, direct, and modify their behavior, to impose limits on their inaction, or to inscribe it within overall strategies that are thus multiple in their forms and zones of enactment.⁵

The aim of this thesis is to analyze the consequences of the broken communication between the mental patient and the rational world. In order to understand the situation of the mental patient in the psychiatric discourse, the formation of the mental patient as the object of the discipline will be examined by touching upon revolving questions: What changes take place when madmen enter the discourse? How are madmen and their speeches evaluated? Through which processes, these speeches become the property of psychiatry?

In this attempt, this thesis shall also make an effort to look at the psychiatrist as the other side of this relationship. Similar questions also arise within this context; that is, what are the circumstances that make him/her as the implementer of psychiatry? What devices does the doctor have for his/her position? How does s/he achieve his/her title? What are his/her obligations as a doctor?

The answers to these questions will shape the relationship between the mental patient and the doctor. The period in which the mental patient is shaped as an object and the doctor is constituted as a subject creates the

⁵ Michel Foucault, "Foucault, Michel, 1926 –" in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, ed. Gary Gutting (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.318

distance between them. Although the doctor studies for understanding and treating the mental patient, s/he is taught to keep a certain distance to him/her in order to stay on the rational side. This distinction prevents the doctor from entering to the world of the patient, and understanding the patient's own reality. Furthermore, the doctor ignores the possibility of truth within the statements of the patient. This avoidance interrupts the communication between the two sides. Although they still seem to communicate, one side of the communication draws a strict line between the speech of the opponent and the possibility of truth. If the patient is also aware of the distance, s/he will either stop talking or lose his/her trust on the doctor.

Since the formation and the consequences of this miscommunication is the aim of this study, it is necessary to choose a field for examining the examples of such situations. It could be done either by observing the existing situations in a mental institution or by looking for the representation of it in a branch of art. As a visual art, cinema is one of the ways for exemplifying approaches toward existing situations. Regardless of the reality of which it aims to represent, cinema helps us see the reflections of social problems and different perspectives for explaining similar issues. Thus, for this purpose, the representation of madness in film is chosen as a field for examining the issue under discussion.

There are plenty of films that have madness and mental institutions as their subject. Each film treats the issue from a different perspective. The approach of the present thesis requires seeing the examples of the constitution of the object, the miscommunication between the patient and the world of rationality, the perspectives towards the patient and the perceptions of the subject. The films have to cover the consequences of the miscommunication on both sides. In addition, these films should also address the question of what is perceived as real. The representations of these issues will be examined in two films named *Gothika* (2003) and *Twelve Monkeys* (1995). Accordingly, the thesis will have three main parts: Theoretical framework, the analysis of *Gothika* (2003) and the analysis of *Twelve Monkeys* (1995).

The first chapter addresses the works of Foucault which will help us understand the situation of object and subject in psychiatric discourse. The chapter will begin with the dynamics that bring an undefined being into the domain of a particular authority. Then it will continue with two subsections. In the first one, the constitution of the object will be examined. In the second one, the dynamics of the subject will be investigated. The whole chapter will be the guide for the analysis of the films.

In the second chapter of the thesis the movie *Gothika* will be examined in terms of object formation. *Gothika* does not only provide an opportunity to see the perceptions towards mental patients; but it also shows

the possible consequences of the “broken language”. In addition, it reflects how a subject can lose all rights when s/he is regarded as the object of the discipline. The transformation of the subject is shown in the movie in three aspects: the eye of the other subject of the same discipline – the doctor –, the eye of the object – another patient in the mental institution – and the eye of another discipline’s subject – the attorney. All aspects show how a person is treated when s/he enters into the psychiatric domain and how the claims of sanity become worthless. To examine those aspects also enable us to see how the act of listening can vary according to the establishment of the narrator. In other words, the dialogues show the effects of certain forms of social roles over the consideration of the listener.

In the third and final chapter, *Twelve Monkeys* will be examined. It is a movie about a man who is confused about what is real and what is not. He lives in two different worlds which have their own realities. He travels back and forth in time and he also travels within the social roles that are constructed for him. While he is a subject in the future world and sent to the past, the world of the past does not perceive him as such. In the reality of the past he can only be an object of psychiatry. The confusion is not only experienced by him in the movie. His doctor begins to hesitate on the meanings of rationality and reality. She is not sure about what is true and what is false. In fact she begins to get suspicious about the definition of the ‘rational’. This leads her to question the role of psychiatry in mental patient’s lives. She questions why and how psychiatry has the right to decide

on what is right and what is wrong. Why do people of reason eliminate all statements that are not formed in scientific knowledge? In the mean time, her patient begins to question his existence in two worlds. Both of the confused characters give spectators a chance to think about the limits of their roles in the authority rules.

To summarize, these two films look at the state of object and subject in the psychiatric discourse. Both films show how the possibility of ‘telling the truth’ is eliminated when the narrator is a mental patient, and how the title of mental patient is created and how the patient is treated. Additionally, both films have psychiatrists who willingly or unwillingly find a way to get out of the psychiatric boundaries and begin to think independently. By this way they find a chance to listen to their patients in a completely different way and manage to understand the meaning of the patient’s claims.

In the second and third chapters of the thesis the films are treated in the following way: In both chapters, there will first be a brief summary of the film. Then the related scenes will be examined in the chronological order. Each scene will have a subtitle that holds two statements: the first part of the subtitles will summarize the content of the scene. The second part will be the name of that scene in the DVD version of the film. Each subsection will be in three parts: firstly, there will be a brief explanation of the scene. Then, the related dialogues of the scene will be displayed. Finally, the given context will be analyzed in terms of a Foucauldian approach.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The main concern of this thesis is how the speeches of the mental patient and the doctors are perceived by each other and by the other members of the community. Thus we will investigate a phase in which certain rules, constraints and norms have already been established. Furthermore, the examined issue is the situation in which the role of the subject and the object has already been constituted.

In his studies Foucault searches the ways in which “the subject has become an object of knowledge”.⁶ He examines the mechanisms that constitute the object and the subject of the sciences. It is important to cover this process from the beginning in order to conceive the relations of identified subjects and objects within the boundaries of certain rules and regulations.

To begin with, there is a stage at which an action or a personal qualification is questioned. It has to create an ambiguity, anxiety or curiosity for people. This is the phase that Foucault called “problematization”.⁷

Problematization is the initiator of the process in which the ‘questioned being’ is taken into consideration. Foucault explains

⁶ Michel Foucault, “Foucault, Michel, 1926 –”, p.316

⁷ Michel Foucault, “Introduction” in *The Use of Pleasure: History of Sexuality Volume 2*, (New York: Vintage, 1986), p.10

problematization: “through which being offers itself to be, necessarily, thought”.⁸ He uses “thought” in his studies to explain “the act that posits a subject and an object in their various possible relations”.⁹ Before going any further, it is important to highlight why Foucault refers to “thought” as “the act”. He clarifies this in the preface of *History of Sexuality Volume 2* by the following sentence:

[T]hought is understood as the very form of action – as action insofar as it implies the play of true and false, the acceptance or refusal of rules, the relation to oneself and others.¹⁰

Hence “thought” is the ways in which the subject, object and their relations are understood. “[I]t is the basis for accepting or refusing rules, and constitutes human beings as social and juridical subjects; it is what establishes the relation with oneself and with others [...]”¹¹ As Foucault puts forward; thought is the basis for this establishment and, this constitution. Then the question is: how are these subjects and objects constituted? In order to answer this question, it has to be understood what Foucault means by the “games of truth” and “the history of thought”.

