Foucault's philosophy in *And I and Silence* by Naomi Wallace

Belgin BAĞIRLAR[1]

APA: Bağırlar, B. (2019). Foucault's philosophy in *And I and Silence* by Naomi Wallace. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö6), 309-319. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.648904

Abstract

This paper aims to interpret both the female characters in Naomi Wallace's play *And I and Silence* (2011), Jamie and Dee's desire to be free and their resistance to power within the framework of Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (1975). Emphasizing concepts such as power, freedom, and resistance, Foucault advocates that nobody is out of power for there exists no place absent of power. Furthermore, it is impossible not to mention freedom wherever there are power and resistance where freedom exists. Wallace introduces her audience to two female characters who had been convicted of different crimes and then met in prison. Jamie is African American while Dee is a white American woman. Both women dream of making a good life together after being set free. The moment that they do get released, they deem that they have gotten rid of disciplinary power, and are free. However, both of them begin to resist as they encounter power again. Characters who feel the power much more as they resist eventually accept that power is everywhere. They commit suicide in order to find freedom, regardless whether or not it is an exact solution. As a result, Wallace effectively reveals the American power system through her avant-garde play. Wallace's characters, moreover, are dramatic instances of Foucault's conceptualization of power, freedom, and resistance.

Keywords: *And I and Silence*, Naomi Wallace, Foucault, freedom, power.

Naomi Wallace'ın *And I and Silence* adlı eserinde Foucault'un felsefesi

Özet

Bu makale Naomi Wallace tarafından yazılan *And I and Silence* (2011) isimli oyundaki Jamie ve Dee isimli kadın karakterlerin özgür olabilmek için çabalarını ve iktidara karşı direnişlerini Michel Foucault'un *Discipline and Punish* (1975) eserinin çerçevisinde incelemektir. İktidar, özgürlük ve direniş gibi kavramlara vurgu yapan Foucault, iktidarın olmadığı bir yerin olmadığını ve hiç kimsenin iktidarın dışında yer almadığını savunur. Dahası, özgürlüğün var olduğu yerde iktidardan ve direnişin olduğu yerde özgürlükten bahsetmemek imkansızdır. Wallace, seyircisini farklı suçlardan mahkum olan ve cezaevinde tanışan iki kadın karakter ile tanıştırır. Jamie, Afrikan Amerikalı iken, Dee beyaz bir Amerikalıdır. Her iki kadın da hapisten çıktıktan sonra birlikte iyi bir hayat kurmayı hayal ederler. Jamie ve Dee serbest bırakıldıkları an, disiplinci iktidardan kurtulduklarını ve özgür olduklarını düşünürler. Ancak ikisi de tekrar iktidar ile karşılaştıklarında direnmeye başlarlar. Direndikçe iktidarı daha çok hisseden karakterler, sonunda iktidarın her yerde olduğunu kabul eder. Kesin bir çözüm olsa da olmasa da özgür olmak için intihar ederler. Sonuç olarak, Wallace çağdaş oyunuyla Amerikan iktidar sistemini etkili bir şekilde ortaya koymaktadır. Ayrıca, Wallace'ın karakterleri Foucault'nun iktidar, özgürlük ve direniş kavramları için etkileyici örnekleridir.

1 Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü (Aydın, Türkiye), belgin.bagirlar@adu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5575-3227 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 01.10.2019- kabul tarihi: 20.11.2019; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide. 648904

Anahtar kelimeler: *And I and Silence*, Naomi Wallace, Foucault, özgürlük, iktidar.

Introduction

The renowned 20th century philosopher Foucault (1926-84) asserts that the previously existing concept of humanity has disappeared, and claims that since it is a metaphysical concept in its very nature, it is impossible to define what man is. In his view, "man is only a recent invention, a figure not yet two centuries old, a new wrinkle in our knowledge, and that he will disappear again as soon as that knowledge has discovered a new form" (Foucault, 2005: XXV). He enunciates that the concept of humanity, which had emerged in Kant's philosophy in the 18th century, ended with Nietzche's proclamation of the death of God. (Foucault, 2005: 420). He states that there are subjects who live and who fulfil the requirements of time rather than of humanity:

> The subject is a form and this form is not above all or always identical to itself. You do not have towards yourself the same kind of relationship when you constitute yourself as a political subject who goes and votes or speaks up in a meeting, and when you try to fulfil your desires in a sexual relationship. There is no doubt that there are some relationships and some interferences between these kinds of subjects. In each case, we play, we establish with one's self some different form of relationship. (Foucault, 1987a: 121).

