

Discipline and Drama: Panoptic Theatre and Griselda Gambaro's *El campo*

Nina L. Molinaro

[The cells] are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible.
—Michel Foucault

Long recognized as one of the most audacious Latin American dramatists of this century, Griselda Gambaro began her extraordinary contribution to the genre over three decades ago with the publication of *Madrigal en ciudad* and *Las paredes* in 1963. These and other plays written during the 1960s have most recently been identified as Gambaro's "theatre of crisis" by Diana Taylor.¹ Rather than aligning her early work with Eurocentric traditions such as absurdist theatre, Theatre of Cruelty, or the dramatic version of the grotesque,² Taylor characterizes Gambaro's plays of the 1960s as crucial to the disclosure of a new discourse on fascism, a discourse that increasingly comes to characterize the later work of the Argentine dramatist and Latin American theatre generally. Gambaro's early theatre has in fact become synonymous with a call to political awareness and responsibility.

One could also argue that French social historian Michel Foucault dedicated his intellectual energy to the analysis of this same discourse, specifically as it displays in cultural institutions such as the asylum, the prison, and the clinic. While literary critics have successfully appropriated certain of Foucault's controlling concepts, the tendency in literary studies has been to "apply" these concepts without interrogating how such concepts might in turn be transformed by the practice of literature. One might productively inquire, for example, to what extent a consideration of Foucauldian strategies serves the interests of literature and vice versa, and to that end I turn to Gambaro's theatre and in particular to one of her cornerstone plays, *El campo*.³

Like much of the Argentine playwright's work, *El campo*, published in Buenos Aires in 1967,⁴ turns on the dynamics between the theatricality of power and the power of theatricality. In the first instance, power is defined by the

relationship of meaning to both visibility and invisibility, whereas in the second instance power informs the knowledge that is produced by the communication between spectator and performer. The two terms depend on each other for enunciation and elaboration; theatricality cannot exist without participating in power relations and power must likewise rely on theatricality for expression and confirmation. I wish to explore precisely this nexus through an examination of Gambaro's *El campo* and Foucault's work on power relations and its correlative, discipline. Gambaro's play, as a dramatization of the mechanics of imprisonment, provides a most appropriate location from which to examine the affiliation between disciplinary power and theatricality; by the same token, Foucault's "analytics of power" assumes substantially more relevance and currency, I would argue, when observed through the optic of theatre, and particularly in the context of a play that both anticipates and follows the reign of visibility through the political environment of Peronist Argentina.

Before turning to an analysis of the specificities of Foucauldian power as they intersect with Gambaro's play, I wish to briefly outline the particular points of Foucault's theories that cross Gambaro's theatrical practice. The French thinker has theorized Western history as the creation and codification of multiple mechanisms of power, intimately linked to the act of producing truth through a will to knowledge.⁵ His work with the development of the penal system, translated into English in 1975 under the title *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, tracks the functioning of power relations through the institution of the prison, one of several social constructs in which control is established and maintained through the exercise of discipline, or "correct training"; this correct training supplies the literal and imaginary site of *El campo* and offers itself up as a particularly telling ritual of theatricality. Foucault proposes that in such analogous settings as the prison, "Discipline 'makes' individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise" (170). When someone deviates from a pre-established order, discipline provides an efficient method by which to impose a certain norm upon and within the transgressor; consequently, power reaches maximum productivity when the exercise of discipline is repeatable and maintains a regular effect.

The success of disciplinary power may be witnessed in the three strategies of hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment and the interrogatory examination, each of which will become crucial to the disciplinary visibility of *El campo*. An architectural metaphor that aptly describes this process is that of the "panopticon," a type of prison theorized by Jeremy Bentham during the nineteenth century.⁶ Especially relevant to a study of theatricality, the panoptic prison features a structure in which each captive can be seen but cannot see; s/he

constitutes the object of information but does not have the possibility for communication, thus producing an effect of passivity:

Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary. (Foucault 201)

Thanks to the double focus of disciplinary power, implicit in the relationship between transgressor and authority and explicit in the panoptic structure, discipline completely controls any transgressor inside *and* outside the prison. This arrangement may be extended to the organization, both physical and psychological, of the many subjects "disciplined" by modern states, such as Perón's Argentina, Francoist Spain, and Nazi Germany, all of which figure prominently in Gambaro's play.