⁸ Michel Foucault, “Introduction” in *The Use of Pleasure: History of Sexuality Volume 2*, p.11

⁹ Michel Foucault, “Foucault, Michel, 1926 –”, p.314

¹⁰ Michel Foucault, “Preface to the *History of Sexuality*, Volume Two” in *Ethics: subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault*, V.1 (ed) Paul Rabinow, (New York: The New Press, 1994), p.201

¹¹ Michel Foucault, “Preface to the *History of Sexuality*, Volume Two” in *Ethics: subjectivity and Truth*, p.200

The games of truth are “the games of truth and error through which being is historically constituted as experience; that is, as something that can and must be thought.”¹² What Foucault means by “experience” is “the correlation between fields of knowledge, types of normativity, and forms of subjectivity in a particular culture”.¹³ It can be argued that the undefined thing is formed by several games of truth in order to become a “form of experience”.¹⁴

“The History of Thought” is clarified in the article by the pseudonym Maurice Florence as follows:

It is the history of “veridictions” understood as the forms according to which discourses capable of being deemed true or false are articulated with a domain of things: what the conditions of that emergence have been; what price has been paid for it; as it were; what effects it has had on the real; and the way in which, linking certain type of object with certain modalities of the subject, it has constituted for a time, a space, and particular individuals, the historical a priori of a possible experience.¹⁵

The relationship between ‘the history of thought’ and the ‘games of truth’ can be summarized as the following: since the games of truth is the system of rules in which the ‘thing’ problematized becomes an experience,

¹² Michel Foucault, “Introduction” in *The Use of Pleasure: History of Sexuality Volume 2*, pp. 6-7

¹³ Ibid, p.4

¹⁴ Michel Foucault, “Preface to the *History of Sexuality, Volume Two*” in *Ethics: subjectivity and Truth*, p.200

¹⁵ Michel Foucault, “Foucault, Michel, 1926 – ”, p.315

the history of thought is the history of the process that leads from 'problematization' to 'experience'.

What Foucault wants to reach by examining "the history of thought" is to find the ways in "which the subject has become an object of knowledge".¹⁶ He studies it in two ways: the conditions under which the subject has the right to practice the particular knowledge, and the conditions under which the subject has been analyzed, defined and regulated within that knowledge.¹⁷ These two constitutions are regarded as "objectivization" and "subjectivization". Foucault firstly questions the subject:

The question is one of determining what the subject must be, what condition is imposed on it, what status it is to have, and what position it is to occupy in reality or in the imaginary, in order to become the legitimate subject of one type of knowledge or another.¹⁸

They are the conditions and regulations in which the subject is constituted. The answers to the questions above will help understand the subjectivization process. By questioning the constitution of the object Foucault states:

[T]he question is also and at the same time one of determining under what conditions something can become an object of a possible

¹⁶ Michel Foucault, "Foucault, Michel, 1926 – ", p.316

¹⁷ Ibid., p.316

¹⁸ Ibid., p.315

knowledge, how it could be problematized as an object to be known, to what procedure of division it could be subjected, and what part of it is considered pertinent. It is thus a matter of determining its mode of objectivization, which varies, too, according to the type of knowledge involved.¹⁹

These two processes, which are examined in *The Archeology of Knowledge*, are the elements of a discursive formation which is divided into four parts: “objects, modes of statement, concepts and thematic choices.”²⁰

The following part of this chapter will focus on the formation of objects and subjects. Firstly, the section of *The Archeology of Knowledge*, “The Formation of Object”, will be examined in which Foucault searches the systems that lead to object formation.²¹ Secondly, in the section, “The Formation of Enunciative Modalities”, the dynamics that enable the subject to have a right to use and operate the statements of the discourse will be examined.²²

1.1 The Formation of Objects

Foucault uses the discourse of psychopathology as an example in order to analyze the object formation process. The reason for this analysis is to understand the ways in which the object becomes a part of a specific

¹⁹ Michel Foucault, “Foucault, Michel, 1926 – ”, p.315

²⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 38

²¹ Ibid. , p.43

²² Ibid., p.50

discourse. The outcomes of the analysis bring out three stages in which the object is detected, formed and described. In the first stage, Foucault looks at the surfaces in which the anomalies are detected. In the second stage, he looks at the authority figure that has a right to give decisions on the object. Lastly, he searches the areas in which the reason of anomalies are searched and classified. The following parts will cover these three stages.

1.1.1 The Surfaces of Emergence

It is the stage in which the acts or speeches of a being come to be perceived as ‘abnormal’. The surface of emergence is:

[W]here these individual differences, which, according to the degrees of rationalization, conceptual codes, and types of theory, will be accorded the status of disease, alienation, anomaly, dementia, neurosis or psychosis, degeneration etc., may emerge, and then be designated and analyzed.²³

Furthermore, there is no concrete surface which has all the authority for declaring the object as deviant. It varies according to society, era, and culture in which it emerges.²⁴ Foucault states some of the surfaces of emergence for psychopathology as:

²³ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 41

²⁴ Ibid.

[T]hey were probably constituted by family, the immediate social group, the work situation, the religious community (which are all normative, which are all susceptible to deviation, which all have a margin of tolerance and a threshold beyond which exclusion is demanded, which all have a mode of designation and a mode of rejecting madness, which all transfer to medicine if not the responsibility for treatment and cure, at least the burden of explanation).²⁵

Given Foucault's explanation, it can be said that the surface of emergence is the first step for introducing an individual into a specific form of discourse. The so called abnormality has to be detected by the people who have the right to take decisions for the treatment or segregation of the individual.

As Foucault mentions, the thing called abnormal varies according to the era and culture that it is identified with. In addition, the members of a specific community can perceive the situation differently according to their family values or personal thoughts. Thus the same symptoms can be interpreted completely differently by the members of the same community according to their own interpretations of the 'abnormal'.

²⁵ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 41

1.1.2 The authorities of delimitation

When Foucault describes the authorities of delimitation over psychopathology, he explains how medicine owns the right to decide on madness.

[M]edicine (as an institution possessing its own rules, as a group of individuals constituting the medical profession: as a body of knowledge and practice, as an authority recognized by public opinion, the law, and government) became the major authority in society that delimited, designated, named and established the madness as an object[...]²⁶

As it is understood by the quotation above, the right to diagnose an illness has to be approved by other institutions. It is a mutual relationship between these institutions. In order to apply the rules and decisions to the objects, medicine has to get an approval from other institutions such as law and government. Furthermore, after the approval, the decision of medicine has to be taken into consideration by the others when the object needs to be identified or the object's actions have to be classified. One of the examples of such a practice can be seen in the regulations of the courts when the defendant has some mental disabilities. In order to evaluate the mental condition as a part of the judgment, first psychiatry and its validity have to be approved by the constitutional policies. As a result of this, when the court experiences such a case, it has to consult psychiatry as the decision maker

²⁶ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, pp. 41-42

on mental capabilities. Only after this process they will have a right to use their knowledge and practices.

In addition to the other institutions, Foucault points out public opinion on the recognition of the authority. Even if the authority of medicine is recognized by the legislative authorities of society, members of the community have a power to reject it and practice some other methods for solving their problems. In some societies, although medicine is the legislative authority for the human health, people legally or illegally can conduct different methods to treat illnesses. They can be religious rituals, spells or alternative medicine. The authority and other organs of the government have to 'educate' the community in order to make them leave their old practices and trust the established authority. Therefore, medicine also needs to be accepted by the members of the community.

1.1.3 The Grids of Specification

Grids of specification are the faculties, which the professionals of one specific authority searches in order to classify the disease. Again, Foucault describes the grids of specification by using the example of psychopathology. He states that "these are the systems according to which different 'kinds of madness' are divided, contrasted, related, regrouped,

classified, derived from one another as an object of psychiatric discourse[...]”²⁷

Foucault identifies these grids in the nineteenth century as “the soul”, and the “the body”.²⁸ The components of these fields are the fractions for searching the reason for anomalies. The anomalies can be found either in one single field or in the intersection of their several components.

