Largely in response to Foucault’s work on surveillance, literary and cultural historians of the early 1980s start revisiting the modern representations of “carcerality,” so much so that within years punishment as discipline gives rise to a whole discipline of punishment, imprisonment, and penal confinement. The discipline was not entirely new. Nor was it one but several rolled in one rather, and that was precisely what made it innovative, capable to take another look at an otherwise longstanding object of inquiry. In other words, the field was, and has remained, interdisciplinary. It is to this institutionally fluid, methodologically complex, and epistemologically demanding domain that Jan Alber’s *Narrating the Prison* belongs, lodged as it stands at the shifting crossroads of literary and film analysis, Victorian scholarship, sociology, legal studies, Frankfurt School-inspired critical theory, imagology, and narratology. I list the focus on imaginary and narrative structures last, but it certainly comes first and defines, I think, the bulk of Alber’s contribution to the study of carceral modernity in Dickens and later, twentieth-century British and American fiction and film.

Impressive as a whole, his toolkit is nevertheless employed selectively. Its use is characteristically geared toward uncovering a certain
ideology of literary form, where form is either a dominant figure, a particular configuration of recurrent tropes, or narrative strategy such as omniscience. The best discussions of things ideological, the most effective Kritik generally obtain, as far as I am concerned, on a bottom-up model that operates inductively by drawing on incidents of “style”—a recurring image or storytelling device—and working itself up into broader considerations that bring together the textual and the contextual. To be sure, this is precisely where the ideological plays out, where it comes into being and holds sway over our lives: not inherently “in” specific cultural forms and formations or completely outside them but on their outer edge, where they and their environment seem to dovetail naturally and, as a result, inquiry, questioning, and revaluation may appear superfluous.

In dwelling on modernity’s fictional production of “carceral topography,” as Monika Fludernik calls it, Narrating the Prison shows that closing out such deliberations is ideologically ambiguous at best in that it projects carcerality as a self-evident carce-reality whose social meanings and roles are in no need of public debate. This is exactly the kind of collective projection Dickens takes to task in Little Dorrit, A Tale of Two Cities, and Great Expectations. Oddly enough, his critique is perhaps more insistent than that of later writers such as Robert E. Burns (I Am a Fugitive from a Georgia Chain Gang, 1932), Thomas E. Gaddis (Birdman of Alcatraz, 1955), Anthony Burgess (A Clockwork Orange, 1962), Stephen King (“Rita Hayworth and Shawshank Redemption,” 1982), and Lorenzo Carcaterra (Sleepers, 1995), not to mention the directors who made movies (hence catered to larger audiences) based on these texts. In their works, Alber points out, a good deal of “naturalizing” cover-up goes on, that is to say, a whole constellation of prison tropes and narrative devices are deployed to the effect that prison stories end up corroborating a number of extant “certainties” about convicts, society, the judicial system, and the sociopolitical status quo such beliefs uphold.

It is only in his conclusion that the author tackles issues of literary history head-on, but the concern is in play throughout and asks repeatedly, directly and indirectly, what kind of critical narrative can
we put together if we zero in on prison literature with Victorians at one end and American pop culture masters at the other? What developments, literary and otherwise, do we register, what shifts do we notice in the artistic and, more broadly, social perception of disciplinary confinement? At last, given the strong imprint Dickens left on this perception—so strong that it has become virtually impossible to talk about modern incarceration without referring or alluding to Dickens—how can we evaluate his posthumousness, his critical-humanist legacy in this all-too-contested area? Narrating the Prison raises all these important questions, and the answers are both compelling and intriguing.