It is my contention that Foucault's disciplinary design configures and is configured by Gambaro's theatre, and in particular by *El campo*, a play which centers the audience's controlling gaze on a continuum of prisoners who occupy various spaces within the physical, imaginary, and discursive panopticon. While panopticism strategically enforces the epistemological difference between visibility and invisibility, secures the network of power relations, and expands it into an increasingly efficient mechanism, in theatre this same organizing principle both engages and disengages the audience's complicity by positing conflicting messages, multiple points of resistance, and opposing sites of observation. *El campo*, as panoptic theatre, insists on the ongoing negotiation between discipline and drama, between the controlling practice of representation and the play of theatricality as they alternately reveal and conceal the mechanisms of their success. Unlike Foucault, Gambaro places her observers in the control tower *and* in the prison cells below, thus intensifying the complexity and interdependence of the forces of conformity and contention.

Composed of two acts subdivided into five scenes, the title of *El campo* immediately displays the force relations that circulate through ambiguity. Suggesting a rural haven, a military establishment, and a place of detention, the initial discursive sign locates referentiality somewhere in the gap between possible meanings⁷ and suggests that the spectator might profitably function as an adjudicator, weighing the available (and unavailable) information, reaching conclusions, and meting out punishment if appropriate. Although the action transpires primarily in two neutral locations, an office and a recital hall, the play

immediately problematizes the association between *either* the visible or the invisible and meaning. The spectator cannot rely on what s/he sees or, conversely, on what is manifestly hidden from view. Foucault would have us suspect what is concealed above all else, whereas *El campo* fomenta a more wide-ranging suspicion that calls attention to itself; how are we to "make meaning" if all signs point away from each other? This spectacular lack of congruency effectively traps the "subjects" of the play, which include the audience, between opposing codes, much as the model panopticon traps its inhabitants between the visible, or the lighted window that frames a prisoner's image, and the invisible, which corresponds to the darkened window that frames a prisoner's shadow. The characters of *El campo* are effectively caught between image and shadow, much as the spectators of this play are made to maneuver among mutually exclusive referents.

The play commences with the requisite arrivals into an impartial territory. Calling for a utilitarian office, the opening stage directions describe an "interior de paredes blancas, deslumbrantes" (161), in which the second adjective expressly underscores the absence of definition. The dichotomy between interior and exterior further attracts attention with the juxtaposition of "dos puertas, una a derecha, interior, y otra a izquierda, exterior" (161). The material location of the play is thus arranged relationally, and the existence of exits encourages the audience to entertain the possibility of movement, freedom, and flexibility by insinuating that the characters may come and go as they please, that the physical place through which they move is benign and their dialogue harmless. The discernable data successfully mediates, if not openly denies, any opposing indications of discord. The audience is quickly inserted into this act of mediation, however, when it discovers that the discipline of panopticism is both immanent and ubiquitous, inserting itself most effectively into the production of contradictory meaning. Caught by its expectations, both positive and negative, the audience's complicity lies precisely in the extent to which this discovery erases the fantasy of liberty.

In order for disciplinary power to achieve full operativity, an imbalance of control, which subsequently produces the first two disciplinary techniques of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgement, must occur. Ushered onto stage by a disembodied voice, the character of Martín furnishes the foreign element in an otherwise cohesive and self-sustaining system; he is the transgressor in need of interrogation and integration. The new administrator in a nameless corporation, Martín personifies order, rationality, and mastery: as he himself declares, "hay que poner todo en orden, necesito datos, si no, no se puede hacer nada, no se sabe dónde empezar. . . . !Y el trabajo es lo único que me importa!" (180). As an individual who conceives of and represents himself as

stable and coherent, he supplies an ideal target for the instrumentality of discipline, while also fully participating in the dialectic between knowledge and visibility.

El campo classifies subjects according to their (and our) capacity to be constrained by and contained within hierarchically arranged sites of observation, which are themselves articulated by the reach of panoptic power. As the object of a surveillance in formation, Martín's gradual psychological disintegration marks the escalating efficacy of discipline, to the point that its effects are automatic, with or without the accompanying action. His capacity for self-determination comes into question early in the first scene when he reacts apathetically to the recurring auditory undercurrent of physical and verbal violence, the "especie de gemido, arrastrándose tan subterráneamente que por momentos parece una ilusión auditiva" (162). How and when might a sound of distress be perceived of as an auditory illusion? When the listener wants to ignore it perhaps, as is the case with Martín. Or when the listener is being encouraged to distrust the process of perception to the extent that s/he detects in a given meaning its opposite. When Martín opens the door or looks out the window he sees nothing, and the noises register merely as a distraction. His responses undermine the truth value of visibility in favor of a discourse of interpretation *against* the legitimacy of either the visible or the invisible. The audience participates in the formation of the disciplinary process in that its resistance to the codes furnished is key to sustaining the force of the power relations.