The subject of the authority needs to identify the “grids of specification” in order to treat the ‘being’ as the ‘object’ of the discipline. In a way the authority has to prove that the object belongs to their domain of knowledge. In order to do that, they have to show that the problematic issue lies in the area of their science. In the case of medicine the doctors have to find the part of the body in which the disease exists. They have to conduct some tests in order to prove their diagnoses. If the results of the tests are negative, they have to search other possibilities. A patient cannot be treated without these procedures and the doctors cannot declare their domination unless they found the grids of specification.

1.2 The Formation of Enunciative Modalities

Under the title of “The Formation of Enunciative Modalities” in *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault studies the reason for using certain

²⁷ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 42

²⁸ Ibid.

types of statements in the discourse of a discipline. The statements that are used by doctors in the nineteenth century are “Qualitative description, biographical account, the location, interpretation, and cross-checking of signs, reasoning by analogy, deduction, statistical calculations, experimental verifications and many other statement[...]²⁹”

Foucault searches the conditions which gives a right to use those statements to a particular authority. Foucault divides this issue into three main components. Firstly, he looks at the construction of the “subject” who has a right to conduct statements. Then he looks at the “sites” in which these statements are practiced. Lastly, he explains the role of the “positions” in which the subject organizes his/her studies with the object.

1.2.1 Who is Speaking?

The first issue is to find the conditions under which one can become a subject. In other words, the conditions that give the right to decide, approve, or act as a subject. Foucault explains the dynamics that a doctor experiences as the following:

The status of doctor involves criteria of competence and knowledge; institutions, systems, pedagogic norms; legal conditions that give the right – though not without laying down certain limitation- to practice and to extend one’s knowledge. It also involves a system of differentiation and relations (the division of attributions, hierarchical

²⁹ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 50

subordination, functional complementarity, the request for and the provision and exchange of information) with other individuals or other groups that also possess their own status (with the state and its representative, with the judiciary, with different professional bodies, with religious groups and, at times, with priests).³⁰

Briefly, competence, knowledge, differentiation and relations are the key elements of subjectivization which is the necessary process “in order to become the legitimate subject of one type of knowledge or another”.³¹ The subject has to gain knowledge and s/he has to compete with others in order to prove his/her abilities. However it is not enough to gain the knowledge and practices in order to be the subject. The ability of conceiving the discourse of medicine has to be approved by the authorities of medicine. Furthermore, the subject has to be differentiated in his/her field in order to be a professional. All of these qualifications give him/her the right to use the statements and interpret their outcomes.

1.2.2 Institutional Sites

Institutional sites are the legitimate areas in which knowledge and practices can be articulated and constituted. These sites for medicine are “the hospital” “the laboratory” and “the library or documentary field”.³²

³⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 50

³¹ Michel Foucault, “Foucault, Michel, 1926 – ”, p.315

³² Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 51

Foucault also mentions the increased responsibilities and reliabilities of these sites in the nineteenth century. According to Foucault the hospital:

[B]ecomes the site of systematic, homogeneous observations, large-scale confrontations, the establishment of frequencies and probabilities, the annulation of individual variants, in short, the site of the appearance of disease, not as a particular species, deploying the essential features beneath the doctor's gaze, but as an average process, with its significant guide-lines, boundaries, and potential development.³³

Thus the hospital is not only a place for treatment anymore. It has its own rules and regulations. It is a mechanism that develops itself consistently. Especially in the case of mental illnesses, the rights of controlling the everyday activities of the patient are held by the hospital. The patient is not allowed to leave the hospital unless it is permitted by the authorities. During his/her treatment, the patient has to obey the rules of the hospital. S/he cannot act freely during and after their therapies. There are certain schedules of the institution such as the time for taking pills or sleeping and so on. When the patient violates these rules, s/he will be regarded as disobedient. These violations are recorded as 'maladaptive behaviors' to his/her medical report and effects his treatment negatively. Hence the hospital is not only a place for hosting the patient during his/her treatment but also a site for keeping the patient under control.

³³ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 52

The hospital also regulates the acts of the doctor. It is something more than a structure for medical treatment. It has a management system that organizes the practices of the doctor. The doctor has to fulfill his/her duties that are assigned by the superiors of the discipline. S/he also has to obey the rules and regulations and has to give priority to the interests of the hospital.

1.2.3 The Position of the Subject

Various positions that the subject owns, regulate the object of the discipline. They are diversified according to the aim of the researcher. Foucault puts forward the following conditions:

The positions of subject are also defined by the situation that is possible for him to occupy in relation to the various domains or groups of objects: according to a certain grid of explicit and implicit interrogations, he is questioning subject and, according to a certain programme of information, he is the listening subject; according to a table of characteristic features, he is the seeing subject, and, according to a descriptive type, the observing subject [...]³⁴

Thus the subject has to take a position which is appropriate to the relation to that particular object. The studies and researches of the subject have to be conducted within the boundaries of the given position. Otherwise, even when the subject reaches concrete results; they will not be

³⁴ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 52

approved by the authorities. In addition, if the subject cannot achieve the expected result, the position will be questioned as a possible reason of the failure.

The position can be changed when the study fails. However, the new position has also to be approved by the authorities. Otherwise the subject cannot present the outcomes of the study or treatment as scientific results.

2. GOTHIKA

Gothika is directed by Mathieu Kassovitz and released in 2003.³⁵ The film is about a psychiatrist who later becomes the patient of her mental institution. This institution is for female criminals who have mental disorders. The psychiatrist is accused of killing her husband. However, she does not remember the event. This is why she is brought to the mental institution. According to the doctors, she does not remember the event because she repressed them. Although the plot of the movie is mainly about the events that occurred after this homicide, the former scenes are also worth examining. Before going any further, it will be useful to present some characters of the film.

The name of the main character is Miranda Grey. She is portrayed as a rational psychiatrist. She is married to the manager of the hospital who is also a psychiatrist, Douglas Grey. One of the main characters is Pete Graham, who is a colleague of Miranda. He becomes her doctor after she enters the institution as patient. The last key figure is not a doctor but a patient of Miranda: Chloe. She is a patient who killed her stepfather after he raped her.

³⁵ *Gothika*, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

In the following part, this thesis will examine the meaning of the dialogues between the characters of the film. They will be useful tools for investigating the object formation of psychiatry.

2.1 Session of Chloe with Doctor Miranda Grey – *Not Listening*

This is the first scene of the movie. The name of the scene in the DVD version also supports the argument of the “silence of the madman”.³⁶ The title “Not Listening” is used for the attitude of Dr. Grey towards the speech of her patient, Chloe.

The scene begins with the explanation of Chloe of the visits of the devil in her cell. Chloe already knows that Miranda perceives the devil as a reference to her stepfather who raped her. Chloe begins to explain how she killed her stepfather. During Chloe’s speech, Miranda seems very calm. She listens to Chloe as a professional psychiatrist; she does not show any emotional reactions towards the event. As she listens to Chloe, she takes notes to her notebook. Suddenly, Chloe stops talking about her stepfather and reveals her ideas about Miranda. The following lines cover what Chloe thinks about the position of the doctor:

CHLOE: You are not listening.

MIRANDA: I am listening, Chloe.

CHLOE: You’re not listening with your hearth. Just your brain.

³⁶ Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, p.xii

Your brain is the problem. You have no idea how it feels not to be trusted.

MIRANDA: You've got to trust me too, Chloe.

CHLOE: You can't trust someone who thinks you're crazy.³⁷

After listening to Chloe's story, it is reasonable to believe that the devil is a reference to the stepfather. The metaphors are the clues to a rape. Thus it makes sense to interpret the speech as a reflection of Chloe's past. On the other hand, the images that Chloe express may refer to something else in her life. They can be the references to another man and his actions. However, Miranda does not consider any other possibilities because she has already defined Chloe's profile. This is why Chloe thinks that Miranda does not listen to her.

