11

① Cultural relativism is a form of m_____ r_____ _____ a_____ ____ e_____ _____ is r_____ ____ a specific culture. ② According to cultural relativism, ___ is never true ____ _____ simply _____ a c_____ _____ ____ b_____ is right or wrong; rather, ___ can _____ _____ be true _____ a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong _____ a s_____ s_____.

① 문화 상대주의는 모든 윤리적 진리가 특정 문화에 따라 상대적이라고 주장하는 도덕 상대주의의 한 형태이다. ② 문화 상대주의에 따르면, 단순히 특정 종류의 행동이 옳거나 그르다고 말하는 것은 결코 진실이 아니며, 오히려 특정 사회 내에서 특정 종류의 행동이 옳거나 그르다고 말하는 것만이 언제나 옳을 수 있다.

③ The s_____ of cultural relativism ___ _____ __ _____ us ____ v_____ our m_____ i_____ _____ _____ ____ ____ j_____ about other societies _____ ____ _____ _____ those intuitions. ④ ___ we r_____ cultural relativism then we _____ _____ _____ ____ _____ ____ c_____ past societies _____ _____ _____ c_____ ____ our modern m_____ c_____ and present societies _____ ____ _____ _____ a_____ __. ⑤ At a time _____ t_____ ___ _____ ____ an important value, cultural relativism certainly _____ ____ ____ an a_____ o_____.

③ 문화 상대주의의 강점은 그것이 우리로 하여금 우리와 같은 도덕적 직관을 공유하고 있지 않은 다른 사회에 대하여 판단할 필요 없이 우리의 도덕적 직관을 평가할 수 있게 해준다는 것이다. ④ 만일 우리가 문화 상대주의를 거부한다면, 우리는 현대의 도덕률에 맞지 않았던 과거 사회와 아직 그것을 받아들이지 않고 있는 현재 사회를 규탄해야 하는 어려움에 직면한다. ⑤ 관용이 중요한 가치로 여겨지는 시대에 문화 상대주의는 확실히 매력적인 선택인 듯하다. ⑥ 그러나 이러한 문화 상대주의의 강점은 또한 그것의 약점이기도 하다.

74 blanks

⑥ This strength of cultural relativism, _____, is also its w_____. ⑦ Cultural relativism e_____ ____ _____ _____ the m_____ s_____ of other cultures _____ _____ ____ _____ i_____, _____ it _____ r_____ us p_____ ____ j_____ the moral s_____ of other cultures _____ _____ ____ seems ___ ____ n_____. ⑧ _____ _____, f_____ _____ a culture _____ d_____ s_____ m_____ a_____, we need to j_____ that society ___ ____ m_____ i_____ ____ _____ _____, _____ the people _____ _____ s_____ _____ the u_____ s_____ _____ ___ _____ ___ _____ r_____. ⑨ In order to _____ _____ __j_____, we need a c_____ moral s_____, _____ ___ p_____ the kind of moral standard _____ cultural relativism c_____ _____ _____ e_____.

70 blanks

⑦ 문화 상대주의는 우리로 하여금 다른 문화의 도덕적 지위를 판단하는 것이 부적절해 보일 경우 그렇게 하는 것으로부터 우리를 면제해 주지만, 다른 문화의 도덕적 지위를 판단하는 것이 필요해 보일 때 우리가 그것(다른 문화의 도덕적 지위)을 판단하는 데 있어 무력하게 만들기도 한다. ⑧ 예를 들어, 노예제도를 도덕적으로 받아들일 수 있다고 생각하는 문화와 마주쳤을 때, 우리는 그 사회를 우리의 것보다 도덕적으로 열등하다고 판단할 필요가 있는데, 왜냐하면 부당한 제도 아래에서 고통당하는 사람들은 구제될 필요가 있기 때문이다. ⑨ 그러한 판단을 하기 위해, 우리는 상호 문화적 도덕 기준이 필요한데, 그것은 바로 문화상대주의가 주장하는 바로는 존재하지 않는 종류의 도덕적 기준이다.