Initially, the prisoner requires a jailer against whom to measure his re-incorporation, someone who will shadow Martín's protest against the successive phases of incarceration, providing a concrete effect from which the techniques of correct training may radiate. This resistance is key to the functioning and progression of discipline in Foucault's theory and Gambaro's practice because it bares the mechanisms of discipline from within; as Foucault writes, "[resistances] are the odd term in relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite" (96). Resistance is likewise a necessary component of audience response, which in turn generates complicity because it triggers participation in the *methods* of discipline; the audience watches from a position of superiority, determined by its relationship to knowledge, and that knowledge is then transformed into its normative judgment against the prison, and all that it stands for, in the case of *El campo*, and in favor of the prisoner. To return to an earlier point, the audience is complicitous insofar as it engages an illusion of freedom and assumes that Martín, for example, exists apart from the system that constrains him.

As the classic warden, the character of Franco supplies both a visual and a verbal corroboration of the increasing reach of the panopticon; while Franco's presence may be all too corporeal, the literal absence and discursive presence of his superiors (Franco names a "sociedad anónima" but the audience never sees it), assure his continued command, while also positioning him as the object of an even larger surveillance. In addition to his name, a reminder of another reign of discipline, Franco wears a Nazi uniform, complete with whip, but "A pesar de esto, su aspecto no es para nada amenazador, es un hombre joven, de rostro casi bondadoso" (162). The escalating discontinuities persist as Franco first requests and then demands that Martín remove his overcoat. When Martín remarks on Franco's attire, the latter answers with "¿Y cuál me iba a poner?" (163), and then asks whether Martín is Jewish or a Communist, two groups who have historically been "disciplined." This same question is repeated at the end of the play as a reminder of the ties between Martín's subjection and the larger structural implications of the panoptic activity, and as an indication that we have just witnessed the implementation and progression of discipline through the power of theatricality.

The conflicting codes with which the play opens serve to defamiliarize the mechanisms by which we traditionally recognize the abuse of political power. After all, it would be tempting to align the figure of Franco with such classic tyrants such as Hitler, Stalin, and Perón, thereby confining the impact of the play to an allegory of personal responsibility; our knowledge of the truth assures us of power *over* the contradictions of literature. I would argue, nevertheless, that the historical referent of the play is at once diffuse and specific; *El campo* exceeds any local geopolitical reality by implicating the totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany, Vietnam, Spain, and the former Soviet Union. At the same time the *absence* of any direct references to Peronist Argentina actively draws attention to the political situation from which the play derives; spectators may extrapolate from the general to the particular in order to allow for the possibility that the environment of *El campo* parallels the atmosphere of Argentina in the 1960s. Discipline as a manifestation of the theatricality of power recognizes no ethnic, racial, religious, or ideological limits; rather, it exists everywhere, always already increasing its breadth and depth, as the audience observes, over the course of the play, the social instability characteristic of military regimes transform itself into an increasingly stable, predictable, and repeatable order.

Judgment—in Gambaro's play and Foucault's theory—begins as encroachment and proceeds by producing standardized behavior and eclipsing any evidence of individual volition. Although Martín initially resists Franco's orders, he eventually complies by allowing Franco to determine the parameters of his actions and identity. In order for the second condition of normalizing judgment

to operate successfully, Martín's behavior must receive public scrutiny and revision. Although at first he plays to a public of one, by the third scene Martín has become the focus of attention for a whole group of Francos (the SS soldiers) and their prisoners, all of whom confirm the process of subjugation.