Miranda hears and perceives the explanations within the boundaries of psychiatric treatment. Her aim is to connect the explanations to scientific conceptualizations. This is because she is the "listening subject".³⁸ She is listening because it is the 'position' that is required for their sessions. Miranda would choose to be a 'questioning subject' if she prefers to interrogate Chloe. However, her position in this session is to listen to the patient's speech, to take notes and to analyze them after the session. In the following scenes Miranda enters her office and writes a report on Chloe's situation. The only outcome of this session will be that report for Miranda.

³⁷ The original script has changed during the filming process. As a result of this the transcript of DVD version will be used instead of the script written by Sebastian Gutierrez in December 8, 2002. *Gothika*, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

³⁸ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 52

Most probably, the report will be in the file of Chloe and will represent the improvement or decline in her mental condition. Miranda has to be irresponsive to the emotional reactions of Chloe. They can only be the symptoms of the mental situation of her patient.

Chloe wants Miranda to listen to the story outside the framework of scientific perception. She is repeatedly raped in the mental institution while she is locked in her cell. However, she thinks that Miranda will not believe her. Chloe knows how Miranda receives the statements of her patients. As the object of the discipline she is aware of her situation. Her profile has been established as a mentally disabled person. It means that her utterances will be related to her delusional mind. This is why she does not directly tell what she experiences. She is not expecting to be understood and helped.

2.2 Conversation between two Professionals – *Distorted Image*

The second scene that will be examined is the conversation between Miranda and her husband Douglas. Miranda meets Douglas in his office after the session with Chloe. She begins to talk about the problematic issue about Chloe. By mentioning her concerns about the imaginations of Chloe, she also reflects how she conceives Chloe's situation: "She is embellishing her rape story again".³⁹ Her expression shows that it is not the first time that

³⁹ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

Chloe mentioned the devil issue; she repeats her story in several sessions.

Miranda reveals her analysis as follows:

MIRANDA: It has something to do with her stepfather, possibly remorse but instead of assessing the memory and accepting it she just falls into these satanic meanderings.⁴⁰

As it is understood from the following conversations, Miranda sees Chloe's statements as a 'problem' and tries to solve them with the use of drugs. She wants to prevent the hallucinations. However, the methods that Miranda used have not changed the story of Chloe. This is a failure for Miranda as a doctor. She is sure about her analysis. It is the one and only rational explanation for the statements of Chloe. Thus her aim is to stop the patient's delusions in order to cure the mental disorder.

Douglas realizes that the failure of the treatment affects Miranda badly. He decides to demonstrate the place of the patient, the doctor and the manager in the mental institution. He wants from Miranda to throw a glass of water to the mirror. He correlates the 'distorted image' on the mirror with the perception of the patients, which implies Chloe in this conversation. He also shows Miranda that she is the mirror which is the device to show to the patient how distorted the things that s/he fantasized are. After these explanations, Miranda asks him his role within that demonstration. He

⁴⁰ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

replies as: "I can see both of you so I'm the God."⁴¹ Then he gives the final recommendation to Miranda:

DOUGLAS: Always remember, the ability to repress is actually a vital survival tool. Without it Chloe might not have survived.⁴²

This scene can be examined in terms of three important outcomes. Firstly, it shows how the doctor perceives and analyzes the patient's speech. The problem is not the words and sentences that she uses but her way of thinking over the speeches that she hears. She thinks that Chloe embellishes the rape issue and that she has not given up doing this. Miranda as a doctor tries to stop it by use of drugs and she did not succeed. Although she cannot stop these so called hallucinations by the methods of psychiatry, she does not try to focus on the speech in order to find another explanation for their reasons. She is dependent on the rules of scientific thinking and refuses to investigate the images from another point of view.

The second outcome is the explanations of Douglas. By interpreting Chloe's mind and the role of Miranda, he clarifies his way of considering the relationship between the subject and the object of the discipline. Although he tries to convince Miranda that the thoughts of Chloe are distorted, it seems that he wants them to stay as they are, because he believes that it is the resistance of the patient to avoid the sorrow of realities.

⁴¹ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

⁴² Ibid.

The last point is about the interpretation of this scene under the guidance of the information that the viewers learn in the further scenes. As the film comes to an end, the viewers know that Chloe was in fact raped by the sheriff. He is also a close friend of Douglas. In fact, Douglas was aware of sheriff's acts as a result of their cooperation in other brutal actions. Because Douglas already knows what devil signifies, it is advantageous to praise the role of repression in patient's life. His aim in this speech is not to solve the problems of Chloe, but to stop Miranda from going over the hallucinations and reconsidering their meanings. Thus, he uses his scientific knowledge and authority in order to suppress the case instead of revealing and solving it.

2.3 Dialogue between Miranda and Pete – *Remembering*

After Douglas is murdered, Miranda is accused of killing him and brought to the mental institution. She is subjected to some neurological tests. She does not remember the last three days. She wakes up in the mental institution. She is unaware of the recent events and wants to learn the reason why she is kept in a cell. The following conversation begins with her request to see her husband:

PETE: You know you are the most logical person I now, bar none. You rely only on the facts. So why am I telling you this?

MIRANDA: You're establishing my personality. You think I am a rational person. You don't think I'm impulsive or emotional.

PETE: And following this pattern of analysis, we are about to discuss a traumatic event which has rendered this psychological profile useless.

MIRANDA: You think I'm in denial.

PETE: Don't analyze yourself. Just focus on remembering.⁴³

The last line shows the shift of the role of Miranda in the “truth games” of psychiatry. She is not the “subject” anymore so her duty is not to analyze but to be analyzed instead

To be transformed from doctor to patient creates some changes on her personal and professional profile. The test results of Miranda are the clues for Pete to think that she is not a stable person anymore. The crucial thing is that although she acts emotionally and represses the incidents, she still has the knowledge of psychiatry. In *The Archeology of Knowledge* Foucault puts forward the conditions under which doctors have the authority to do and evaluate the scientific tests and methods. He mentions the following:

The status of doctor involves a criteria of competence and knowledge; institutions, systems, pedagogic norms; legal conditions that give right – though not without laying down the certain limitations – to practise and to extend one's knowledge.⁴⁴

⁴³ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

⁴⁴ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 50

Therefore the knowledge of doctors is functional unless the right to speak and to diagnose is prohibited by the dominant disciplines. In the case of Miranda, to have the knowledge that she gained does not make her subject anymore. It is because medicine defines her as ‘mentally disabled’.

After this transition, she will not be evaluated as a rational person and her doctor will treat her as if she does not possess the qualifications of her psychiatrist profile. Thus even though Miranda still keeps the knowledge of psychiatry she does not have the right to practice it.

In this scene, it is shown that Miranda Grey will not be seen as a psychiatrist anymore unless she proves her sanity. After this diagnosis, the things that she sees will not be considered as rational.

2.4 Confrontation of Miranda and Chloe as Two Patients –

Invisible Now

In this scene, Miranda is taken out of her cell and brought to the common room for the patients. When Chloe sees Miranda, she sits next to her and reveals her ideas about the situation of the madman in the psychiatric discourse:

CHLOE: You are one of us now.

MIRANDA: You know I don't belong here, Chloe.

CHLOE: If you're here, it must mean that you belong. You are not a doctor in here. And even you tell the truth no one will listen. You

know why? Because you're crazy. And the more you try to prove them wrong the crazier you appear. You are invisible now. Can you feel it?⁴⁵

This is the time for explaining the shift in Miranda's life from the object's point of view. It explains how objects are treated by doctors in a simple but effective way.

