

“Seeing and Being Seen”: Analysis of Foucault’s View of Power Gaze

Lefei Han

School of Liberal Arts, Shandong University, Jinan, China

2508787627@qq.com

Abstract. In Foucault’s academic pedigree, gaze, as a visual tool, helps to build a power-knowledge network and promote dynamic power. The power mechanism system of modern society is Foucault’s focus: crazy people are regarded as the existence opposite to “rational people” by psychiatric diagnosis and treatment, which tries to standardize their behavior through the “medical gaze”. Panoramic open prison controls prisoners’ behaviors through invisible gaze and trains prisoners as a link to improve power reproduction. Such a gaze mode has become a universal operation mechanism in modern society. Foucault then applied gaze power to the field of painting art, which reveals a picture in the power network, that is, the traditional gaze mode of “seeing and being seen” between the viewer and the picture can be subverted through the ingenious arrangement of plane composition, light, and viewer position. In his later years, Foucault analyzed the possibility of modern people resisting the power gaze and proposed to purify their spiritual realm under the existing system by “free practice” such as criticism and self-care.

Keywords: Power Gaze; Foucault; Social Discipline; Seeing and Being Seen; Free Practice.

1. Introduction

With the semantic connotation of “watching for a long time”, gazing and its related research on literary theory originated in art criticism. In the Western 20th-century literary theories, Sartre and Lacan extended the academic context of gaze theory from the perspective of philosophical and cultural studies. Based on the two studies, Foucault regarded the gaze as a way of watching with a will to power, which provides the viewer with the power to possess and control the viewee in a peeping manner. In other words, gaze highlights the inequality in psychological relationships, that is, the gazer is superior to the person that is gazed at, thus founding the power gaze.

In the power relationship shaped by “seeing and being seen”, the viewer masters the power, realizing the subjectivity of “seeing” in the name of rationality, while the party of “being seen” is reduced to the “other” opposite to the viewer. Therefore, what is hidden behind the eyes is the social construction of power, desire, self, and the other. The construction of this relationship is often linked with political and social status, which forms various expressions of power relations unequal in essence. For example, the rich gaze at the poor, the white gaze at the black, the man gaze at the woman, and the West gaze at the East. The intention of gaze theory is to present the complex and pluralistic social and political relations produced by the behavior of “seeing”.

As a further pioneer of gaze theory, French philosopher Michel Foucault paid close attention to the influence of cultural context on gaze mechanism in modern society. In terms of functional tools, “knowledge” becomes the accomplice of power operation, which promotes the viewed party to accelerate the dissolution of subjectivity. In terms of action mechanism, the discipline institutions represented by panoramic open prison have formed the power network in modern society, which enables everyone to be “seen”, constructs themselves under the requirements of discipline power, and then unconsciously boosts the power reproduction.

However, both the universal applicability of gaze theory and the richness of Foucault’s fields determine the pluralistic attributes of “seeing and being seen”. The gaze mechanism can be used not only in sociological people-related research, but also in the perspective of investigating the human-

art relationship. There is no doubt that Foucault did not merely analyze the mechanism of gaze power, but focused on how to resist gaze in his research in his later years. Although he was pessimistic that subjectivity can not escape the fate of being gazed at and objectified, he also struggled to explore the path of resistance and regarded self-care as the ultimate way to keep the true self, thus paving an ideal way for human beings to unshackle the gaze.

2. “Eyes of Power”—Gaze under the Power Mechanism of Modern Society

“Power” is a heart-like existence to Foucault, while “eyes” to power are capillaries leading to the heart. The sophisticated visual gaze builds a power network and contains the whole social relations, which is “the Empire of the Gaze” constructed by Foucault. From this perspective, vision, as a key perceptual practice, is intertwined with many social factors and forces such as knowledge and power. “Seeing and being seen”, the dialectical relationship between subject and object, has become the initial topic of Foucault’s power research as the core concept. In *Madness and Civilization, The Birth of Clinical Medicine, Discipline and Punish*, Foucault examined how to promote dynamic power together with knowledge in the entanglement of knowledge and power from the perspective of modern social power institutions such as mental hospitals and panoramic open prisons.