I will not spoil its readers the pleasure of discovering these answers for themselves as they work their way through Alber’s careful readings of novels, novellas, film, and nonfiction. “Close” as they necessarily are, showcasing some painstaking attention paid to detail, these readings are far from formalist. As noted earlier, they dwell on form to tease out its commitment to specific sociopolitical and ethical arrangements (or rearrangements). There is no question in my mind that both narrative studies and the New Historicism need this kind of approach, eclectic in the best sense, keen on stylistic details from narrative viewpoint to cinematic technique as much as on these details’ cultural and political inflections. Consistently applied across a century and a half of prison literature and film, this methodology fits its object like glove. It helps us see, for instance, how and why post-Dickensian representation of correctional landscapes gives way to an uncritical exceptionalism of sorts with the protagonist (such as Stephen King’s) set up as an “exception” to the grim rule of the prison and the imprisoned others. It is these others whom he must fight and thus prove himself as a man and as an “individual” in a racially and homosocially threatening environment that otherwise filters outside phobias associated with race, sexual choice, and class. Alber’s discussion of The Shawshank Redemption, which I have just outlined, is emblematic for how his analysis works to uncover a rather cynical or, as I say above, uncritical strain in recent carceral discourses that bespeaks the breakdown or shift of former prison-world-at-large homologies. While Dickens and other realists
fancied society itself as one big prison and the latter as a microcosm of the former, a significant number of authors and movie directors closer to our time appear to buy into the notion of prison as “social necessity” and violent arena that retroactively legitimates our apprehensions and further shores up “consensus” around the dominant correctional mindset. For sure, these are all controversial problems of urgent interest inside and outside the academy. *Narrating the Prison* deals with them systematically, without preconceptions. Thoroughly researched, the book sheds refreshing light on prison literature and film.

Professor Christian Moraru
University of North Carolina, Greensboro
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NARRATING THE PRISON
This book investigates the ways in which Charles Dickens’ mature fiction, prison novels of the twentieth century, and prison films narrate the prison. In other words, it looks at the depiction of British and American institutions that hold captives. Since most people lack first-hand experience of the prison and gain their ‘knowledge’ through indirect means, it is of primary importance to deal with fictional representations of the prison to get an understanding of how the prison has entered the cultural subconscious. For good or ill, prison narratives influence the cognitive categories of their recipients and thus the popular understanding of the prison.

This study looks at prison novels and films from four interrelated perspectives and addresses the ideological underpinnings of these prison narratives; the representation of the prison experience; the role of prison metaphors; and narratological questions concerning similarities, differences, and continuities between Dickens’ mature novels, twentieth-century fiction, and films.

This book deals with the ideological underpinnings of prison novels and films, i.e., the question of whether they generate cultural understandings of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the prison.
Prison narratives spread certain images of prisons and their inmates and these pictures always correlate with a certain type of ideology in the sense of James H. Kavanagh. Kavanagh argues that an ideology “has the function of producing an obvious ‘reality’ that social subjects can assume and accept, precisely as if it had not been socially produced and did not need to be ‘known’ at all” (311). Dickens’ mature fiction participates in a philanthropic discourse that constructs prisoners as the innocent victims of an evil society. Dickens represents the prison as an instrument of a fundamentally unjust society which is to be blamed for the existence of criminals. Twentieth-century novels and films, on the other hand, usually legitimize the prison as a social institution by arguing that irreclaimably depraved criminals exist and need to be punished. They participate in a conservative discourse of pro-prison propaganda that presents the prison as a societal necessity.

My investigation of the ideological underpinnings of prison narratives naturally also comprises an analysis of the ways in which novels and films narrate the prison experience. Since fictional prison narratives always transform and distort the actual prison experience, I pay particular attention to the ways in which novels and films depart from the experiential realities of prison life. In a second step, I interpret these narrations (or ‘misrepresentations’) against the foil of historical and criminological analyses of the prison experience in British and American prisons of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

While Dickens narrates the prison experience in terms of the unjust suffering of many idealized and sympathetic inmates, prison novels and films of the twentieth century tend to focus on one newcomer who is sent to prison because he committed a trivial crime and then suffers under a brutal system. And while they represent the fate of this ‘unique’ character as being terrible and unjust, the attitude toward the mass of ordinary prisoners is complicit with the common view that ‘real’ criminals have to be imprisoned. Prison narratives of the twentieth century only invite us to sympathize with the quasi-innocent prisoner-hero but do not allow us to empathize with the ‘deviant’ rest of the prison population and thus implicitly sanction the existence of prisons.
Furthermore, these delimitations are connected with other cultural delineations. The newcomer is typically a member of the white and heterosexual middle class, and has to go through a process of symbolic ‘feminization’ in prison that threatens his masculinity\(^2\) (violent and sadistic guards, ‘homosexual’ rapes, and time in the ‘hole’ normally play an important role). Also, twentieth-century narratives typically counter the ill-treatment of this prisoner-hero by means of his escape and restore his manliness and, by extension, the phallic power of the white middle class. Such narratives do not address the situation of the actual prison population in British and American prisons. Rather, they present us with stories about the unjust victimization of ‘innocent’ members of the white and heterosexual middle class, and they additionally code colored and homosexual inmates as ‘real’ criminals who belong where they are.