Thusly, subjects re-establish themselves at different times, depending on different situations and relationships. What is more is that Foucault accentuates the relevancy between power and the subject cannot be denied since subjects are both the producers of power as well as the objects upon which the power practices take place.

Throughout all of his works, Foucault mostly focuses on 'power'. Nevertheless, the power he is talking about differs from the juridic-discursive model, which is oppressive and has strict rules. Initially, he believes that "Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (Foucault, 1980: 93). He essentially articulates that there is no place where the traces of power do not appear, even if power occasionally changes. In a sense, there is no single centre of power that doubles as a set of hierarchies that are intertwined and it is difficult to separate from one other. He takes the position that although laws are the basic elements of power, the influence of power does manifests itself not only through laws, and rules but it is also possible to see power in the relations of family, state, education, as well as production. Thus, given that everyone is a part of power, it ensures the reproduction and protection of power. In other words, power relations are never static. Rather, power relations "are a mode of action which does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead, it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future" (Foucault, 1982: 789). In this regard, Foucault differentiates power relations from torturing someone. The tortured person becomes silent and submits, while power relations protect, support, and reshape subjects to a certain extent.

Foucaultian concepts such as freedom and resistance depend on power. He advocates that "where there is resistance there is power, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (Foucault, 1990: 95). Accordingly, the existence of resistance is directly proportional to the existence of power, and therefore the two are interdependent upon one another. What is more, Foucault states that resistance does not jeopardize the power. To him, resistance is "opposition to the power of women, parents of children, the psychology of the mentally ill, medicine of the population, administration of the ways of people live" (Foucault, 1982: 780) and all of them have common characteristics. Firstly, these resistances are transversal struggles, therefore they are in similar

forms in many countries. Secondly, "the aim of these struggles is the power effects" (Foucault, 1982: 780). In other words, they criticize the work instead of criticizing the subject who does the work and benefits from it. In fact, these resistances usually react only to find solutions and conclude. Hence, "the main objective of these struggles is to attack not so much such as institution an institution of power, or group, or elite, or class but rather a technique, a form of power" (Foucault, 1982: 781). In brief, he skilfully reveals that resistance has a reinforcing effect on power relations.

Another important concept for power is freedom—or the reason why power is omnipresent. Foucault evidently depicts that "power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free" (Foucault, 1982: 790). Even if subjects consider themselves free, they are merely as free as power allows. Subjects "are faced with a field of possibilities in which several ways of behaving, several reactions, and diverse comportments" (Foucault, 1982: 790). In one sense, liberty is an inseperablepart of the power relations. Therefore, "slavery is not a power relationship when man is in chains" (Foucault, 1982: 790). Power relations do not work unless subjects counter or resist and for Foucault, the concepts of freedom and resistance are henceforth used interchangeably. Indeed, there is no place where we do not experience power relations, and so it is not possible to place ourselves outside of it. Foucault broadly delineates that "there are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised ... It exists all the more by being in the same place as power; hence, like power, resistance is multiple and can be integrated in global strategies. (Foucault, 1980:142). Thus, power needs resistance to be more effective and active; for without resistance, it cannot renew itself or undergo change. In other words, subjects do, in fact, have the freedom to a certain extent to change power relations. To have this kind of freedom means that they have resistance. Despite of the fact that the trilogy of freedom, resistance, and power relations is complementary, the subjects are free to the extent permitted by power, that is to say, to a limited extent, and can resist. That is why Foucault defines the relationship between resistance, freedom and power relations as agonism.

