Why else would they readily subject themselves to the high degree of scrutiny and challenge that goes along with presenting oneself as an expert in the legal system (e.g., challenging cross-examination, withering criticism of peers consulting to the opposing side, and increased risk of ethical complaints)?” (Goldstein 2007, p. x).
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Michel Foucault (1926–1984) was one of the major thinkers of the twentieth century. He was born, educated, and lived in France. He held a chair at the prestigious Collège de France; he also taught at universities around the world, including the University of California at Berkeley.

Foucault was not a psychologist, but his formulations on such issues as discipline and the care of the self, as well as the emergence of psychology and the human sciences more generally, continue to possess great relevance for psychology. In addressing Foucault’s work, perhaps the best place to start is his Discipline and Punish (1975/1979). The book dealt with the emergence of the “disciplines” in the Western world from the seventeenth century on. The disciplines involved such practices and procedures as fixing in place and confining, observation and surveillance, training and exercise, judging and classifying according to norms (“normalization”), and examination. The disciplines avoided violent methods and public displays. They were geared toward enhancing and guiding human capacities, aptitudes, and energies, not repressing them. Nevertheless, the disciplines deployed power over the individual in order to enhance the utility and docility of the individual for institutions such as prisons, hospitals, factories, schools, and the military, and for society more generally. The disciplines were thus applied to the bodies of prisoners, students, patients in hospitals, inmates in madhouses, workers, and others – but the effects of the disciplines also produced certain forms of selfhood “within” these individuals. Indeed, Foucault described his book as “a correlative history of the modern soul and of a new power to judge” (p. 23).

The schools provide a good example of how discipline produced effects of selfhood within the individual, effects that simultaneously tended to homogenize and to differentiate individuals. Thus, in the schools, students were observed, examined, compared, and categorized with regard to norms of behavior and performance. In this process, the individual student was both pressured to conform to standardized norms, and thus in a sense homogenized with respect to his or her schoolmates, while, at the same time, the student developed a differentiated sense of self – as, for example, being an industrious, well-behaved, superior student, or a lazy, misbehaved, mediocre student.

The emergence of psychology and the other human sciences was closely connected to the deployment of the disciplines and their production of selfhood, especially from the eighteenth century onward. Prisoners, students, workers, the “insane,” and others were subjected to hierarchical observation within their respective institutional contexts; their behaviors, the results of examinations conducted on them, and so on were recorded, compiled, and classified; and the resulting records and case files were examined and compared. According to Foucault, it was precisely from such “ignoble” procedures that human sciences such as criminology, educational psychology, psychiatry, and industrial psychology originated. Foucault used the term “power-knowledge” to designate the complex of technologies of power and forms of knowledge that
emerged in the West. The term aptly indicated the manner in which disciplinary power and the human sciences interacted with each other, mutually reinforcing each other in their development during the modern era.

With the publication of the introductory volume of *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault (1976/1978) supplemented his treatment of discipline with the notion of “biopower.” According to Foucault, biopower came to combine disciplinary techniques with the regulation of the population. The disciplines were thus incorporated within biopolitical strategies directed at enhancing the health and welfare of the population while simultaneously managing the population. As the “pivot” that connected the discipline of the individual’s body with the enhancement and management of the population, sexuality played an important role in the rise of biopower. Moreover, it assumed a special significance for the modern sense of selfhood. Arguing against the “repressive hypothesis,” Foucault thus claimed that in the modern Western world, sexuality had, by the nineteenth century, come to be elicited, observed, and disciplined – while individuals had come by then to see sexuality as the key to the inner truth of their psyches.

In his later work, Foucault (2003a, b) elaborated on what he called the “technologies of the self.” According to Foucault, the ancient Greeks and Romans were concerned not primarily with knowing the self in the modern sense, but with the care of the self. For the ancients, the care of self involved a kind of esthetic self-fashioning: that is, they focused on the art of living – which involved mastering themselves and their passions, avoiding excess, and, at least during the era of the *polis*, caring for their fellow citizens – in order to live in an ethical manner. To be sure, during the Hellenistic and Roman eras, the emphasis shifted toward detailed self-examination, but the concern with the art of living remained. In the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., however, the Christians formulated and implemented a very different mode of the care of self. Stressing purification and self-renunciation, they turned inward, searching the deepest recesses of their souls for forbidden desires. According to Foucault, Christianity thus initiated the Western project of subjecting the self to constant scrutiny in order to decipher its hidden truth. The implications of these developments for the history of Western civilization were great: the emergence of the modern self, with its unceasing hermeneutic quest for meaning within the psyche, and the emergence of the modern human sciences, especially psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and related fields, came to be inextricably intertwined in the West during the modern era.

As suggested above, Foucault’s work is valuable both for providing an understanding of the historical context for the emergence of psychology and for the critical examination of the practices that came to be associated with this field. In addition to his own writings, those interested in exploring Foucault’s critical approach to psychology and its history will find the work of Nikolas Rose instructive. Rose has done extensive work on the rise of the “psy” disciplines, as he has put it. See especially his *Inventing Our Selves* (Rose 1998).
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