2.1. Psychiatric Diagnosis and Treatment: Medical Gaze

Madness and Civilization puts the gaze of rights on crazy people (i.e. mental patients) and so-called normal people. From the perspective of knowledge archaeology, the historical changes in the social treatment of crazy people are investigated, which deduces the illusion that the concept of modern social power “standardizes” mental patients by moral meaning.

Foucault first traced back to madness in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. As an alien in the human world, those crazy were permanently exiled in a ship of fools, looking for truth and hometowns in the vast sea. However, madness at this time was regarded as another mode of human existence. Even if it was despised and hated, it still remained a valuable challenge to reason, revealing the fields that occupy human true knowledge and are unknown by reason. Until the 17th century, the confinement center became the common destination of the crazy, the poor, the prisoners, and the unemployed. Foucault believed that isolating the sick had the function of “public security”. “The so-called public security is the sum of the means that make all those who cannot survive without work can and must work”. In other words, crazy people move from wandering at sea to public security management featuring confinement, but they still exist in opposition to “the rational”, and even become the gaze object of so-called rational people under their curiosity. It is worth noting that confinement is not aimed at treating madness without medical attributes. Through moral and labor influence, a myth that integrates crazy people into a happy society is woven, so as to encourage them to contribute to national prosperity, which is the political intention of rulers to implement confinement.

The confinement center has deemed madness as “irrational” and the mental hospitals that undertake the medical treatment are advocated on this basis. The formal formation of mental hospitals in the 20th century means that madness has been completely alienated and regarded as an “abnormal” physiological state. Here, doctors, as a symbol of rationality and morality, become the authority of mental hospitals with absolute gaze power for mental patients. This “medical gaze” has the moral foundation of medical diagnosis and treatment, which seems so reasonable. Doctors, as the main body of gaze, observe and treat madness symptoms with a commanding attitude to make patients regain their rationality. Crazy characteristics of purely objectified psychotic patients are infinitely enlarged and even become synonymous with physiological diseases. Foucault’s anger is aimed at the mad view that does not recognize any other meaningful practices besides conventional standards and defines all views and behaviors deviating from these standards as off-track. This is quite different from the madness in the Middle Ages and Renaissance in terms of value attributes. As for Foucault, madness is a meaningful challenge to the rational state, so he mocked the sanatorium conceived by Tuke and Pinel.

Freeing the crazy from bondage and physical abuse, the “sanatorium” put them in a quiet environment and strictly monitored any deviation from the norm. The treatment is to make the mad “feel morally responsible for anything in himself that might affect ethics or interfere with society, and that only himself is responsible”.

This paper explains a moral paradox in the state of gaze. Doctors’ one-way gaze to patients is conducted in the name of taming madness and curing diseases. In the self-supervision and judgment caused by others’ gaze, crazy people are accompanied by spiritual bondage and loss of subjectivity. Therefore, this modern power corrects people’s brutal confinement and physical control of madness in classical times under the mask of kindness and humanity, and “replaces the wanton terror of madness with the pain of overwhelming responsibility”. Thus, through the one-way nursing relationship, the gap between the healer and the crazy is deepening day by day, and the possibility of dialogue is completely diminished. The crazy person can only recognize his object status and linger under the gaze of normal people.

During the generation of gaze power, “knowledge”, as a reliable barrier, not only provides the rationality of gaze, but also ensures the renewability of power. In the taming of madness by psychiatry, “knowledge” has two connotations. One refers to the social convention constructed by rational thinking, which treats all irrational abnormal behaviors, and the resulting psychiatry is an order with academic standardization and knowledge truth. The other is the knowledge attribute of the medical gaze itself. In medical diagnosis and treatment, the medical theoretical knowledge of doctors is the prerequisite for monitoring and controlling crazy people. On this basis, “patients become the object of clinical medical investigation and the object of medical gaze with power-knowledge coding.” Therefore, knowledge provides rationality for the power gaze. In addition, knowledge guarantees the dynamic production of power. In the process of being monitored and regulated, crazy people gradually lose their subjectivity and become the product of a “successful” transformation of the disciplined power. “Knowledge”, which is recognized by the public, is invisibly rooted in the crazy people, thus making them regulate their actions with knowledge and become one of the links of power reproduction.