The ideological underpinnings of prison narratives also closely correlate with the use of prison metaphors and similes. I treat similes and metaphors as being more or less equivalent because I am concerned with the results of the mapping process. In both cases, the recipient starts to correlate aspects of the source and the target domain and creates a complex understanding of their conjunction to generate new meaning structures. Like Fludernik (“The Prison as World,” “Metaphorics”), I discriminate between three types of prison metaphors. First, metaphors of imprisonment (PRISON IS X) that describe the prison in terms of another domain of human experience usually play an important role with regard to the rendering of the prison experience. Second, the ‘prison-as-world’ simile operates by means of a homological structure between the prison and society and accentuates that certain attitudes or societal eccentricities are reproduced in prison. Third, proper prison metaphors (X IS PRISON) project the image of the prison onto domains outside a legal or penal context and are normally used to critique a certain segment of society.

Since my analyses of prison metaphors aim at semantic significance, they contribute to my investigation of ideological underpinnings. Dickens’ mature fiction focuses on ‘negative’ metaphors of imprisonment that describe the prison as a tomb, a cage, or in terms
of hell. By means of these metaphors, which highlight the inmates’ agony, Dickens condemns the prison system as such. Twentieth-century narratives, on the other hand, only critique discipline-based institutions but argue in favor of rehabilitative penal styles. More specifically, they describe the former by using ‘negative’ metaphors and the latter through positive ones that invite us to see the prison as a womb, a matrix of spiritual rebirth, a catalyst of intense friendship, or as an ‘academy.’ Furthermore, prison narratives of the twentieth century suggest that society needs such reformative prisons for colored and homosexual inmates, while members of the white and heterosexual middle class do not belong there.

Finally, since this study deals with the ways in which novels and films narrate the prison, I also address similarities, differences, and continuities between filmic and novelistic narration. With regard to the depiction of crucial features of the experience of imprisonment, the book wishes to gain an understanding of the possibilities of the media novel and film. Furthermore, Dickens’ mature fiction anticipates prison narratives of the twentieth century in a wide variety of ways. First, Dickens’ panoramic visions in the authorial novels Little Dorrit and A Tale of Two Cities foreshadow prison films of the twentieth century. Both Dickens’ novels and twentieth-century prison films correlate with a third-person perspective, extremely detailed descriptions of prison settings, and various attempts to simulate the inmates’ internal states through external details. Second, the embedded first-person confessions, letters and diaries in Little Dorrit and A Tale of Two Cities as well as the pseudo-autobiography Great Expectations, written immediately after A Tale of Two Cities, anticipate the increasingly narrower and internal visions of first-person prison novels in the twentieth century.

Since this study discusses prison novels and films, it makes sense to provide definitions of the prison novel and the prison film before moving on to a more specific account of the corpus. According to W.B. Carnochan, “literature of the prison includes, on the one hand, fictions written about prison experience and, on the other, writing of every sort by inmates” (“Literature” 431). Following this definition,
prison literature deals with the experience of imprisonment and its consequences. Indeed, this book concentrates on novels that centrally address the prison experience, i.e., the dynamic interrelationship between the prisoner and his surroundings, the prison world. More specifically, it focuses on narratives that deal with “the crucial position of the prison subject” as well as the subject’s resulting “identity crisis” (Fludernik “Carceral Topography” 46).

This takes me to a definition of the prison film. As Paul Mason has shown (“Screen Machine” 282), the prison film is not a proper genre like the western or the science fiction film. Following Mike Nellis (“British Prison Movies” 2), one may characterize prison films as fiction films which take the experience of imprisonment and its consequences as a primary theme, and which are usually (but not always) set in a penal institution. Hence, western films or science fiction movies may qualify as prison films if they centrally address the prison experience and/or its consequences.