12

① One of the t_____/r_____ m_____ of power/knowledge c_____ by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher a_____ _____ the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, _____ the Panopticon, an architectural design _____ _____ by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. ② Instead of using v_____ m_____, such as t_____, the p_____ and m_____ d_____ s_____ needed a different s_____ ____ system ____ r_____ its citizens. ③ The Panopticon offered a powerful and s_____ _____ ____ i_____ c_____, _____ _____ a_____ _____ the c_____ o_____ of prisoners, _____ s_____ _____ _____ _____, a_____ _____ i_____ or no communication. ④ This modern structure _____ a_____ guards ____ c_____ _____ inside each _____ from their v_____ _____ in a high c_____ tower, u_____ _____ the prisoners. ⑤ Constant observation _____ a___ ____ a c_____ mechanism, a c_____ ____ c_____ s_____ _____ _____ _____ ____ i_____.

62 blanks

① 구조주의 및 후기 구조주의 운동과 관련 있는 프랑스 철학자 미셸 푸코가 인용한 권력/지식의 기법/규제 수단 중 하나는 제러미 벤담이 18세기 후반에 감옥, 정신병원, 학교, 병원, 공장을 위해 제안한 건축 설계인 파놉티콘이었다. ② 고문 같은 폭력적인 수단을 사용하는 대신, 진보적이고 현대적인 민주국가는 시민을 규제하는 데 다른 종류의 체제를 필요로 했다. ③ 파놉티콘은 내면화된 강압의 강력하고도 정교한 형태를 가했는데, 이것은 상호작용이나 소통이 허용되지 않은 채 서로 격리된 수감자에 대한 끊임없는 감시를 통해 이루어졌다. ④ 이 현대적인 구조는 감시자가 높은 중앙 탑의 감시 지점에서 수감자에게는 보이지 않은 채 각 감방 안을 끊임없이 관찰할 수 있게 해 주는 것이었다. ⑤ 끊임없는 감시는 통제 기제로 기능했고, 그에 따라 지속적인 감시에 대한 인식이 내면화되었다.

⑥ The Panopticon was a m_____ _____ a_____ Foucault ____ e_____ 1) the relationship between systems of s_____ c_____ and people in a d_____ situation, and 2) the power-knowledge c_____. ⑦ In his view, power and knowledge _____ _____ o_____ _____. ⑧ It m_____ the t_____ ____ a d_____ power, _____ _____ m_____ s_____ and ____ e_____ r_____. ⑨ The result of this s_____ ___ a_____ ____ r_____ and d_____ — a n_____ ____ _____, s_____ _____ the t_____ of d_____. ⑩ S_____ behavior ___ a_____ _____ _____ t_____ surveillance, _____ ____ p_____ discipline and _____ a population ____ _____ _____ the i_____ of this r_____. ⑪ The actions of the o_____ _____ _____ _____ this m_____ and the behaviors he _____ e_____; _____ _____ _____ o_____, _____ _____ _____ _____ b_____. ⑫ The power comes from the knowledge the observer _____ a_____ from his observations of actions in a _____ _____, _____ knowledge and power r_____ each other. ⑬ Foucault says that "____ _____ c_____ and g_____, they a_____ a level ___ _____ the f_____ of knowledge and the i_____ in power _____ r_____ one another in a c_____ p_____."

87 blanks

⑥ 파놉티콘은 푸코가 1) 사회 통제 체제와 처벌 상황에 처한 사람들 사이의 관계와 2) 권력-지식 개념을 탐구할 수 있게 한 은유였다. ⑦ 그가 보기에, 권력과 지식은 타인을 관찰하는 데서 비롯한다. ⑧ 그것은 모든 움직임이 감시되고 모든 사건이 기록되는 규율적 권력으로의 이행을 나타냈다. ⑨ 이 감시의 결과는 규제를 받아들이고 순응하는 것이다. 즉, 부류들의 표준화로 이것은 규율의 위협으로부터 비롯한다. ⑩ 적합한 행동은 총체적인 감시를 통해서가 아니라, 일망감시적 통제에 의해 사람들이 이러한 현실을 내면화함으로써 순응하도록 유도하며 이루어진다. ⑪ 감시자의 행동은 이러한 감시와 드러나는 것을 관찰하는 행동을 바탕으로 한다. 더 많이 감시할수록, 그는 더 강력해진다. ⑫ 권력은 관찰자가 순환적으로 활동을 관찰하는 데서 축적한 지식에서 비롯하며, 지식과 권력은 서로를 강화한다. ⑬ 푸코는 "결합되고 일반화되면서, 그들은 지식의 형성과 권력의 증대가 순환 과정 속에서 서로를 꾸준히 강화하는 단계에 도달했다."라고 말한다.