2.2. Panoramic Open Prison: Invisible Surveillance

When psychiatric hospitals and the medical gaze extended to the social field, the management paradigm of Western capitalist society has been constituted. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault elaborated on the gaze operation mechanism in detail and found a typical case of power deployment panopticon designed by Bentham.

Foucault said that Bentham described the panoramic open prison as a circular building. Its interior consists of a circle of small cells, with each containing an inward iron grille door and two windows, one of which faces the outside, where sunlight can shine, and the other faces the watchtower, where supervisors can monitor the daily situation of prisoners through light. Meanwhile, there is a multi-storey tower in the building center, which has a circular window to facilitate the supervision of prisoners. In history, from the guillotine to the dungeon to prison and then to this panoramic open prison, the punishment measures tend to be mild. However, under its humanitarian cloak, there is a frightening gaze power. Firstly, it is the opposition between “visibility” and “invisibility”. The lights in the tower and the natural light through the cell window ensure the visibility of the prisoners in the cell, but the monitors are invisible to the prisoners. Facing the hidden monitors, prisoners don't know where the “gaze” comes from or whether they are in the “gaze”. This relationship of being gazed “automatically produces a real conquest” to ensure that the gaze power continues and effectively maintains the natural function of the prison. Secondly, it is the trap of “tyranny” and “gentleness”. Different from the violent and oppressive nature of traditional surveillance, as for this panoramic open prison, “the publicity about punishment should not have the effect of physical terror but open a book for people to read.” In other words, restrained and gentle soft violence replaces tyranny and blood, which restraints the soul of the gazed.

In the process of “seeing and being seen”, the gaze is not only to spread power, but also to produce knowledge. The gaze of others for prisoners is transformed into the gaze of prisoners themselves under invisible anxiety. Therefore, people will transform their pressure into their supervision, thus realizing self-detention. Self-regulation just serves the knowledge-power system, that is, through the monitoring, manipulation, and even transformation of prisoners, “transform their bodies into ‘reasonable’ ones that are beneficial to the development of social production”. That is to say, gaze, as a lasting and insightful power production, can optimize prisoners’ behavior with positive significance. On this basis, Foucault deduced and thought that panoramic open prison “should be a laboratory... (it) can be regarded as an institution for experimenting, changing behavior, training and correcting individuals”. Namely, this kind of behavior that makes the viewer useful and effective means the invisible gaze can be a link to promote power reproduction. As Wang Min’an said, “This is the operation direction of capitalist power: discipline is carried out towards the production to strengthen social forces. Increase production, develop the economy, spread education, and improve public moral standards.”

It is because of the gaze that the viewee constantly develops towards the “good” aspect required by society. This gaze mechanism of panoramic open prison has been extended to all aspects of social life as a condensed metaphor of a disciplined society. The punitive nature of prison slowly degenerates, while its discipline remains and exists in hospitals, factories, schools, and other social institutions, which has become a universal operating mechanism in modern society. In the gaze, “eyes” can be tangible human eyes, monitoring, or intangible existence. For example, everyone has a file to record his life history. Although there is no concrete other to regulate personal actions, the existence of the file makes individuals regulate their behavior, which is the manipulation of the invisible eye. It can be seen that “eyes”, as a dominant tool, gaze at every individual in the relationship networks and urge them to produce a standardized self under the convention.

3. “Relative View of Painting”—Power Gaze Towards Artistic Elucidation

The power gaze put forward by Foucault is not limited to societal discipline. He applies the subject-object relationship of “seeing and being seen” to the painting art, so as to build a picture in the power network. Foucault, based on the power contest between the object of painting and the subject of the viewer, subverted the traditional man-painting relationship featuring that “viewer gazes at the painting”, revealing the state of “being seen” for the viewer in the aesthetic process.