Whilst Foucault examines power, he contextualizes the closure of people in various ways for centuries through madhouses, prisons, and certain sexual patterns. In *Discipline And Punish* (1975) he makes an in-depth analysis of trio concepts, jails, prisoners, and power. Prisons that have existed for centuries are the closure areas will exist as long as society demands them to. They substantially ensure that the supervisory bodies of power are functional. Foucault asserts that "no crime means no police" (Foucault, 1980a: 47). For this reason, as there are prisoners and crime, the disciplinary mechanisms of power do exist. Moroever, both offense and criminal mechanisms coexist. Foucault ventilates that "the penalty must be made to conform as closely as possible to the nature of the offence, so that fear of punishment diverts the mind from the road along which the prospect of an advantageous crime was leading it" (Foucault, 1995: 104). Certain direct penalties must be imposed on the offense committed so that crime and punishment can come to life in the mind at the same time. Only through this means can the penalty come to mind when the crime is mentioned, or vice versa. From Foucault's end, punishment varies according to class differences. With the expansion of the capitalist system, "the economy of illegalities was restructured" (Foucault, 1995:87). It is precisely because of that "for illegalities of property - for theft - there were the ordinary courts and punishments; for the illegalities of rights - fraud, tax evasion, irregular commercial operations - special legal institutions applied with transactions, accommodations, reduced fines, etc." (Foucualt, 1995: 87). Whilst there are mitigating laws for crimes committed by the upper-class, ordinary courts operate as jurisdictions for crimes committed by lower-classes, and are sentenced to imprisonment.

As we might assume, prisons are unable to transform criminals, namely 'abnormal' people, into better citizens. Their objective is "to make them virtuous, but to regroup them within a clearly demarcated, card-indexed milieu which could serve as a tool for economic or political ends" (Foucault, 1980a:42). In this respect, the disciplinary power both creates more docile subjects from criminals, who are under pressure, and then excludes those criminals from society.

Foucault explicates this closure through Jeremy Bentham's 'Panopticon' building design (1791). He elaborately makes public regarding the building design:

> At the periphery, an annular building: at the center, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; The other, on the outside, allows the light to cross the cell from one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy (Foucault, 1995: 200)

Foucault dwells upon how the power functions as a machine. To him, it is not substantial whether or not there is an observer in the tower or who the observer is. The notable thing is to feel and accept that the person is constantly being observed. The subject, who accepts the pressure of being consistently observed, eventually begins to control himself. In a sense, the disciplinary power successfully indicates its impact. It is also probable to witness the operational power of Panopticon in many other enviornments like "hospitals, workshops, schools, prisons" (Foucault, 1995: 205). What is more, not only does disciplinary power monitor only subjects in these places, but also monitors their blood relations as well.

Like Foucault, Naomi deals with the notion of prison and detainees in *And I and Silence*. In this sense, we will examine Wallace's play elaborately in light of Foucault's dazzling view on power, resistance, and freedom.

Naomi Wallace

Born in Kentucky in 1960, Naomi Wallace is an experimental and innovative playwright who has made significant contributions to American theatre from the 1990s onwards. After studying poetry and theatre at the University of Iowa, her plays have been staged in London, where by she "[...] came to enjoy a measure of recognition and success in Britain – rare for an American playwright" (Cummings& Abbitt, 2013: 4).

Her activist parents' sensitivity to social issues played a major role in shaping Wallace an activist writer. Labeled as a political writer by many critics, Wallace "did, indeed, embrace radical opinions and as a writer was that relative rarity in twenty-first-century American drama, a political playwright interested in exploring class, racism, human rights and America's adventures abroad" (Bigsby, 2018: 194). Wallace's first two plays, *The War Boys* in 1993 and *In the Heart of America* (1994), attracted tremendous attention because they put down both American foreign policy and the phenomenon of war. Her different perspective is the reason why the New York Times Sunday magazine picked her apart as "an American Exile in America" (Cummings & Abbitt, 2013: 4). *In The Heart of America*, Wallace presents a queer love story in the middle of the war, challenging political power and revealing the reality in American society. Additionally, she has also criticizes war policy from a different dimension through *The Trestle at Pope Lick Creek* (1998), which uncovers the traumatic impact of war on people and how it disturbs human psychology. In 1995, she released *One Flea Spare*, a play about trapped characters

between social rules and class differences. This led her to become "[…] the second American playwright (after Tennessee Williams) to have a play enter the permanent repertoire of La Comedie - Française, the national theater of France" (Cummings & Abbitt, 2013: 7). Her play *Slaughter City* (1996), respects the intermingled relations between workers in a meat factory and the pressure of the upper class to the lower class, and was staged at London's Royal Shakespeare Company.