Initially Martín's passivity, accompanied by his "fastidio, como un recuerdo penoso que no puede precisar" (167) and vague references to his memories of other scenes of human extermination, directly corroborates the expanding web of discipline even as he attempts to proceed with the job for which he has been hired. As the model prisoner becomes ever more objectified and objectifiable, unable to articulate even minimal resistance, the forces of control increase in reach and extent to the point that neither a specific jailer nor the geopolitical environment of the concentration camp are necessary to sustain the disciplinary activities already in place. As Franco himself explains, "La disciplina es interna, en lo exterior es bastante relajada. Los cabellos largos, el entendimiento corto: todavía en vigencia" (168). The increasing breakdown of the dialectic between victim and victimizer, a dialectic that critics cite in many of Gambaro's other plays such as *Los siameses*, intensifies throughout *El campo* and culminates in the brutality of the third scene, in which Martín, in consonance with his correct training, is tortured in front of his captors and a group of other prisoners. After this moment, Martín becomes constantly visible in the panopticon; all that remains is for the system to acquire iterability.

Enter Emma. In her the audience witnesses an individual controlled completely by the normative eye of the panopticon to the point that her subjectivity is completely effaced by her instrumentality. Introduced to Martín as Franco's childhood friend, Emma bears all the bodily marks of a concentration camp prisoner, from her shaven head to her tattooed identification number. Not coincidentally, the prototypical prisoner of the play is a woman and an artist, both of which have historically been the target of ever more sophisticated procedures of control.⁸ Literally thrust onto the stage in the second scene, Emma's character visibly broadens the complexity of the disciplinary project of *El campo*. As a point of mediation, Emma signals what Jean Franco has called a fixed territory; although she is coerced into contradictory responses, her relationship to her environment, which includes Martín and Franco, achieves stability through her passivity and permanent subjection.

The techniques of discipline become increasingly stratified with the introduction of Emma as a third subject of control, and this particular subject also brings to bear the issue of desire in the operativity of discipline. As a fully functional prisoner, Emma is continually trapped between the conflicting desires of others; her incarceration involves being completely subjected to the will and judgment of those who observe her, and demonstrating this relationship to the

next prisoner, Martín. She initially appears on stage because Franco wants to distract the new arrival with her company: speaking to Martín, Franco says, "Pensé en usted: un día de trabajo, gente desconocida, alejado de su hogar, una mujer, Venus, el elemento frívolo" (173). Although her capacity to provoke erotic desire is compromised by her environment, the circumstances of Emma's present condition heighten her ability to provoke compassion and pity, both of which represent mediated forms of desire, in her public. As a synonym for the fireflies that she lovingly describes, her character knows no escape: "Las luciérnagas no pican. Tienen una luz en el cuerpo. . . . La luz se enciende, se apaga, como si pidieran auxilio. ¿Qué auxilio? Nadie entiende. La noche se queda oscura, silenciosa, y nosotros miramos" (174). The audience, along with Emma, gazes out into the darkness of the panoptic prison in search of an image that will answer for its lack of knowledge. It appears that Emma may well see only darkness, hence her status as an ideal member of the disciplinary society. And when the audience sees something *other* than darkness, it is reinforcing the dynamics of discipline. Any compassion that Emma provokes, for example, serves principally to provide someone with whom to identify, someone who may resurrect the possibility of hope for salvation. A marked and packaged product of the camp, Emma also most obviously performs the role of star actress, as well as contributing the principal focus for the parody of the play, and in the space between the actress and the role that she performs portrays lies a point of resistance, so necessary to the maintenance of power. Whether attempting to break from her assigned script or delivering her lines as directed, Emma's performance discloses fractures and dissonance, both of which encourage the expanding net of disciplinary power; although she has already been assigned all of the attributes of a prisoner, "Hace un visible esfuerzo, como si empezara a actuar, y avanza con un ademán de bienvenida. Sus gestos no concuerdan para nada con su aspecto. Son los gestos, actitudes, de una mujer que luciera un vestido de fiesta" (173). Her acting is purposefully flawed in order to better draw attention to itself and the politics of representation that underwrite *El campo*. Unlike Foucault, Gambaro includes large doses of self-reflexivity in her observations on the workings of discipline and resistance, thus highlighting how theatrical practice may productively supplement Foucault's own theory of power relations.

If, as Foucault suggests, discipline is fully articulated by the instruments of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment, the scene of the recital as the culmination of parody encapsulates the third factor of the disciplinary process, the examination. Parody, as an instance of self-conscious manipulation, complements Foucauldian discipline by converting individuals into instruments of control, both structurally and relationally. In *El campo* parody calls attention to the potential

simulation of liberty, coherence, and meaning. Observation and judgment meet in the combined interrogation of Martín and Emma, as well as the assembly of prisoners that constitute the mandated public for Emma's recital. And the examination produces the requisite effect, the successful dissemination of the disciplinary process that has been established in the first two scenes.