After being labeled as insane, every act will be evaluated within the boundaries of psychiatric discourse. The denial of insanity does not change the conditions. The mirror demonstration of Douglas is applicable to Miranda now. Her doctor will perceive her speeches as the outcome of her distorted thoughts. When the patient is aware of this approach, the chance of a mutual trust is cancelled because the patient already knows that the doctor does not believe his/her statements.

2.5 Meeting with the Attorney – *Overwhelming Evidence*

Following the scenes with the doctors and patients, the issue is covered by another institution: legislative authority. Since the incident that puts Miranda into mental institution is a homicide, it is directly related to jurisprudence. Miranda meets with her attorney, Terry, in the mental institution. He studies the case and reaches a conclusion. At the beginning of his speech Terry states the evidences that were gathered from the crime scene which make Miranda the prime suspect. After finding all these

⁴⁵ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

evidences there is no doubt that she is the killer. However, Miranda still rejects this accusation, because she does not remember what happened and she cannot find any reason to kill her husband. No matter what she thinks, she is considered as the murderer. As the evidences show that the murder was committed by Miranda, Terry has to find the appropriate way to diminish the penalty. He reveals his decision as following:

TERRY: The only shot we have is to plead temporary insanity. I don't even know if that's gonna work. You're a brilliant psychiatrist. That will make jurors think "If she wanted to kill somebody she could probably fake insanity and get away with it."⁴⁶

Although temporal insanity is the best defense, he also has some concerns about it. The reason is that the jurors will not believe in her. This aspect has two points to be examined. Firstly, it contradicts the evaluation of mental institution towards the same person. They make tests; observe the repression of the incidents during her hospital stay. They are convinced that she is insane. In addition to this, her claim of sanity is not acceptable to them, because it is a way of escaping reality. On the contrary, for the jurisprudence, to claim insanity is a way of escaping reality, because reality in the court is not about madness. The Court is looking for who is responsible for the crime. To claim mental disability is an option if showing that the person is not responsible for his/her actions. Thus s/he can not be punished and sent to prison. The possibility of using temporal insanity as a defense to escape punishment creates a suspicion in the court. This causes a

⁴⁶ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

dilemma between the evaluation of science and jurisprudence towards the same subject.

The second point is about the concern of the attorney about convincing people that a psychiatrist can be insane. Her knowledge as a psychiatrist can be used in order to pretend insanity. Thus her knowledge as a subject of psychiatry is questioned by the legal system for creating an ambiguous situation. Although all claims of insanity are investigated carefully in order to eliminate deceitful actions, Miranda's case is more suspicious than others. As a psychiatrist, she has a chance to observe the mental patients' acts and speeches which can be used in order to pretend to be an insane person. Thus the legislative authority still perceives the knowledge of the subject as a functional tool even when it is eliminated by psychiatry.

2.6 Dialogue between Miranda and Pete – *There – Dead or Alive*

This dialogue takes place after Miranda finds a way to get out of her cell and sees the man in Chloe's cell. She realizes that Chloe was talking about a real situation through their sessions. Now Miranda knows that there is a man, which devil refers to, who comes to her cell at midnight. He has a tattoo of a woman burning in flames. These facts fit the statements of Chloe. Hence they are not delusions about Chloe's past but the signifiers of a present situation. However, the person who witnesses reality is also a patient

in the institution and the following lines show how her explanations are evaluated by her doctor. They begin to talk about the shape of the tattoo:

MIRANDA: The anima sola. That's what I saw.

PETE: It's a common archetypal image. I mean, it's the woman in chains, awaiting her fate.

MIRANDA: I'm talking about something I saw on the chest of a man. That's what I saw.

PETE: You're in crisis. This image is tailor-made for your state of mind. A woman in purgatory.⁴⁷

Just like Miranda in the chapter called "Not listening" Pete is the listening subject. While he listens to Miranda, he is aware of her present situation in the mental institution. Thus he takes her speech as a reference to her mental instability. He does not need to consider the possibility of truth. Thus Miranda's current situation is similar to Chloe's as an object of the discourse. Contrary to Chloe, Miranda explains it in a more realistic way; she avoids using metaphors and tells directly what she saw. However, the meaning of the tattoo is very suitable to the situation of Miranda as an object of psychiatry who is waiting for the court's decision on her. Thus Pete does not think about the possibility of truth in her speeches. Pete does not consider that Miranda might be telling the truth. In the following part of this dialogue, Miranda begins to get angry just like Chloe did after their session. It is the reaction of a "being" that is treated according to the rules and regulations of a scientific discipline. However, they will be treated as the outcomes of the emotional instability of the patient.

⁴⁷ Gothika, Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

2.7 The Ending – *Intersection*

The following scenes of the film show the escape of Miranda from the institution. She reveals the truths about the acts of her husband and Sheriff. Miranda proves that she does not create everything in her mind. By proving her “sanity” she is identified as a rational person again. She is a speaking subject now. Her inferences are taken into consideration and Chloe is freed from institution. The two women, who are out of the boundaries of the authorities, build a new life for themselves out of the mental institution.

While the genre of the film is a horror movie, there is something beneath the main plot that gives an opportunity to see the subject-object relations within the psychiatric discourse. The formation of subject and object of knowledge is caught within the lines of the characters. The film shows how a patient’s explanations are perceived by the doctor, how a doctor’s knowledge can be ineffective when her role within the discourse is shifted, how a reality can become imaginary and vice versa with respect to the nature of its narrator, how the position of the object can be determined by different authorities and so on. The beginning and the end of the movie is about listening to the object of the discipline within the framework of the concepts and the boundaries of the knowledge. In other words, the subject firstly clarifies the framework and the system for deciphering the speech, and then begins to listen. This construction makes the subject listen in a way in which the outcomes are already defined.

3. TWELVE MONKEYS

Twelve Monkeys is directed by Terry Gilliam in 1995.⁴⁸ The movie is about the time travels of James Cole who lives in the future. In the future world, it is believed that a virus created a disease in 1996 and most of the humankind died. The survivors created an underground world and they are investigating the surface of the earth and collecting samples. One of their aims is to send people to the past and get information about the virus. By this way, they are planning to dispel the mortal effect of the virus and begin to live in the surface again.

James Cole, who is a former criminal, is chosen for this mission and sent to the past. However, something goes wrong and he finds himself in 1990 instead of 1996.⁴⁹ He is found naked by the police on the street and brought to the police station. He claims that he comes from the future. His instability makes him sent to the mental institution. The movie continues with his stays in hospital and his travels between the future and the past.

⁴⁸ *Twelve Monkeys*, Dir: Terry Gilliam, 1995, DVD, Universal Studios, 2005

⁴⁹ In the original script of film the years are 1989 -1995. However they are changed in film as 1990-1996

3.1 The subject of the future world – *the “volunteer” and an opportunity*

The first scene in the underground world begins with an announcement. It is done for calling the “volunteers” for the surface investigation. The interesting thing is that they are not really volunteers for the mission. Cole declares it to the guard but he is ignored.⁵⁰ When his mission of collecting samples from the surface finishes, he comes back to the underground. There is a community of scientists who is waiting for him. When the scientists want to stay alone with Cole, the guard warns them that he has a violent history.⁵¹ However, the scientists already know about his criminal records and they do not think that he will hurt them. They want to be alone in order to offer him another mission. The new mission is to go to the past and get information about the virus. They need “tough- minded people and strong mentality.”⁵² This is why they choose Cole. If he accepts this mission, they will reduce his sentence. They encourage him to be the “volunteer” for the mission. In the next scene it is understood that he accepts it.

This is the scene in which the viewer becomes familiar with the system of the underground world. The scientific community decides the

⁵⁰ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994, retrieved 26 June 2009, http://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/twelve_monkeys.html

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

time and space of the researches; the guards are responsible for the order of the community, and citizens have to work in the researches as “volunteers” when scientists choose them for the mission.