Wallace, being aware of the violence that people have suppressed, squares the negative impact of desire to consume in humans with violence in *Standard Time* (2000) and *The Hard Weather Boating Party* (2009). Her characters blindfoldedly commit murder in order to satisfy their material desires, similar to the characters in Martin Crimp's *Dealing with Clair* (1988). In *And I and Silence* (2011), she writes about the survival of prisoners who have been pushed out of society.

Wallace has an innovative style in her subjects, and is able to have an influence over her audience through impressive poetic language, a reflection of her inner poet. In 1995 she published a collection of poems dealing with racism, war, violence, and children. Wallace's characters often belong to the lower class, and are ordinary people, because she "listens for voices that are absent that whisper from the past or a disregarded present" (Bigsby, 196). By virtue of its overriding political side, she exposes her audience to covered issues, such as racism, sexual preferences, or class segregation, using a certain period of time. Therefore, Wallace's theatre is provocative. According to Cummings and Abbitt, "obscene intimacy" is a common feature of Wallace's characters. They affirm "again and again, she presents characters who come to erotically charged moments when they make themselves vulnerable, risk physical injury, relinquish power, and submit to the will of another" (Cummings & Abbitt, 2013: 9). For instance, while in *The Trestle at Pope Lick Creek*, Pace and Dalton observe their nudity without thouching each other, in *In the Heart of America*, the audience witnesses the sexual rapprochement between the two soldiers, Remzi and Craver. In this sense, Wallace challenge to power relations in her plays to upset the balance of power.

And I and Silence

And I and Silence was released in London in 2011 and is considered to be "an expert at mixing politics and poetry" (Adler, 2013: 405) by virtue of Wallace's enhancing language and challenging plot. For the title of the play, Wallace is inspired by Emily Dickinson's poem called *I felt a funeral, in my brain,* which is about a symbolic death. From the moment it took to the stage, the play attracted the attention of many critics. Lyn Gardner focused on the realist side of the play, stating "Wallace's devastating, moving play is entirely without extravagance and artifice and is completely grounded in the harshness of the real world" (Gardner, https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2011/may/22/and-i-and-silence-review). Charles Isherwood, likewise, asserts that "*And I and Silence* does contain a culminating spasm of violence" (Isherwood, 2014: n.p.) due to the two scenes featuring suicide and the the guard's punishment. Artfully drawing upon metaphoric language, Wallace does not hesitate to criticize American politics and power masterfully. Wallace's characters eventually die, however their death, like Dickinson's metaphoric death, signifies their freedom. The 'peppermints' that the young Dee gives to the young Jamie represent affection between them. According to Cumming and Abbitt, the play "is marked by the presence of provocation, invention, imagination, transgression, and transformation in form and content" (Cumming & Abbitt, 2013: 97). In brief, Wallace's poetic language and the dances of the characters make the play more vivid and impressive by subtracting the monotony.

Despite the play only having two protagonists, Jamie and Dee, the young spirits of the characters from nine years prior also make an appearance. The past and present scenes follow one other in a certain order and harmony. When Dee was little, she could not bear the constant violence that her father had inflicted upon her mother. Dee, whose father breaks both her mother's arms after pushing her down the stairs, stabs her father and goes to jail. Jamie is sentenced to nine years in prison for stealing an accessory. What is more, Naomi uses a specific time frame for her play with twelve scenes and she refers to the 1950s.