In Gambaro's play the examination assumes various guises. Most obviously, Martín's body furnishes the site of a physical intervention when the SS soldiers surround him and scratch his face to the point of drawing blood, although "Todo esto se ha ejecutado casi tiernamente, sin violencia" (190-91). At the same time, Emma becomes increasingly unable to tolerate her rash, and when she begins to frenetically scratch herself, the other prisoners imitate her, "agitándose en sus asientos, grotescamente" (190). The impact of these parallel scenes is double and contradictory: Emma's rash is transferred to Martín as a kind of punishment, and the visible signs of violence become interwoven with compassion. In the final moments of the interrogation, Martín and Emma effectively change places, and the first act concludes with him clinging to her knees and sobbing "Me divertí . . . mucho . . . mucho . . . mucho" (196). Discipline inevitably overcomes any momentary opposition, as the actors are made visible in order to conceal the invisible structure of power that increasingly constrains them.

If in the recital the audience witnesses the acting out of discipline, the final scene corroborates its iterability. After the complete mental and physical erosion of his independence, Martín suddenly discovers that he and Emma are free to return to his home. When they do, however, the house bears a striking resemblance to the camp that they have just left. It appears deserted, yet the teacups are still warm and the children's homework half done. Martín again hears noises outside, but they no longer contain the threatening undercurrents: "Se escucha la misma algarabía de chicos del comienzo, pero, naturalmente, sin órdenes ni gemidos" (206). Discipline has become "naturalized" and the visible signs yield only distrust, doubt, and an elaborate lack of communication. Martín throws the homework on the floor and asks Emma what her name is. She, in turn, persists in calling him Franco in spite of his repeated admonitions. Appearing disoriented and confused, Emma assumes the mannerisms of an aristocrat and requests reservations in a hotel. The stage is set for the final performance, which will recycle itself interminably.

In the last pages of the play, the expected visitors arrive at Martín's house: "un personaje con cara de cerdo feliz, aparece en el umbral. Chista para llamar la atención y se frota las manos, con una sonrisa casi abyecta, de disculpa y satisfacción a la vez" (211). Apparently the masked caller has visited Martín's home several times because he remarks on the fact that Martín's siblings have

grown into adults. And of course there are the obligatory questions, Franco's questions, about whether Martín is Jewish or a Communist. When the newest prisoner answers negatively, the functionary responds tellingly, "Y bueno será otra cosa. . . . Todos somos algo, es difícil elegir" (212). The horrific consummation of the play unfolds when the official readies a branding iron to stamp Martín with an identification number so that, like Emma, he will not get lost, yet another effect of the panoptic structure of discipline. She finally remembers Martín's name in the same moment that an assistant prepares to "sanitize" the new prisoner with a vaccine. The disciplinary activity of the play has reached its desired conclusion; the panoptic prison exists outside the discrete walls of the camp and inside the minds of its observers.

A theatre audience may inhabit many kinds of roles, although a customary position, and certainly that of the audience in/of *El campo*, continues to be one of passive observation. Kathryn Remen has remarked that in observational theatre, "As members of the audience, we assume that we can gather enough information from the actions of the entrapped figure to come away with a better understanding of the internal workings of people" (391).⁹ In Gambaro's play the characters are presented to the audience as objects from whom knowledge is to be acquired; while they move within the walls of the metaphorical prison that is the play, the spectators gaze upon them from a position of control and knowledge. Because of the norms of theatre, they cannot *see* us, whereas we can do nothing *but* see them.

The prisoners of *El campo* are displayed from the very outset, arranged according to the structural necessities of disciplinary power. As an inquiry into the instrumentality of power, Gambaro's play marks the process of discipline as systematized and repeatable, shielding knowledge by removing the possibility of coherence and communication. And what is the point of the play, if not to either give the audience a greater understanding of the repressive nature of power or to implicate the audience's failure to derive meaning and thus avoid the burden of social responsibility? The point is that neither of these options fully encompasses disciplinary power; indeed, both knowledge and a lack of knowledge consolidate such power. When we think we know the truth about power, and the truth about power in *El campo*, then we enter into the panoptic prison ourselves, if only to "observe" from the control tower. When the audience marks Emma as the fully functional prisoner and Martín as the prisoner in formation, it extends the "permanent surveillance" of this particular play. Likewise, when the audience resists the imposition of discipline by refusing to judge, organize, or interpret, by seeing without a will to knowledge, then it comes perilously close to inhabiting the panopticon itself. Theatre is the ideal arena in which to engage this dynamic because it turns on the relationship between the visible and the invisible, between

performance and referentiality. And the panopticon of *El campo* is particularly tangible because it reaches past the actors to embrace the spectators, entice them into the play of theatricality, where they are held until the cells finally empty out.