순서

11

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture.

- ☐ According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society.
- ☐ At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option.
- ☐ For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued.
- ☐ If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it.
- ☐ In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.
- ☐ The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions.
- ☐ This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary.

12

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories.

- ☐ Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.
- ☐ Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens.
- ☐ The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication.
- ☐ This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept.

- ☐ Foucault says that "by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process."

- ☐ In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others.
- ☐ It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded.
- ☐ Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality.
- ☐ The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes.
- ☐ The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other.
- ☐ The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline.

12

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories.

- ☐ In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others.
- ☐ Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens.
- ☐ It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline.
- ☐ Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes.
- ☐ The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication.
- ☐ The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept.
- ☐ The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that "by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process."
- ☐ This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

삽입

11

For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society. The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option. This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary. In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

12

This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that “by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process.”

11

The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option. This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary. For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued. In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

12

It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that “by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process.”

11

This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society. The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary. For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued. In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

12

Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that “by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process.”

11

In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society. The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option. This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary. For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued.

12

Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that “by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process.”

11

Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society. The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option. This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued. In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

12

Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.
The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that “by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process.”

11

At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society. The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary. For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued. In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

12

In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that "by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process."

11

According to cultural relativism, it is never true to say simply that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong; rather, it can only ever be true that a certain kind of behavior is right or wrong within a specific society.

Cultural relativism is a form of moral relativism that asserts all ethical truth is relative to a specific culture. The strength of cultural relativism is that it allows us to value our moral intuitions without having to be judgmental about other societies that do not share those intuitions. If we reject cultural relativism then we face the difficulty of having to condemn past societies that did not conform to our modern moral code and present societies that do not already accept it. At a time when tolerance is seen as an important value, cultural relativism certainly seems to be an attractive option. This strength of cultural relativism, however, is also its weakness. Cultural relativism excuses us from judging the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems inappropriate, but it also renders us powerless to judge the moral status of other cultures when doing so seems to be necessary. For example, faced with a culture that deems slavery morally acceptable, we need to judge that society to be morally inferior to our own, for the people who are suffering under the unjust system are in need of being rescued. In order to make such a judgment, we need a cross-cultural moral standard, which is precisely the kind of moral standard that cultural relativism claims does not exist.

12

The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. Foucault says that “by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process.”

12

The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes. Foucault says that "by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process."

12

The actions of the observer are based upon this monitoring and the behaviors he sees exhibited; the more one observes, the more powerful one becomes.

One of the techniques/regulatory modes of power/knowledge cited by Michel Foucault, a French philosopher associated with the structuralist and poststructuralist movements, was the Panopticon, an architectural design put forth by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century for prisons, insane asylums, schools, hospitals, and factories. Instead of using violent methods, such as torture, the progressive and modern democratic state needed a different sort of system to regulate its citizens. The Panopticon offered a powerful and sophisticated form of internalized coercion, which was achieved through the constant observation of prisoners, each separated from the others, allowing no interaction or no communication. This modern structure would allow guards to continually see inside each cell from their vantage point in a high central tower, unseen by the prisoners. Constant observation would act as a control mechanism, a consciousness of constant surveillance that would be internalized.

The Panopticon was a metaphor that allowed Foucault to explore 1) the relationship between systems of social control and people in a disciplinary situation, and 2) the power-knowledge concept. In his view, power and knowledge come from observing others. It marked the transition to a disciplinary power, with every movement supervised and all events recorded. The result of this surveillance is acceptance of regulations and docility — a normalization of sorts, stemming from the threat of discipline. Suitable behavior is achieved not through total surveillance, but by panoptic discipline and inducing a population to conform by the internalization of this reality. The power comes from the knowledge the observer has accumulated from his observations of actions in a circular fashion, with knowledge and power reinforcing each other. Foucault says that "by being combined and generalized, they attained a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase in power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process."