For Foucault, the epoch, namely history, in which each concept comes out and every event occurs, is important given that everything substantiates depending on specific circumstances as well as on needs. In this respect, each event and phenomenon should be investigated within its own period. Similar to Foucault, Wallace considers the strength of history, asserting that "politics is history and history is what sparks my imagination. That's where my fire comes from. For me, politics and art can never be divided" (Gornick, 1997: np.). She uses a specific time frame for her play, which features twelve scenes that expose the politics of the period, and she researches extensively into the social, cultural, and political events of the period before writing. *And I and Silence* is set between 1950 and 1959 in the USA, just when traces of the Second World War slowly begin to taper off. Wallace deftly chooses a period in which power is jolted by new inventions, the recovery of the economy, and increasing protests for protection of civil rights due to racism. Wallace, thus, makes the play more realistic and political by sending warnings that are more effective to the audience.

With the characters' ghosts being visible in a prison, Jamie and Dee, as adults, appear "outside, in a city, in a small, mostly bare room" (Naomi, 2011: ii). Indeed, they are bound within small spaces both at present and in the past. Additionally, while they were in prison, Dee is bound within the cell. In this sense, Wallace throughout the play articulates not only limited freedom, but also a dream that will never come to fruition. She also reveals both how prisoners are transformed by disciplinary power in the prison alongside the experiences of prisoners who have been ostracized by society after prison.

Foucault believes that "prison was not at first a deprivation of liberty to which a technical function of correction was later added; it was from the outset a form of legal detention entrusted with an additional corrective task, or an enterprise for reforming individuals that the deprivation of liberty allowed to function in the legal system" (Foucault, 1995: 233). He talks about the versatility of the prison, the detainees deprived of liberty, and the purpose of power to create obedient bodies. In this respect, Jamie, who was arrested for theft and Dee, who was sentenced for injuring her father, are deprived of their freedom. That is why Wallace accentuates Dee and Jamie's dreams quite often throughout the play. They want to apply for jobs in order to fulfil their dream of "getting a cabin with a porch" (Wallace, 2011: 7), after they have acquired freedom. At the prison, Jamie teaches Dee how to be a good employee, the only profession she knows due to her mother so that Dee can work as a cleaner. The two women bond with one another at heart and try to write a reference letter:

> Dee She stands up straight, sure keeps her eyes polite.
> She's not stupid, but then she's not too bright.
> Jamie No, no, her brain is just the perfect size
> And she knows who's the boss, who's always wise
> Dee She carries her own bucket and a brush,
> And she won't say two words if you say - (Naomi, 2011:3)

Both protagonists' dreams are as small as the cell within which they are imprisoned, and as narrow cabin within which they live, since both interiorize the relationship between boss and worker in the capitalist system, which provides the growth of the function of disciplinary power. This is the reason why Dee and Jamie are seen as two 'docile bodies' who are ready to take every request of their boss and even be punished for their mistakes. From this standpoint, they are the bodies that disciplinary power demands.

Foucault enunciates how inefficient the training of prisoners in jails is in terms of their reformation. Initially, power asks "to make each individual useful" (Foucault, 1995: 162). For this reason, in prisons, detainees both are employed as well as provided with a free education. Even the concept of reformation, which is necessary for disciplinary power to function, does not change the fact that prisons are "the great failure of penal justice" (Foucault, 1995: 264). Wallace's characters also support Foucault's view. During their detention, Jee and Damie learn nothing, but nevertheless they strengthen the bond between them. After getting out of the jail, Dee admits that she cannot write a reference letter to Jamie because she is illiterate. Jamie blames Dee for that and tells her "you had nine years inside to learn. Shame on you. Why didn't you learn?" (Wallace, 2011: 4). Herein, Wallace sets forth that Dee, who has been imprisoned for nine years in prison, is indicative of the failure of the prison policy.