The word “volunteer” has a meaning which contrasts with the existing system. It is obvious that people who are sent to the surface are not volunteers. They are chosen by the authorities of the underground system and are obliged to take part in the mission. However, the authorities – scientists – do not want to use such terms as ‘obligation’, ‘regulation’, ‘compulsory’, and so on. Although citizens do not go to the surface voluntarily, the scientists want to construct a language in which obligation is transformed into free will.

Another issue in this scene is the reason for which Cole is chosen for the second mission. While the scientists try to convince him about the mission, one of them mentions his previous studies at the surface. She tells him: “you are a good observer.”⁵³ His duty as an “observing subject” in his previous mission is completed successfully. It creates a positive impression about him because it proves that he can perform the second mission successfully, too. Thus the earlier knowledge and practices of Cole as a subject are taken into consideration by the scientists.

⁵³ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

3.2 Meeting with the psychiatrist – *Baltimore 1990*

The second scene passes in 1990, in Baltimore. Cole is arrested by the police because of his instable actions. The police call Doctor Kathryn Raily for psychiatric consultation. She enters Cole's cell and tries to communicate with him.

After she introduces herself she tries to get information about him. However, he does not respond to her questions and he just wants to leave the police station. While Cole is explaining his reasons for being there, Dr. Raily tries to identify his profile. As a result of this, the conversation does not provide any efficient result for either side.

The reason of this failure lies upon the positions of Cole and Doctor in the dialogue. Cole, as the object of the conversation is not responding to the questions as a patient has to be. On the other hand, the doctor is not listening to his answers. She is what Foucault calls the "questioning subject" in this conversation.⁵⁴ However, Cole does not perceive himself as the object; so the doctor is not receiving the information that she needs.

Throughout the conversation in the cell, they do not change their 'position' in the dialogue. Dr. Raily, as a rational psychiatrist, ignores the possibility of 'truth' within the statements of Cole. His claims are outside

⁵⁴ Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 52

the realm of rationality. Dr Railly's aim is to identify his mental disability in order to cure him with the appropriate methods of science. Cole, on the contrary, does not want to deal with the past. His aim is to finish his mission successfully and return to the future. He does not consider his statements as irrational. He does not see his condition as problematic. This is why he does not answer Dr. Raily's questions as she wants.

3.3 Meet the Madmen - *The Deluxe Mental Hospital*

After the conversation in the police station Cole is sent to the mental institution. There, he meets another patient, Jeffrey Goines.⁵⁵ While Jeffrey shows him around, Cole tells him that he wants to make a telephone call. Cole's request surprises Jeffrey and he says the following:

JEFFREY: A telephone call? That's communication with the outside world! Doctor's discretion. .⁵⁶

The patients are not permitted to make phone calls whenever they want. The doctor is the decision maker of the regulation of telephone calls. The line of Jeffrey reminds the phrases in *Madness and Civilization* about the silence of the madman. As Foucault states: " the man of madness communicates with society only by the intermediary of an equally abstract reason which is order, physical and moral constraint, the anonymous

⁵⁵ The Surname is changed from Mason to Goines in the film version. Goines will be used in the thesis

⁵⁶ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

pressure of the group, the requirements of conformity.”⁵⁷ The man in the mental institution is not free to act independently anymore. There is an order of the psychiatric discourse and the patients have to obey it.

During the mental institution scene, a patient talks about his situation. The monologue of that patient is worth listening to because he is analyzing himself through his speech. The following lines are from this analysis:

TJ WASHINGTON: I don't really come from outer space.

JEFFREY: This is TJ Washington, Jim he doesn't really come from outer space.

TJ WASHINGTON: Don't mock me, my friend. It's a condition of "mental divergence". I find myself on another planet, Ogo, part of an intellectual elite, preparing to subjugate barbarian hordes on Pluto. But even though it's a totally convincing reality in every way... I can feel, breathe, hear ... nevertheless, Ogo is actually a construct of my psyche. I am mentally divergent in that I am escaping certain unnamed realities that plague my life here. When I stop going there, I will be well. Are you also divergent, friend?⁵⁸

It is the declaration of a patient who is aware of his position in the psychiatric discourse. Moreover, he is aware of the identification of his illness. However, he is still in the mental institution. This shows that he has not fully recovered yet. It seems that he repeats what doctors tell him about his condition and he tries to convince himself. It is understood from his speech that he still can feel the existence of the planet Ogo. However, by the guidance of his doctors, he begins to think that it may not be real. He shows it by declaring that the planet is a "convincing reality". In fact, he still thinks

⁵⁷ Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, p.xii

⁵⁸ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

that it is real, but he forces himself to reconstruct his mental situation. He is an object who tries to think about his condition as subjects of discourse do. He wants to trace the path that is constructed for him by the subjects of the psychiatric discourse. By this way, his aim is to try to diminish the ‘reality’ of his mind and construct a new one which is appropriate in the existing world. At the end of this period, he will be able to prove that he is thinking with the tools of the rational world, that the planet Ogo is not real and that he has fully recovered in the mental institution. This is the only way for him to be treated as a ‘normal’ person and adjust to the outside world.

3.4 Who is Crazy? - *Colonies for Everyone*

At night, while everyone is sleeping, Cole is looking out of the window; possibly trying to figure out a way to escape. Meanwhile, Jeffrey sees him awake and begins to talk to him. He wants to reveal his ideas about being “crazy”. The lines of Jeffrey are given below:

JEFFREY: You know what “crazy” is? “crazy” is “majority rules”. Take germs for example

In the 18th century there was no such thing! Nobody had ever imagined such a thing – no sane person anyway. Along comes this doctor... Semmelweiss. I think. He tries to convince people... other doctors mostly... that there are these teeny tiny invisible “bad things” called germs that get into your body and make you... sick! He’s trying to get doctors to wash their hands. What this guy ... crazy? Teeny tiny invisible whaddayou call’em?...”germs”!⁵⁹

⁵⁹ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

The event that Jeffrey explains about germs is related to the “problematization” process that is discussed in chapter one.⁶⁰ It is the phase in which Semmelweiss had detected an unnamed and undefined thing and tried to make other people believe in its existence. Although we know about germs today, they were unknown in that era. Society and decision makers were not familiar with that ‘thing’, but this does not mean that germs had not existed. It had not been identified yet. Jeffrey tells this story in order to emphasize his statement about the majority rules. He believes that the term “crazy” is the majority rules. They are the rules that determine what a fact is and what is not. The situation of the being is shaped according to the majority rules of the existing period. Semmelweiss was perceived as crazy in his community because the problematized being is not taken into consideration in his lifetime. Similarly, the crazy people in mental institutions can be regarded as rational beings according to the rules, type of knowledge and culture of future worlds.

3.5 Criticism by Superiors – *Bad Judgment*

After an attempt to escape from the mental institution, Cole is captured by the guards and locked in a cell with his hands tied in order to eliminate another attempt of escape. Meanwhile, the council of the hospital is judging the treatment style of Dr. Railly. They think that Cole had a

⁶⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: History of Sexuality Volume 2*, p.10

possibility to escape because of Dr. Raily's wrong choices. The following dialogue is between Dr. Raily and her superior Dr. Fletcher:

DR. FLETCHER: Don't be defensive, Kathryn, this isn't an inquisition.

RAILLY: I didn't think I was being defensive. I was just...

DR. FLETCHER: He should have been in restraints. It was bad judgment on your part, plain and simple. Why not just cop to it?

RAILLY: Okay, it was a bad judgment. But I have the strangest feeling about him – I've seen him somewhere and...

DR. FLETCHER: Two policemen were already in the hospital and now we have an orderly with a broken arm and a Security Officer with a fractured skull.

RAILLY: I said it was bad judgment! What else do you want me to say?