University of Colorado, Boulder

Notes

1. In her 1991 study of Latin American theatre, published under the title of *Theatre of Crisis: Drama and Politics in Latin America*, Taylor cogently articulates three phases in Gambaro's theatre, organized roughly according to the decades of the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. The plays of the first decade, among them *Los siameses* (1965) and *El campo* (1967), correspond to Taylor's centerpiece concept of the theatre of crisis, defined as the "combination of objective, systemic rifts and the subjective experience of personal dissolution" (97). The precise ingredients of said combination may vary from play to play, but the active relationship between objective and subjective, and collective and individual, remains constant. While Taylor's analysis clearly lays some of the groundwork for the present essay, my understanding of the play diverges considerably from hers in my theoretical focus on disciplinary power as well as my interpretation of the connections between character, structure, and audience.

2. I am thinking specifically of Tamara Holzapfel's "Griselda Gambaro's Theatre of the Absurd" (1970), Sandra Messinger Cypess's "Physical Imagery in the Works of Griselda Gambaro" and her chapter in Lyday and Woodyard's *Dramatists in Revolt* on Gambaro (1976), and, finally, the multiple studies appearing in the 1980s on the relationship between the Theatre of Cruelty and Gambaro's plays, exemplified by Evelyn Picón Garfield's "Una dulce bondad que atempera las crueldades: *El campo de Griselda Gambaro*" (1980). Although it has subsequently been suggested that such critical acts of contiguity may imply yet another manifestation of the colonializing impulse that has shaped so much of Latin American culture, these early analyses were extremely significant. Not only did they focus the intellectual spotlight squarely on Latin American theatre, and, moreover, on the theatre of a Latin American woman dramatist, but they also successfully legitimated, using the theoretical concepts available and acceptable at the time, a genre which stood well beyond the bounds drawn by the critical establishment.

3. The criticism on Gambaro's theatre is extensive. For a comprehensive bibliography on the scholarly studies published through 1989, see Diana Taylor's *En busca de una imagen: Ensayos críticos sobre Griselda Gambaro y José Triana (187-89)* and the volume edited by Nora Mazzioti, et al on *Poder, deseo, y marginación: Aproximaciones a la obra de Griselda Gambaro* (146-50). Severino João Albuquerque, Marguerite Feitlowitz, Diana Taylor, and Linda S. Zee have also produced additional evaluations of Gambaro's theatre since 1989.

4. *El campo* was first performed October 11, 1968 in the SHA Theatre of Buenos Aires. Originally published in 1967 by Ediciones Insurrexit, the play later appeared, along with *Las paredes*, *El desatino*, *Los siameses*, and *Nada que ver* in *Teatro 4* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor, 1990), the fourth volume of Gambaro's collected theatre. All subsequent quotes from *El campo* are from the latter source. The play was also translated into English by William I. Oliver in 1971 under the title of *The Camp* and is included in his anthology *Voices of Change in the Spanish American Theatre*.

5. Foucault's principal arguments are excessively complex to summarize here. Among the many fine introductions to his substantial corpus, I would single out Alan Sheridan's *Michel Foucault*:

The Will to Truth (1980) and Simon During's recent *Foucault and Literature: Towards a Genealogy of Writing* (1992). The latter offers a concise and helpful discussion of the notion of discipline (147-64).

6. Foucault describes Bentham's panopticon as a central control tower that looks out towards several individual cells arranged in the shape of a half moon. These cells feature two windows, one of which corresponds to the windows of the tower and the other of which permits light to move from one end of the cell to the other. With the addition of backlighting, the captives' shadows are easily and completely discernible; "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 200). For more information on the structural and metaphorical specifications of the panopticon, as well as visual examples, see Foucault's chapter on "Panopticism" (195-228) and the plates between 169-70.