According to Foucault, prisons do not allow criminals to feel regret owing to their crimes (Foucault, 1980a: 42). Given that society does not accept criminals, this prevents them from feeling remorse. In Wallace's play, both Dee and Jamie find it hard to find a job or continue working, even if they try to lead a normal life. As they dream of, they both find boyfriends for themselves, one married and the other typeless, but cannot maintain their relationships. Jamie allows herself to be sexual abuse in order to earn money. Dee cannot find work after leaving her job due to sexual assault, and spends her days sleeping. At first, they live off of drinking soup, and then water due to a lack of money. Due to both hunger and the fear of losing their home, Dee gives up her dreams. For her to wake up at night is "not a waking in the dark" but "the waking is the dark" (Wallace: 2011: 54). Desperate Dee propounds Jamie to start stealing again. In this sense, Wallace brings the failure of the prison's policy of reforming prisoners to light, parallel to Foucault. Even though Jamie realizes that there is no hope for them, she rejects Dee's proposal and goes on pretending to be happy for a while.

Foucault asserts that "discipline produces docile bodies" (Foucault, 1995: 138) and that disciplinary power uses its power to make the prisoners' souls obedient. When elaborating on Wallace's characters, it is obvious that they are indeed instances of 'docile bodies'. In scene two, Dee confronts Jamie in prison and she explains why she chose to befriend Jamie:

> Young Dee Few months ago, I saw the old Mr Crackle knock the guard out of a bowl of hot chilli right out of your hands.
>
> Young Jamie Chilli's my favorite.
>
> Young Dee Hit the floor, splash.
>
> Young Jamie I picked the bowl up.
>
> Young Dee Yep. But Mr Crackle, he knocked it out of your hands a second time.
>
> Young Jamie And I picked up that bowl again, though there wasn't any chilli in it any more.
>
> Young Dee Me. I would have let it lay. Eight times he knocked that bowl outta your hands. I counted. And you picked it up eight times till Mr Crackle gave in. That's the kind of friend I want. (Wallace, 2011: 12).

Considering the superiority of disciplinary power in creating 'docile bodies', Jamie takes her plate off the floor several times instead of giving up getting her own plate, thus showing a certain degree of resistance to authority—that is exactly why Jamie attracts Dee. On the other hand, we can speculate that Jamie is an obedient subject, just disciplinary power demands. The guard, the overseer of disciplinary power, strikes Jamie's plate multiple times, and Jamie succumbs to Mr Crackle's instincts with all her docility. She does not swear, shout, or act violently. Here, Jamie represents a small part of the flawless mechanism of disciplinary power. Dee, in contrast, is not as obedient as Jamie and often refuses to be a submissive body. In reality, Dee's desire to be friends with Jamie symbolizes a kind of resistance to power, considering the racist policy of that time. Dee is sentenced twice for sneaking into Jamie's cell and shouting at night. Her third cell sentence is different:

> Young Dee... So one mornin 'I pour my juice into the girl's next to me, then I put my cup under the table and I piss in it.
>
> Young Jamie No!
>
> Young Dee Yes. Then I put the cup right there on my tray, waiting for Monkfish. He leans over me like he always does, buttons on his uniform brushin 'my neck, my face. Picks up the cup and drinks deep.
>
> Young Jamie (clapping her hands) Oh no! Oh no, Dee! (Wallace, 2011: 45).

Because of Dee's opposition to power, that is to say, her violent resistance, Jamie naturally reacts with surprise. According to Foucault, "if punishment is to present itself to the mind as soon as one thinks of committing a crime, as immediate a link as possible must be made between the two" (Foucualt, 1995: 104). Namely, Jamie overreacts as soon as she hears about the crime Dee committed inasmuch as she links the crime with the punishment. Dee, who is beaten until she passes out, does not regret her resistance to power and is eventually sent to another prison. Through this lens, Wallace puts forth the failure of the prison to reform the detainee Dee. Dee's resistance, in fact, both strengthens the functioning of disciplinary power, and is an example for other prisoners to comprehend the strength of power. On the other hand, Dee also learns to be obedient and to adapt to the hierarchical structure of power from Jamie, just as her mother had taught her to do. After deciding to become a prison janitor, Jamie teaches Dee how to clean and how to be obedient. They even internalize this hierarchical structure of power, the boss-employee relationship, and sing together:

> Young Jamie No! Ma'am ... If you don't want that thing no more,
>
> I'll take it home, 'cause I'm so poor.
>
> And you are so kind, your heart is so big.
>
> If you're sweet to me, I'll dance a jig... (Wallace, 2011: 34).