DR. FLETCHER: You see what I mean? You're being defensive.⁶¹

Dr. Raily is responsible for James Cole's actions in the mental institution. Since the patient is incapable of taking rational decisions, it is the doctor's duty to keep the patient stable and safe. If the order of the institution is violated by the patient, the doctor has to give an explanation for the incident. This explanation has to be given to the scientific community because there is a "hierarchical subordination"⁶² in the psychiatric discourse.

In this case, Dr. Raily is criticized because of her wrong decisions on the method of treatment. Whenever she tries to explain something, her speech is interrupted by Dr. Fletcher repeatedly. It is because the council has already decided that Dr. Raily was wrong and there is no way to prove the opposite. All of her attempts are conceived as defensive reactions

⁶¹ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

⁶² Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, p. 50

towards the criticisms. What is expected from her is to accept her mistakes and obey the council's decisions.

Similar to the position of the subject, the methods that the subject uses are also bound by the rules of the discipline. In the case of Dr. Raily, she is accused of choosing the wrong method – keeping a violent patient untied – and providing an opportunity of escape. As it is discussed in chapter one, the subject of a particular discipline is not free to treat the object by only his/her decisions. The treatment has to be consistent with the rules and regulations of the institution. Otherwise, the treatment will be considered to be unscientific or unsuccessful. In Dr. Raily's case the method she chose does not violate the scientific rules but it is unsuccessful in keeping the object obedient and stable. Thus, although Dr. Raily is still accepted as the subject of the discipline, she is criticized for her wrong decision that affects the order of the institution by her superiors.

3.6 The doctor analyzes her patient – *Going After Jeffrey*

After Cole's travels in time, he is finally sent to 1996 successfully. He finds Dr. Raily and kidnaps her to trace The Army of the Twelve Monkeys together. The underground community believes that Twelve Monkeys is the secret group who spread the virus to the World.⁶³ Cole wants Dr. Raily to drive to Philadelphia. When they reach there, he sees some

⁶³ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

images which were shown to him by the underground world scientists. It is a clue showing that he is in the right path. He follows the images and reaches a group of animal activists. They tell that the Army of Twelve Monkeys is formed by Jeffrey Goines for animal rights. He was with the animal activists but then he split up from the organization in order to perform bigger and more dangerous actions about animals. Cole learns that Jeffrey's father is a virologist and Jeffrey and his army of Twelve Monkeys is against his fathers' works. However, Twelve Monkeys suddenly stop its actions because Jeffrey decides to support his father.⁶⁴

After learning the story of Twelve Monkeys, Cole decides to talk to Jeffrey. In the car on their road, Dr. Raily make her analysis about the condition of Cole as:

DR. RAILLY: You are not going to save the world okay? You are delusional. You've made all this up out of bits and pieces in your head.

COLE: No.

DR. RAILLY: Yes. Let me give you an example. You know Jeffrey Goines. You were both patients at County Hospital

COLE: Jeffrey Goines was a fruitcake.

DR. RAILLY: He told you his father was a famous scientist who worked with viruses so you incorporated that information to this cockeyed fantasy⁶⁵

This is the first time in the film that the doctor makes an analysis of the condition of her patient. Although he was kept in the mental institution because of his instability, there was not a concrete explanation for his

⁶⁴ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

⁶⁵ Ibid.

delusions. Dr. Raily finally gets a chance to identify the abnormality in James Cole's speech. By the help of the explanations of animal activists, she reaches necessary information to analyze Cole's condition.

When Cole reaches Jeffrey's house he talks to him about the army of the Twelve Monkeys and the virus. Actually, Jeffrey has no idea about the virus. His aim with the Twelve Monkeys is not to spread out a virus and exterminate the human kind. Because of this reason Jeffrey is surprised by the claims of Cole. Then he makes the following statement:

JEFFREY: Remember? We were in dayroom, watching TV, and you were all upset about the...desecration of the planet. And you said to me "Wouldn't it be great if there was a germ or a virus that could wipe out mankind and leave the plants and animals just as they are?" You do remember that, don't you?⁶⁶

Cole is not sure who started the epidemic anymore. If Jeffrey tells the truth then Cole is the one who discovers the idea of a mortal virus. Therefore he is responsible for the future disasters. Cole returns to the place where he left Dr. Raily. He is devastated with this new information. He explains Dr. Raily what Jeffrey told him. The reaction of Dr. Raily will give an idea to Cole in order to rescue him from going back and forth in time.

RAILLY: Nobody is going to wipe out the human race. Not you or Jeffrey or anybody else. You've created something in your mind,

⁶⁶ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

James – a substitute reality. In order to avoid something you don't want to face.⁶⁷

At the end of the scene, Cole disappears in 1996 and finds himself in the underground world.

3.7 Accepting the Diagnosis – *You are my Insanity*

When Cole wakes up in the underground, he is in a hospital room in order to be recovered from the effects of time travel. The scientific community is in the room and they are expressing their satisfaction with the data that he collected.

However, Cole thinks differently about the underground now. His demand is to stay in 1996 for fresh air, flowers and all other things on the surface of the earth. In order to eliminate the possibility of the underground, he tries to believe that it is all imaginary.

COLE: You don't exist. You're not real. People don't travel in time! You aren't here. Made you up! You can't trick me! You're in my mind. I'm insane and you're my insanity!⁶⁸

Meanwhile, Dr. Raily is in Dr. Fletcher's office, trying to explain him that Cole may really be coming from the future. It is because she remembers that Cole was talking about a news event that they heard on the

⁶⁷ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

⁶⁸ Ibid.

radio. After his disappearance, the incident ends exactly as he told. This issue and some other details that Dr. Raily finds confuse her mind and she begins to suspect what is real and what is not. Conversation between the two doctors continues as below:

DR: FLETCHER: Kathryn, you know he can't possibly know that... you're a rational person. You're a trained psychiatrist. you know the difference between what's real and what's not.

RAILLY: And what we believe is what's accepted as "truth" now, isn't it Owen? Psychiatry – it's the latest religion. And we're the priests – we decide what's right and what's wrong – we decide who's crazy and who isn't. I am in trouble Owen. I'm losing my faith.⁶⁹

This is the scene in which both characters change their attitudes towards the real-imaginary, truth - falsehood, and right - wrong distinctions. Cole begins to identify himself with the concepts of psychiatry while Dr. Raily begins to suspect the psychiatric discourse. Cole explains the reason for this change in the new meeting with Dr. Raily in 1996.

3.8 The Reason – *I Want to Stay Here*

In the last travel in time, Cole finds Dr. Raily in front of the office of Animal Activists. She believes Cole and tries to change the future. Cole, on the contrary, seems calm and independent of his concerns. As she is aware that the police are chasing them – in order to catch Cole because of his crimes – she takes him to a hotel room in order to speak the details of the incident.

⁶⁹ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

She is questioning Cole again, just like she did when they first met, however, this time her target is different. She still needs to identify him but this time she believes in his story and wants to know the details. On the other hand, Cole answers her questions exactly in the opposite way. He relates every incident with their equivalent in the psychiatric discourse. He tries to constitute a “mentally divergent” person.⁷⁰ He explains the reason for this attempt as the following:

COLE I want to be here. In this time. With you. I want to become ... become a whole person. I want this to be the present. I want the future to be unknown.⁷¹

These lines reveal the reason of Cole’s attempt for denying the underground world and questioning his mental stability. Just like the patient TJ. Washington, Cole tries to identify his condition in psychiatric terms. He tries to give a meaning to the incident that he has lived but no other people in 1996. He is doing this in order to cope with the community of 1996. Simply, he wants to be one of them. In order to achieve this goal, he needs to admit abnormality and believes that he has created all those things in his mind. This is a “voluntary” action similar to ones in the underground world. He has to be the “object” of psychiatry in order to be a part of the community.

⁷⁰ David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994

⁷¹ Ibid.