The relative relationship between “seeing and being seen” is explained by Foucault. In the traditional mode of thinking, the gaze often comes from the viewer to the painting, which embodies unidirectional aesthetics. Breaking this single interpretation mode, Foucault applied power to the aesthetic process and highlighted the uncertainty and relativity of the gaze itself. As mentioned above, the prisoners in the panoramic open prison are under invisible surveillance all the time, but they cannot see the monitor themselves. Similarly, the viewer fails to get a glimpse of the whole picture, and the characters in the painting have the power to clearly capture the dynamics of the viewer. Therefore, the painting is invisible to the viewer and the viewer becomes the gaze object of the painting.

This reversal of gaze can be demonstrated by Foucault’s interpretation of Velasquez’s *Las Meninas* (see Figure 1), which hosts many things about seeing and being seen. The painter dressed in black holds a brush and gazes at something. What is he gazing at? At first glance, it seems to be looking at the viewer outside the painting. However, when the perspective is changed, the viewer is also gazing at the painter on the canvas. That is to say, there is an eye interaction between the viewer and the painter, a mutual gaze, and endless eye contact. After careful observation, the painter may be staring at the model who is not in the picture. Besides, the reflection in the mirror tells the model implicitly. According to historical textual research, the characters in the mirror are kings and queens. In addition, the object of the princess’ gaze, that of the black man when turning back, and that of the maid’s gaze

all seem to be vague. Moreover, the three pairs of “seeing and being seen” composed of the king and his wife, painters, and viewers are the central links of the gaze.

The eye contact between the viewer and the painter constitutes the first pair of gaze relations. Because the painter’s line of sight is projected on an invisible point, we cannot determine whether this point is the position where the king and his wife are or the place where the viewer may reach in the process of flow. Therefore, the traditional mode of “seeing and being seen” has been subverted and the viewer has a panoramic view of the characters in the painting, but the viewer cannot be sure that the people in the painting can see, which confuses the relationship between subject and object. The second and third pairs are the painter’s gaze at the king and his wife and the latter’s gaze at all persons in the place, which involves the power center of the picture. Foucault believed that the power center of the whole picture focuses on the king and his wife who are not present, rather than the little princess who seems to be at the painting center. If the situation in the painting is presented in three dimensions, it is not difficult to find that the king and his wife are in the center of this room. “Through this mirror, the king becomes omnipresent: all characters in the picture look at the king who looks at all people present in his summer palace office and at you in the picture background”. Although the king and queen are in the farthest and most vague invisible place, they still rule over all people. Foucault “metaphorically points to the subject who appears as nothing in the modern cognitive type”. In other words, the real dominant subject may be in a secret corner, but the concealment of the “entity” does not mean the absence of power gaze, which echos Foucault’s view of social statute power. The subject of human boasting power is just a small brick in the block world. The real master is hidden in an invisible place and the “eyes outside the painting” may be watching you. For the so-called aesthetic subject-the viewer, we may not be able to capture the existence of the real core, fail to determine our position, and the power we control is a perishable bubble. When depriving the self-subjectivity, the relationship between seeing and being seen is reversed, which is the operation of gaze.



Figure 1. Las Meninas

In the uncertain gaze of subject and object, plane composition, light, and viewer’s position are potential variables, which make the relationship between “seeing and being seen” more mysterious and unpredictable.

With the help of “the temptation of invisible objects”, the plane composition of paintings makes the viewer lose the initiative of subjectivity and gaze. In the painting *Railway* (see Figure 2), the woman looks at the viewer, while the little girl turns her back to the viewer. The viewer cannot see what the woman sees and the little girl’s sight is hidden in the fog, so we fail to see it clearly. This front-back method presents the two-dimensional flat characteristics of the picture to the viewer. Besides, “it seems to force the viewer to flip the canvas and change the position”. The limitation of plane composition enables the viewer who originally had active power unable to control the whole picture, which changes the original power dominance relationship.