Wallace denotes the audience that both Jamie and Dee embark on the hierarchical structure of power. This is an indication of Foucault's argument that power actually makes subjects' souls, not bodies, obedient. Their dream about what to do also uncovers their subservient souls.

Foucault dwells on the observer strength of power and thus the pressure of power using the panopticon metaphor. He delineates that the effect of the Panopticon is "to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, 1995: 201). Therefore, even if the subject feeling under constant surveillance is not observed, after a while, it embraces that this situation is continuous. Both characters, especially Dee, are aware that they are being observed, hence the reason why they feel great pressure on them. When Dee runs away from the refectory, she tells Jamie, "Dee I couldn't get here. They watch me now" (Wallace, 2011: 26). Even if at

first the observation is explicit, over time they begin to feel it unconsciously. Whilst Jamie teaches Dee how to do the dusting in prison, she urges Dee to be careful while working "because whoever's gonna hire you, they're gonna watch you" (Wallace, 2011: 46). Concordantly, both characters unconsciously consider that power is actually watching them everywhere in every way. Reminding of the concept of racism that prevailed in the 1950s, Wallace essentially showcases to the audience that they cannot leave the small house where their characters live together:

> Dee… Here, we can't go out together. We can't sit together. We can't walk together anymore.
>
> Jamie We can walk together.
>
> Then why don't we?
>
> Jamie You know why.
>
> Dee Sure. 'Cause folks on the street see us together, everyone thinks you're my maid… (Wallace, 2011: 55).

Jamie is seen as 'abnormal' by society on the ground of racism, a form of biopolitical government created to protect society from deformities. Although Jamie seems to accept this fact, Dee desperately wants to resist; however, she never has the guts for going for a walk with Jamie. The only place they feel content is their small house. Bigsby enunciates that "slavery, at least in America, has passed into history, but its contaminating residue has not… Wallace turns to the past because it is unfinished business even as a journey is underway "(Bigsby, 2018: 218). To paraphrase, Naomi's skilful use of two different conceptions of time is actually related to revealing the functioning of power.

After Dee and Jamie become unemployed, they are left with no money to either rent or to buy food. Dee, who has given up all hope for his life, clearly tells Jamie what she thinks:

> Dee There's no place for us.
>
> Jamie Yes there is.
>
> Dee The streets don't want us.
>
> Jamie That'll change.
>
> Dee Bullshit. (Wallace, 2011: 74).

The protagonists are conscious of the fact that they out of place in society. Considering that they will be free after imprisonment, Jamie and Dee actually realize they are 'abnormal' after being fired, sexually abused, and starved. Both characters, who are unable to even drink coffee together outside, are condemned to loneliness. Wallace also exhibits her characters' resistance using sexual preference. At the beginning of the play, Jamie and Dee are heterosexual. They briefly have boyfriends. Yet, their relationship is not what they imagine, and moreover their boyfriends do not request meeting up a second time. Once more, Wallace uncovers the prisoners are obliged to live alone. However, when they perceive that they are happy together and cannot resist power, they also prefer each other sexually (Wallace, 2011: 81). Thusly, towards the end of the play, they put up resistance to power in their way that only allow heterosexuality in the name of the protection of society. In a sense, Dee and Jamie both acknowledge being 'abnormal' and deem that the world they live in is not for them. Dee tries to convince Jamie to seek a happier world: "Dee… There's no cold 'cause winter forgot what cold was. And no wind 'cause it's laid down to sleep. Where there's no being hungry and the dark is just something easy you can shake from your hair. That world is ours" (Wallace, 2011: 75).

Towards the end of the play, Wallace combines the final scenes: scene eleven which belongs to the present time, and scene twelve that Young Jamie and Young Dee act. Dee and Jamie stab each other with a knife that Dee had stolen. Meanwhile, Young Jamie and Young Dee promise to never leave each other. They who cannot bear being 'abnormal', exploiting their bodies and the strength of power in the world they live in, find a solution in suicide. Thereby, Wallace puts forth that Dee and Jamie's aspirations for freedom and their resistance have no chance against the functioning of power. Bigsby is of the belief that "their mutual deaths are finally the only way they can stay together, command their own fate, the only freedom available" (Bigsby, 2018: 215). On the other hand, it is controversial how suicide is analytical; however, for Jamie and Dee, this means a kind of resistance and freedom that does not contribute to the functioning of power.