7. Jeanne Colleran, in an intriguing discussion of the political dimensions of *El campo* and Harold Pinter's *Mountain Language*, explicates this same phenomenon, which she terms "disjuncture," as specific to postmodern theatre. She cites two kinds of disjuncture in Gambaro's play, verbal/gestural ruptures and the split between onstage/offstage, and analyzes them in terms of "a recognizable replication of the social disjuncture characteristic of oppressive forces operative outside the theatre" (53). Although there are certain overlapping elements between Foucault's work and postmodernism, these are substantially outside the scope of my current argument.

8. In her article on "Self-Destructing Heroines" Jean Franco argues that certain *topoi*, that of the stigmatized female body and that of the liberated artist, run through much of Latin American literature. At the same time, "for women writers to depict creativity in terms of a performance inevitably (sic) exposes the painful contradiction that, to be creative, she must become a public woman" (108). Emma may in fact be doubly disciplined, and her visibility heightened, precisely *because* she is a woman. At the same time I would suggest that *El campo* does not present "structures [] at the point of breakdown and madness," as Franco posits, but structures at the point of radical stability. The action of *El campo* may at first appear random and chaotic, but through the course of the play, the social system, anchored by means of disciplinary power, achieves coherence and consistency to the extent that stability eclipses any possible disequilibrium. And the character of Emma, as a visual foregrounding of Martín's own fate, marks the first concrete instance of this stability.

9. Remen convincingly argues that *M. Butterfly* uses the audience's passivity against them, eclipsing the "normal" observational mode in favor of a "system of theater and punishment that directly implicates and involves the audience" (392). Many of her comments on observation ring true for *El campo* as well, although according to my reading Gambaro's play transcends the issue of punishment, which may be understood as *one* of the operations of discipline, in order to examine the structural and discursive ubiquitousness of discipline.

Works Cited

- Albuquerque, Severino João. *Violent Acts: A Study of Contemporary Latin American Theatre*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1991.
- Colleran, Jeanne. "Disjuncture as Theatrical and Postmodern Practice in Griselda Gambaro's *The Camp* and Harold Pinter's *Mountain Language*."

- Pinter At Sixty*. Eds. Katherine H. Burkman and John L. Kundert-Gibbs. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1993. 49-63.
- Cypess, Sandra Messinger. "Physical Imagery in the Works of Griselda Gambaro." *Modern Drama* 18.4 (1975): 357-64.
- _____. "The Plays of Griselda Gambaro." *Dramatists in Revolt*. Eds. Leon F. Lyday and George W. Woodyard. Austin: U of Texas P, 1976. 95-109.
- During, Simon. *Foucault and Literature: Towards a Genealogy of Writing*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Feitlowitz, Marguerite. "Crisis, Terror, Disappearance: The Theater of Griselda Gambaro." *Theater* 21.3 (1990): 34-38.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977.
- Franco, Jean. "Self-Destructing Heroines." *The Minnesota Review* 22-23 (1984): 105-115.
- Gambaro, Griselda. *Teatro 4*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor, 1990.
- Garfield, Evelyn Picón. "Una dulce bondad que atempera las crueldades: *El campo* de Griselda Gambaro." *Latin American Theatre Review* 13.2 (1980): 95-101.
- Holzzapfel, Tamara. "Griselda Gambaro's Theatre of the Absurd." *Latin American Theatre Review* 4.1 (1970): 5-11.
- Mazziotti, Nora, et al. *Poder, deseo y marginación: Aproximaciones a la obra de Griselda Gambaro*. Buenos Aires: Puntosur, 1989.
- Oliver, William I. *Voices of Change in the Spanish American Theatre: An Anthology*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1971.
- Remen, Kathryn. "The Theatre of Punishment: David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly* and Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*." *Modern Drama* 37.3 (1994): 391-400.
- Sheridan, Alan. *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth*. London: Tavistock, 1980.
- Taylor, Diana. "Theater and Terrorism: Griselda Gambaro's *Information for Foreigners*." *Theatre Journal* 42.2 (1990): 165-82.
- _____. *Theatre of Crisis: Drama and Politics in Latin America*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1991.
- Taylor, Diana, ed. *En busca de una imagen: Ensayos críticos sobre Griselda Gambaro y José Triana*. Ottawa: Girol Gooks, 1989.
- Zee, Linda S. "*El campo, Los siameses, El Señor Galíndez*: A Theatrical Manual of Torture." *Romance Languages Annual* 2 (1990):604-08.