Figure 2. Railway

In addition, Foucault exposed the “light game” used by painters, that is, invisible light outside the painting. As for traditional painting, the light in the painting should come from the inside of the picture, which is the light of the reproduced scene that has nothing to do with the external real light. Then, the source of this light should be a corner of the picture, which usually flows in through the window and illuminates the scene in the painting with shadows to imitate the real light and shadow in nature. However, Manet emphasized the real light outside the painting. In the *Fifer* (see Figure 3), Instead of adopting the traditional way that uses side light to highlight the three-dimensional effect, Manet allowed the positive light directly on the hand, face, and body of the boy, thus reducing the change of light and shade to weaken the three-dimensional effect. Although there are still projections in some places, on the whole, the image of teenagers depicted by pure colors is quite flat, which was even called “playing cards” by Daumier. However, where does this uniform light come from? Foucault believed that it comes from the viewer’s eyes. Reminiscent of his description of panoramic open prison, the prisoner’s cell is the place where the light source is produced, while the watchtower is dark. In the aesthetic field, the light source comes from the viewer’s eyes, which means that the viewer moved by light is in the prisoner’s position and exists as “being seen”, while the situation in the painting is protected by darkness. As a result, the power gaze relationship of “seeing and being seen” has been misplaced and inverted.



Figure 3. Fifer

Finally, Foucault analyzed the rejection of the viewer’s stable and definite position in Manet’s paintings. In *A Bar at Folies* (see Figure 4), the mirror behind the barmaid interferes with the position relationship of the characters. There is a paradox between the viewer’s direct observation and the scene reflected by the mirror: if you stand in front of the painting and look directly at it, no one is in front of the waitress; otherwise, she will be blocked. However, if you look at the image reflected in the mirror, it is not difficult to find that a man is close to her in front of the waitress. Therefore, from what angle should we look at this painting? What is the position relationship among the waitress, man, and viewer? To find out the truth, we need the viewer to change his position and analyze and judge from different perspectives. He can either look directly at the picture (when looking at the front portrait of the waitress) or turn and squint at the picture (when looking at the back and mirror image of the woman). Besides, he is assigned to different positions to see and rotated his position as the changing waitress and her mirror image. Because of the uncertainty of their position, the viewer cannot determine the gaze of the characters in the painting, which leads to the viewer’s anxiety. Connecting with the panoramic open prison, the viewpoint in the picture becomes the watchtower and the viewer cannot determine the relative position of the watchman. “The relationship between

the viewer and the character is reversed. The viewer becomes the watched, and the character becomes the viewer. It is the person's eyes on the viewer that determine the viewer's position". In addition, Foucault also explained the structure of the power gaze. In the traditional concept of power, power seems to be the focus of light gathering, with the implementation of monarchical power as its typical example. For instance, the king and queen in *Las Meninas* symbolize a single power center. According to Foucault, power often presents a pyramid structure, but it is not a "source" or "principle" for generating power. In other words, the power gaze is not an authoritative gaze from top to bottom, but in a mutual relationship such as the interaction between the viewer and the waitress, which has a two-way nature.



Figure 4. A Bar at Folies

It should not be overlooked that building a platform for power gaze in art is not a compulsory interpretation of art socialization for Foucault. The author thinks that in addition to Foucault's exploration of the "visible and invisible" and "power subject" of painting art in *The Order of Things* and *The Picture of Manet*, his analysis of composition, light, and viewer position aims to find a discourse about art. He should put painting analysis in the knowledge construction and turn the spatial representation of painting into a typical illustration of a new knowledge form. Foucault himself called it the practice of "cognition" and "aesthetics". Therefore, his examination of artistic paintings based on the concept of power gaze is not a mechanically copied social discipline but has its uniqueness in aesthetics and knowledge.

4. "Free Practice"—How to Get Out of the Vicious Cycle of Being Gazed?

Gazing under social discipline intertwines power with knowledge inseparably, such as everyone is watched in a panoramic open prison. Modern people live in this "thoroughly mobile distrust mechanism" and are gradually objectified. The gaze in art painting also reverses the relationship between "seeing and being seen" between subject and object, and the viewer loses control of the picture and becomes the object dominated by the painting. So, why do we resist this oppressive and uncertain power gaze? How can self-subjectivity escape objectification and realize self-construction? This is Foucault's thinking in his later years, which is also a beneficial exploration for contemporary people to get out of the vicious cycle of being gazed at and realize their self-care.

However, Foucault believed that intentional resistance to the gaze of external power is invalid, and even resistance itself must be understood as a manifestation of power. Thus, the resisters are always in the vicious cycle of being gazed at. The *History of Sexuality (Volume I)* is illustrated by Foucault with the typical case of homosexuality.