Conclusion

As a political writer, Wallace, "writes about power in its various guises while rejecting the notion that the political excludes an interest I the individual, in the private passions and needs of those who function within a world they do not command" (Bigsby, 2017:196). As in her other works, Wallace reflects the politics of the time using lower class characters in *And I and Silence,* whereby she heightens her spectators' awareness by rolling present and past time combination in order to make them comprehend the importance of the concept of time. In doing this, she draws from a realistic framework in order to criticize the politics of the time.

In choosing the character of Jamie from Jamaica as well as the American Dee, Wallace explicitly puts forward the functioning of disciplinary power by impanting question marks in the minds of her audience. The protagonists are sentenced to nine years in prison for their crimes. Jamie literally represents the docile body that succumbs to the strength of power. Dee screams at night, runs into Jamie's cell and makes the guard urinate. Dee's small resistances do nothing but strengthen the functioning of disciplinary power. Wallace reveals that his prison life has made no contribution to the prisoner except to learn to submit. According to Foucault, the fact that the subject feels he is under constant supervision shows the perfection of the functioning of power (1995: 2001). Wallace's characters also consider they are constantly being observed so that Wallace reveals the panoptic effect of power on subjects.

Jamie and Dee have the same dreams to fulfil after being free. When they think they are free, they keep a small house and start working as a cleaner. Foucault argues that the concepts of freedom and resistance are necessary for power to properly function (2003: 283). However, being outside the prison and working towards their dreams does not mean that Jamie and Dee are, in fact, free. The characters are happy when they spend time at home with each other, and yet have difficulty gaining acceptance from the community after they leave of prison, because the power system excludes the 'abnormal' in order to preserve the normal order of society. Both Dee and Jamie struggle for finding employment and are exposed to sexual harassment. Wallace ingeniously confronts the audience with the conflicts that the subjects face with the society. Like Foucault, Wallace explicitly reveals that the concepts of freedom and resistance are intertwined and are an integral part of power. Wallace reveals that imprisonment does not correct the prisoner, but rather makes the psychology of the detainee more deteriorated. Hence, Dee and Jamie, who towards the end of the play cannot find a way out, commit suicide. Similar to Foucault, Wallace exposes the uselessness of the disciplinary power of the period by questioning how it functions. She defends that there is nowhere without power or power relations, and so the only way to get rid of power is to live in another world.

References

Adler, T., Cummings, ST, Achilles, J., Urban, K., Benesch, K., Vandenbroucke, R., ... Abbotson, S. (2013). *The Methuen Drama Guide to Contemporary American Playwrights* . A&C Black.

Bigsby, C. (2018). Twenty-First Century American Playwrights. Cambridge University Press.

Cummings, ST, & Abbitt, ES (2013). *The Theater of Naomi Wallace: Embodied Dialogues* . Springer.

Foucault, M. (2005). The order of Things: An archeology of the human sicences, Taylor & Francis, New York.

Foucault, M. (1980a). *Power / knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* . Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980b). The History of Sexuality. Volume one: An introduction.

Foucault, M. (1982). Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry, The University of Chicago Press* , Vol. 8, No. 4, 777-795.

Foucault, M. (1987). The interview with Michael Foucault on 20th January 1984.

Foucault, M. (1995). Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison. NY

Gardner, L. (2011). And I and Silence-review, The Guardian, 22 May 2011. https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2011/may/22/and-i-and-silence-review

Gornick, V. (1997). An Exile in America, New York Times, March 2, 1997. www.nytimes.com/1997/03/02/magazine/an-american-exile-in-america.html?pagewanted=all

Isherwood, C. (2014) Women in Prison: the new black ?. The New York Times. 25. https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/26/theater/and-i-and-silence-a-prison-drama-by-naomi-wallace.html