Which prison novels and films serve as the book’s corpus? First of all, this study focuses on Dickens’ mature fiction because in novels like *Little Dorrit*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, and *Great Expectations*, prisons, prisoners, and prison metaphors are of paramount importance. Generally speaking, and in comparison with other nineteenth-century novels, it is in Dickens’ fiction that the prison figures most prominently. Charles Dickens’ father John Dickens was imprisoned for debt in the Marshalsea in 1824, and many of his books deal with the subject at length. But even without any knowledge of the biographical background, the dominance of the prison theme in Dickens’ work is obvious. The decision to concentrate on Dickens was also motivated by the lack of film adaptations of other nineteenth-century novels. Dickens’ novels, on the other hand, appear perennially attractive to filmmakers. According to Marsh, “more films have been made of works by Dickens than of any other author’s” (204).

In comparison with nineteenth-century texts, prison novels of the twentieth century focus much more extensively on inside views of prisoners. Many ‘newer’ prison novels are written from the perspective of an imprisoned first-person narrator and offer us access to the
narrator’s thoughts, feelings, and motivations. This book focuses on prison novels that have been read by a vast audience and have influenced the popular understanding of the prison. Therefore, the book’s corpus contains novels that may be classified as high literature but also works that may be categorized as popular literature.

Even though one cannot verify the influence of prison narratives on the citizen’s image of prisons as such, certain indications exist that suggest a link between the representation of prisons in certain narratives and the public idea of imprisonment. Sometimes one can be fairly certain that many recipients must have read or viewed a prison narrative. For instance, Mike Poole points out that serial publication ensured Dickens’ novels “a cultural currency greatly in excess of its merely literary reputation” (150). Indeed, when the publication of Dickens’ *Great Expectations* was halfway through its run in *All Year Round*, the magazine was selling approximately one thousand copies a week. This figure is significant because it represented many more copies than the daily circulation of the London *Times* (Carlisle “Critical” 445). Hence, the instalments of Dickens’ novels must have shaped the popular understanding of the prison in a significant way. Also, on the Internet Movie data base of the top 250 films of all times, female voters rate the film *The Shawshank Redemption* (1996) as the best (<http://www.imdb.com/chart/female>) and male voters as the second best film of all times (<http://www.imdb.com/chart/male>). One can conclude that a huge number of people have viewed this film and this must have influenced their perception of the prison as well. Furthermore, cases exist in which prison narratives actually caused social action. For example, the film *I Am a Fugitive from a Georgia Chain Gang!* played a central role in the campaign to abolish the chain gangs in the south of the US. Also, the novel *Birdman of Alcatraz* led to the formation of the Committee for Release of Robert F. Stroud. “Thousands of letters were written through the efforts of the committee’s bulletins, to President Eisenhower and other federal officials” (Gaddis *Birdman* 255). Such prison narratives are important because they clearly influenced the public’s perception.
In this context, it is perhaps worth noting that my corpus includes one famous and heavily fictionalized autobiography, namely Robert E. Burns’ *I Am a Fugitive from a Georgia Chain Gang!* This narrative is a classical prison autobiography and reads like a sensationalist novel. In contrast to Lejeune (1994), who argues that we can differentiate between novels and autobiographies on the basis of the so-called *pacte autobiographique*, this study assumes that an absolute separation between novels and autobiographies is impossible. The prison experience in autobiographies is always reinvented and fictionalized. Also, the fact that the magazine *Time* points out that Burns “admitted he had never been chained or whipped in Georgia” (qtd. in Campbell 17) even though he claims this in his narrative, justifies the treating of Burns’ text as a novel rather than an autobiography.

This book also focuses on prison films because today, most individuals gain their knowledge of prisons from films or television shows about them. The criminologists Wilson and O’Sullivan point out that they

[…]
cannot assume that the general public have more access to and interest in factual information about the nature of prison rather than its fictional representation. If anything, the reverse is likely to be true. Given this assumption, we need to consider the possibility that fictional representations of prison are an important source of these ideas and understandings. (14)

At the beginning of the research for this book, I viewed about one hundred prison films at the British Film Institute in London. The choice of movies focused on was then primarily based on their wider availability. Also, the films I discuss cover different decades ranging from the 1930s up until the 1990s.