Undoubtedly, in psychiatry, jurisprudence, and literature in the 19th century, a series of discourses about homosexuality, sexual perversion, sodomy, "psychological intersex", and its variants...appeared. It may also form a kind of "reverse" that homosexuality began to use the vocabulary and category medically belittled to talk about themselves, asking people to recognize its legitimacy or "naturalness".

As Foucault said, under the power gaze, the gay group created words such as "gay bar" and "gay pride" to resist the conventional gaze. However, this resistance made the power gaze "intensify" by emphasizing the particularity of the "gay". It can be seen that initiative is the ability of a person to

act for his interests based on his beliefs and desires. However, if these beliefs and desires are also the product of the power that one wants to resist, then the initiative to resist the power gaze is illusory. According to Linda Alkov, “Foucault degraded subjectivity to an analytical position inferior to power, which will bring a concept of subjectivity without initiative... In the absence of initiative... resistance to domination is impossible.” In addition to this objective obstacle, the uncertainty of sending a power gaze also increases the difficulty of resistance. Foucault believed that the modern power system is as fine as “capillaries”, breaking the previous dualistic power system, that is, the viewer “at the top of the pyramid” gazes at the lower viewees. Therefore, we cannot determine the clear gaze subject, let alone what kind of gaze structure we are in, so we fail to know how to act or who to resist.

If it is not easy to resist or even eliminate the fine and deep mechanism of power gaze, will we eventually escape the fate of being objectified? Foucault is not a pessimist. On the contrary, Foucault opened up a space for creative resistance behavior called “free practice” by wedging a gap between the power relationship and domination relationship. That is to say, Foucault did not try to eliminate the power gaze but thought under the existing system: how to find the direction under the background characterized by gaze to expand the field of possible action plans and thinking modes. This exploration is not intended to avoid or get rid of the power gaze, but to survive in the existing gaze in a more comfortable way.

In the free practice, “criticism” can keep our spirit of doubt, instead of being influenced by the gaze of external power or being forced to become “accomplices” of power production, thus avoiding the vicious cycle of being gazed at. Foucault held that criticism “gives the subject the right to question the power effect of truth and the truth discourse of power”. Critical behavior can be reflected in every aspect of daily life. For example, when “taking thinness as beauty” becomes a social power gaze at individuals, the endlessly detailed narration of body weight, fat distribution, cholesterol level, calorie consumption, exercise habits, etc. become the object of attention under this power gaze. While we are not completely free from the power gaze, we are not simply influenced by the gaze of the outside world. We do not have to reproduce the mainstream “gaze standard” in our society uncritically, instead, we should eat and exercise normally and not pay too much attention to the external evaluation of fatness and thinness... Apart from being dominated by external power gaze, there are many options to choose from, so we are not only constructed, but also self-constructed. These critical self-reflective traits endow individuals with liberating potential.

Besides criticism, self-care is also the essence of “free practice”. Foucault believed that modern society especially emphasizes culture and rationality, which leads individuals to bring themselves into the norms and systems created by society. Therefore, with the development of culture, people gaze at and supervise each other more closely, and people gradually become the subject of restraint. In this regard, Foucault compared modern society with ancient Greece and Rome. As for ancient Greece and Rome, culture was not used to force and restrain themselves, but to make themselves more comfortable to meet pleasure requirements and to summarize and promote pleasure experience. In other words, culture was not a tool for people to gaze at power, but to better realize their self-care.

So, how to realize this self-care? According to Foucault, the practice of self-care “is not an individual invention. These practices are patterns discovered by individuals from their culture, and are advocated, implied, and imposed on them by the culture, society, and social groups in which individuals live.” In other words, self-care is generated in the power gaze structure. With the help of model judgment and technology provided by the outside world, people can acquire and freely create a personal temperament, which is reflected by their behavior and lifestyle.