3.9 The Final – *Full Circle*

Dr. Raily and Cole are now confused about what is real and what is not. They begin to escape from the police who chase them because of Cole's previous crimes. Dr. Raily is still not sure about the reality of Cole's world. The important thing is that she decides to act according to the possibilities, and not to the rules of rationality. She does not want to ignore the statements of Cole anymore. If there is not such a 'reality' then they can continue to their life as they were.

At the end of the movie, it is shown that the future world really exists. The virus is not spread out by Jeffrey but a fanatic scientist who works in virologist's laboratory. Nobody is aware of his mortal plans. He is planning to travel to different countries and spread out the virus. In the last scene, Cole and Dr. Raily try to stop him in the airport but they fail. Now the spectators know that the virologist will spread out the virus and most of the human kind will be dead. The rest of them will live in the underground and search for the information about the virus.

CONCLUSION

In the “preface” of *History of Sexuality*, Foucault states that in his analysis he treats “sexuality” as:

[T]he correlation of a domain of knowledge [savoir], a type of normativity, and a mode of relation to the self; it means trying to decipher how, in Western societies, a complex experience is constituted from and around the certain forms of behavior: an experience that conjoins a field of knowledge [connaissance] (with its own concepts, theories, diverse disciplines), a collection of rules (which differentiate the permissible from the forbidden, natural from monstrous, normal from pathological, what is decent from what is not, and so on), and a mode of relation between the individual and himself (which enables him to recognize himself as a sexual subject amid others).⁷²

The things that form sexuality are the conditions in which the objects of scientific disciplines are constituted. The object is a form of experience that is shaped by the tools of authority such as rules, policies, theories and laws. Furthermore, this experience and the identity it defines have to be internalized by the individual. The self has to believe in that established identity. S/he has to describe him/herself with the concepts of the authority. This new form of internalization also causes one to perceive both one’s and other people’s acts and speeches within the territories set by the particular

⁷² Michel Foucault, “Preface to the *History of Sexuality*, Volume Two” in *Ethics: subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault*, p.200

authority. To restrain the domain of perception leads a miscommunication between people.

The examples of miscommunication have been found in the analysis of two films in this study. Dialogues between various characters put forward the role of the object and the subject formation on the perception of the speeches. Additionally, the contents of the dialogues show the broken language between the rational agent and the mental patient.

In *Gothika*, one of the examples of miscommunication is experienced between Miranda and Chloe. Chloe, as the object of the discipline, tries to communicate with Miranda. Her desire is to be conceived and to be listened independently of psychiatric knowledge. However, Miranda defines both Chloe's and her position within the boundaries of psychiatry and consciously or unconsciously refuses to listen to Chloe's speech outside the bounds of this domain. By acting in this way, Miranda correlates Chloe's speech with her traumatic past and misses the actual problem that Chloe experiences.

Miranda goes through a similar experience in the further scenes of the film. However, in the latter scenes, she is on the other side of the confrontation; she becomes the object of psychiatry. Her speeches are not considered as rational and reasonable anymore. Although she feels, thinks and speaks as before, her new identification prevents others to conceive her

as the way it used to be. This is because she is an object of psychiatry and she is regarded as mentally disabled. From now on, even though she still keeps the knowledge of psychiatry, she is not permitted to use it for analyzing herself or other patients. Moreover, her former colleague, Pete changes his perception of Miranda's acts and speeches after she becomes his patient. The dialogues between Miranda and Pete change completely after the diagnosis. In this case, the important point is that Miranda's expressions do not change because she is not internalizing her new identity. However, Pete does not perceive her as before; he identifies her with the new formation of Miranda Grey. Hence her speeches are not considered as rational by Pete and this creates the same miscommunication parallel to one that Miranda and Chloe experienced.

An alternative perception is portrayed by the subject of the legislative authority. While Miranda is perceived as a mental patient in the institution, her attorney's priority is the criminal part of her new identity. Throughout their dialogue he does not question her mental stability. However, their dialogue is still not successful because he perceives her as the murderer while she does not believe that she committed the crime. She cannot find any motive to kill her husband, but the law already defines her as the murderer by the tools of the discipline: the evidences. This is why her attorney does not consider the possibility of innocence. Hence they cannot communicate properly and reach a conclusion.

In *Twelve Monkeys*, the miscommunication occurs firstly between Cole and Dr. Raily in the police station. Dr. Raily goes to the station with the belief that the person she will see is insane. She already constructs the ways of communication in her mind. At the same time, Cole does not identify himself as an object. He is a subject of important investigations in the future world and he does not change this formation when he comes to the past. These two strict formations affect their conversation and neither side can achieve the information that it needs.

Twelve Monkeys also has a character who tries to internalize his role. TJ Washington is a patient in the mental institution and he introduces himself to others as 'mentally divergent'. Although he tries to believe that the Planet Ogo is only an imaginary place, he claims that he still feels its existence. The question is why does a person want to destroy the reality of his/her own? Most probably, it is because of his need to adjust to the existing world. In the mental institution, it is told that the Planet Ogo does not exist and he is not considered as mentally stable until he accepts this reality. Hence he succeeds to change his belief but he fails to change his sensations.

The last example from *Twelve Monkeys* is again the relationship between Cole and Dr. Raily. But this time Cole accepts his identification in the past world. The miscommunication results from the changes in Dr. Raily's perception. Since she has some clues about Cole's time travels, she

begins to suspect what is real and what is not. When they meet again, she is ready to listen to him. All of her efforts to reach Cole's world are interrupted by Cole's analysis of his mental situation. He becomes the doctor of his own and tries to find rational explanations for his experiences. The conversation reaches a conclusion with his confession: He wants to stay there with Dr. Raily. He learns that he can stay on the surface of the earth and be a part of it only through accepting the formation of him by the authorities of the past. If Dr. Raily's thoughts had been the same as his, they would have gone to the mental institution and continue to his treatment. However, she neither acts as a subject of the discipline nor conceives Cole as mentally divergent anymore.

As given in the above examples, when the object of psychiatry identifies him/herself outside the boundaries of the discipline, the miscommunication begins. This is because the relationship between the object and the subject is established within a strict territory defined and preserved by certain rules and norms. Hence the man of rationality can communicate with the madman in only one way. The "Games of Truth" constitute this formation so successfully that when one side gets out of the boundaries of psychiatry through the communication, the other side cannot understand him/her. The communication has to be directed by the rules and the concepts of psychiatry. Another way of communication is not allowed by rules of the authority because there is no place for madman in the rational world.

The world of reason and unreason has to be segregated to maintain the 'order' of society. The madman can only enter into the modern world by accepting that s/he is a mental patient. By this way, s/he also recognizes the irrationality of his/her own reality. The next step should be the demand for the treatment in order to be cured from all delusions and be a rational person. This is the only way for the madman to be in touch with the rational world. Briefly, the communication of the madman with the rational man can only be successful through the declaration of irrationality.

REFERENCES

Foucault Michel, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith, London and New York: Routledge, 1995

---, "Introduction", *The Use of Pleasure: History of Sexuality Volume 2*, New York: Vintage, 1986

---, *Madness and Civilization; A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, Trans. R. Howard, London: Routledge, 1995

---, "Foucault Michel, 1926-", *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Trans. Catherine Porter, ed. by G. Gutting, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994

---, "Preface to the *History of Sexuality*, Volume Two" in *Ethics: subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault*, V.1, Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: The New Press, 1994

Films

Gothika Dir. Mathieu Kassovitz, 2003, DVD, Columbia Pictures and Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004

Twelve Monkeys, Dir: Terry Gilliam, 1995, DVD, Universal Studios, 2005

Electronic Resources

David Peoples, Janet Peoples, *Twelve Monkeys: an original screenplay*, 1994, retrieved 26 June 2009,

http://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/twelve_monkeys.html