Moreover, the desire to get a comprehensive picture of British and American prison institutions motivated the selection of narratives for my corpus. Hence, this book looks at narratives that represent British debtors’ prisons, penal colonies, convict prisons, and borstals but also at novels and films that narrate American reform schools as well as state and federal penitentiaries. For example, Dickens’ *Little Dorrit*
and Christine Edzard’s two-partite 1987 film adaptation are set at the Marshalsea debtors’ prison; Dickens’ *Great Expectations* and David Lean’s 1946 film adaptation deal with Newgate Prison, the hulks and penal colonies; the film *Wilde* narrates Oscar Wilde’s time in Victorian prisons; the novella “The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner” and its 1964 film version are set at an English borstal; and the novel *A Clockwork Orange* and its 1971 film adaptation deal with a futuristic British prison (including a special psychiatric unit). The American autobiography *I Am a Fugitive from a Georgia Chain Gang!* and the 1932 film version present us with a chain gang in the south of the US; the novella “Rita Hayworth and Shawshank Redemption” and the film version *The Shawshank Redemption* are set at the so-called Shawshank State Prison, while the movie *Down by Law* (1986) deals with the Orleans Parish Prison; the novel *Birdman of Alcatraz* and its 1962 film adaptation are set at the federal penitentiaries at Leavenworth and Alcatraz; and the novel *Sleepers* and its 1996 film version present us with the Wilkinson Home for Boys, a reform school in New York.

This takes me to prison narratives that I have excluded from the corpus. First, the book focuses on narratives that were produced after the ‘birth’ of the ‘new’ prison system at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Second, the book restricts itself to a discussion of narratives about male prisoners. This is so because the prison population in real and fictional prisons has been and still is predominantly male. Furthermore, an analysis of female inmates and prison narratives would yield a slightly different account of the experience of imprisonment than the one given in this study. For example, women may be forced to give birth in prison, and they may be shackled during their pregnancy, “during transport to a hospital, throughout labour, and again immediately after the child is born” (Schulz 33). This is of course a humiliating component of the prison experience men do not have to go through. In contrast to prison narratives about male prisoners, which frequently reproduce traditional masculinity (or tough-guy ideals), the deconstruction of gender roles appears to be one of the most central concerns of prison narratives about imprisoned women. For instance,
in women-in-prison (WIP) films, female prisoners like Marie Allen (Eleanor Parker) in *Caged* (1949) use the prison as a cultural space to subvert, and break out of, traditional gender roles. At the end of the film, Marie is unsuited to domestic life, symbolically throws her wedding ring away, and, accompanied by joyful jazz music, emerges from the prison door to become a self-determined and happy crook.

Surprisingly, even the many WIP films of the 1970s that shade off into sexploitation movies like *Caged Heat* (1974) question traditional gender roles by constructing a type of a female masculinity. With regard to such films, Judith Halberstam notes that “the scenes of rebellious women in prison films always allow for the possibility of an overt feminist message that involves both a critique of male-dominated society and some notion of female community” (201). Similarly, prison autobiographies by women—such as the anonymous *Female Convict* (1934) or Edna O’Brien’s *So I Went to Prison* (1938)—foreground community feeling among women and view imprisonment as the logical outcome of exploitation by men. Since WIP narratives focus on the exploitation of women by the patriarchal system or construct the prison as a counter-site that allows women to deconstruct traditional gender roles, they require a different analytical framework and call for a separate study (rather than a single section or an afterthought in a book about male prisoners).

What is new about the present study? While earlier studies of prison narratives focus on the dialectical relationship between physical incarceration and mental flight, more recent work concentrates on ideological questions from the perspective of Michel Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* (1975), and addresses the alleged importance of Jeremy Bentham’s plans for a *Panopticon* (1791). These newer studies link narrative structures (like authorial narration, first-person narratives or neutral filmic narration) to structural attributes of the penitentiary and/or the idea of panoptic vision. Thus, certain narratives are considered to be conservative and autocratic because their formal features are argued to reproduce the prison. And, by extension, these structures are supposed to infiltrate us with a pro-prison ideology.
This book investigates the ideological underpinnings of prison narratives as well. However, in contrast to critics like Seltzer, Bender, Miller, Hale, and Grass, I do not link these understandings of the prison to narrative structures but to the way in which prison novels and films as a whole narrate the prison. More specifically, I analyse the representation of the prison experience, i.e., the interaction between prisons and their inmates, and the use of prison metaphors. In order to determine whether prison narratives critique or buttress the prison, questions like the following will be addressed: Is the major protagonist a criminal or not? Is he likeable or not? How is the relationship between the major protagonist and the ‘rest’ of the prison population depicted? How is the interaction between prisoners and prison officers envisioned? Which prison metaphors are used?