Caring for yourself means turning inward from the perspective of gaze. Through this gaze form, people will transform from watching the outside world and others into watching themselves, thus realizing self-education, correction, and liberation. Therefore, self-care is a way to ask and reflect on one’s inner world. Because of the gaze transformation from outside to inside, people can monitor and supervise their ideological process. In this sense, self-care is a process of self-meditation. People find

behaviors that conform to their values through thinking, so as to purify and transform themselves and improve the quality, character, style, presentation form, and realm of their spiritual life.

5. Conclusion

Under the power regulations, Foucault's gaze view may be so pessimistic and output visual anxiety. The whole society is like a huge panoramic prison, and art viewing loses its aesthetic brilliance because of the difficulty in determining the power relationship between subject and object. However, it is because Foucault exposed the hidden gaze mechanism of modern society to us that we will try to reflect on whether we participated in the power production unconsciously and whether we became an accomplice of power, and then explore ways to resist gaze. The way out of the vicious cycle of power gaze is bound to be thorny. Foucault's self-care practice promotes the inward turn of human thinking mode, which is inevitably utopian to a certain extent, but its concern for self-inner emotional care has a significance that can not be ignored. In reality, there are pervasive monitoring systems, sports punch-in APPs, and weight loss softwares... How the viewer adjusts his vision and state, localizes the theoretical concepts produced in the Western context, and integrates them into the Chinese context to apply to practical life for self-use is also the direction of later research.

References

- [1] Wang, M. A. (2002). Power. *Foreign Literature*, (02), 81-89.
- [2] Gao, X. Y. (2005). Foucault's aesthetics of existence. Beijing: China Renmin University Press.
- [3] Gao, X. Y. (2005). The basic significance of Foucault's aesthetics of existence. *Journal of Tongji University (Social Science Edition)*, (01), 21-30.
- [4] Chen, R. (2006). Gaze. Zhao, Y. F. ed. *Keywords of western literary theory*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [5] Arasse, D. (2007). We see nothing--A different collection of painting descriptions. He, Q. trans. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- [6] Foucault, M. (2009). Discipline and punish. Liu, B. C. & Yang, Y. Y. trans. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company.
- [7] Foucault, M. (2000). The history of sexuality (Volume I). Yu, B. P. trans. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House.
- [8] Zhong, Y. B. (2010). Gaze: View of power. *Art Observation*, (06), 1.
- [9] Du, X. Z. (2011). Archaeology of "seeing" --On Foucault's 'La peinture de Manet'. *Literature & Art Studies*, (03), 129-138.
- [10] Zhu, X. L. (2011). An analysis on gaze theory. Nanjing: Doctoral Dissertation of Nanjing University.
- [11] Foucault, M. (2012). Madness and civilization. Liu, B. C. & Yang, Y. Y. trans. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company.
- [12] Gutting, G. (2013). Foucault: A very short introduction. Wang, Y. P. trans. Nanjing: Yilin Press.
- [13] Cripps, H. (2014). The politics of gazing : Foucault, Lacan, and Zizek. Yu, Q. trans. *Journal of Beijing Film Academy*, (04).
- [14] Wang, M. A. (2015). The disintegration mode of 'reproduction': Painting from the Foucault's view. *Literature & Art Studies*, (04), 134-142.
- [15] Zhang, Y. B. (2016). Back to Foucault : Violent order and the discourse construction of life security. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House.
- [16] Foucault, M. (2017). La peinture de Manet. Xie, Q. trans. Zhengzhou: Henan University Press.
- [17] Tang, Y. H. (2020). Foucault or Lacan : An investigation of gaze. *Literature & Art Studies*, (12), 5-19.
- [18] Foucault, M. (2000). The ethics of concern for self as a practice of freedom. *Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: The Essential Works of Michel Foucault*. New York: New Press, 1954-1984.
- [19] Foucault, M. What is critique? The politics of truth. S. Lotringer & L.Hochroth (eds). New York: Semiotext(e).
- [20] Foucault, M. (1994). The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences. New York: Vintage Books.
- [21] Alcoff, L. Dangerous pleasures: Foucault and the politics of pedophilia. *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault*, Penn State University Press.
- [22] Foucault, M. Foucault live: Interviews, Lysa Hochroth and John Johnson trans, New York: Semiotext(e), 1961-1984.