This study also transcends the traditional Foucauldian or Panopticon-centered paradigm by demonstrating how narrations of imprisonment work in relation to the discursive delimitations of cultural categories like race and gender. More specifically, the book shows that in contrast to Dickens’ novels, most prison narratives of the twentieth century implicitly code colored and homosexual inmates as ‘real’ criminals. Hence, they sanction the existence of prisons because evil villains are argued to exist. In a second step, they also make relatively clear statements concerning the question of who belongs into prison and who does not. In other words, they do not only constitute a form of pro-prison propaganda. They additionally describe colored and homosexual prisoners as criminals, and are openly racist and homophobic systems of representation.

Since well-known prison novels and films are far more likely to be an important source of the public’s ideas about prisoners and prisons than government reports or campaigning documents, this book discusses fictional narratives that were read or viewed by a significant number of recipients. An investigation of the way in which they narrate the prison is necessary to demonstrate how prison novels and films construct popular ‘misunderstandings’ of the prison. The investigation of prison metaphors essentially follows the same purpose.
Introduction

By showing what associations the prison evokes and by illustrating what aspects of the prison are highlighted in prison metaphors, this study attempts to gain a deeper understanding of how the prison has entered the cultural subconscious. Furthermore, this study looks at metaphors that have so far been neglected by metaphor studies, namely cinematic (or film) metaphors. The book presents a new taxonomy of film metaphors, i.e., the various ways in which films may evoke metaphorical readings, and thus contributes to an area of film studies that is still largely under-researched.

Finally, it is worth noting that many scholars have already dealt with the proto-cinematic quality of Dickens’ novels. However, up until now no study has drawn the obvious thematic and stylistic link between Dickens’ prison novels and prison films of the twentieth century. This book shows how Dickens’ mature fiction anticipates the representation of prisons in twentieth-century novels and films.
ENDNOTES

1. It deals with Dickens’ *Little Dorrit* (1855–57); *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859); and *Great Expectations* (1860–61) as well as their film adaptations. The book also analyzes Robert E. Burns’ *I Am a Fugitive from a Georgia Chain Gang!* (1932); Thomas E. Gaddis’ *Birdman of Alcatraz* (1955); Alan Sillitoe’s “The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner” (1959); Anthony Burgess’ *A Clockwork Orange* (1962); Stephen King’s “Rita Hayworth and Shawshank Redemption” (1982); and Lorenzo Carcaterra’s *Sleepers* (1995) as well as their film versions. Finally, the book also looks at the films *Down by Law* (1986) and *Wilde* (1997).

2. Since it is certainly reductionist to speak of ‘masculinity’ in the singular, I wish to stress that various different forms of masculinity exist. Gender roles are never stable or fixed but hyper-legible and artificial. Traditional masculinity correlates with a clear preference for heterosexual practices (as opposed to homosexual ones) and sometimes even homophobia. Also, traditional manliness correlates with toughness as well as a stress on activity (as opposed to passivity) and dominance (as opposed to submission).

3. In authorial novels, the story is told by and presented from the perspective of an authorial or ‘omniscient’ narrator who is not present as a character in the story. An authorial narrator is typically overt, i.e., clearly recognisable as a speaker or writer (Stanzel *Theory*).

4. Other nineteenth-century novels that deal with imprisonment include Charles Reade’s *It Is Never Too Late to Mend* (1895), George Eliot’s *Adam Bede* (1859) and the so-called Newgate novels by Edward Bulwer Lytton (1803–73) and William Harrison Ainsworth (1805–82). Forms of metaphorical imprisonment can be found in Charlotte Brontë’s *Villette* (1853) and Wilkie Collins’ *Armadale* (1866).

5. See my list of British and American prison films in the bibliography.


7. Bentham envisioned the Panopticon as a circular prison with a central tower at the center, from which the inspectors can observe all cells located on the outer perimeter. Strategically positioned venetian
blinds on the central watchtower prevent the prisoners from observing the guards, while allowing the prison officers an unobstructed view of the prisoners. The idea behind this arrangement was to inculcate compliance, self-surveillance and self-control in the inmates by subjecting them to the fiction of permanent surveillance.