

Literariness Journal

A Peer-Reviewed Quarterly
Journal of Literature and Cultural
Studies

P-ISSN: 3108-1614
E-ISSN: 3108-172X

LiterarinessJournal.org

Vol. 1, Issue. 3 June 2026

© 2026 by the author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



A Literariness.org Project

The Dynamics of Power: a Foucauldian Reading of Spatial Partitioning and Social Organization in Times of the COVID-19 Pandemic

SREELAKSHMI M. NAIR

Student
BCM College Kottayam, Kerala

MS. ANCY CYRIAC

Assistant Professor of English
BCM College Kottayam, Kerala

Abstract: The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic led to unprecedented challenges worldwide, forcing governments to implement strict measures to control the spread of the virus. The pandemic has bestowed the governments with immense power, which allowed the authorities to look into the everyday activities of the individuals. According to Michel Foucault, the postmodern condition is characterized by the spatial reorganization of social forces and the increased surveillance that goes along with it. This shows how power functions outside of overt coercion and repression. The pandemic can be interpreted from a Foucauldian perspective as a time when disciplinary and biopolitical mechanisms converged to control space, health, and life. Moreover, the enforcement of lockdowns and the regulation of public and private spaces demonstrate the process of spatial partitioning, a key feature in Foucault's analysis of disciplinary societies. Individuals were confined to specific zones, their mobility restricted and constantly monitored, thereby reinforcing the idea of controlled bodies within regulated spaces. The emphasis on hygiene practices, social distancing, and self-isolation contributed to the normalization of disciplined behavior, where individuals began to regulate themselves in accordance with prescribed norms. This reflects the shift from external enforcement to internalized control, a hallmark of Foucauldian power. Through this lens, the study argues that COVID-19 functioned as a critical moment that made visible the intricate and often invisible operations of power, shaping both individual behavior and collective social realities in profound ways.

Keywords: *COVID-19, Disciplinary power, Biopower, Spatial partitioning, Normalization, Government*

Introduction

COVID-19 is a global pandemic which was first identified from an outbreak in Wuhan, a Chinese city, in December 2019 and spread across the globe making it one of the deadliest pandemics in history. COVID-19 has brought about a significant impact on our daily lives, leading to the implementation of various restrictions, quarantine protocols, and isolation measures. In an effort to curb the spread of the virus and protect public health, governments and health organizations worldwide have imposed restrictions such as lockdowns, social distancing guidelines, and mandatory mask-wearing in public spaces. Additionally, individuals who have been exposed to or diagnosed with COVID-19 were advised to undergo quarantine or isolation to prevent further transmission. Quarantine involves separating individuals who may have been exposed to the virus but are not showing symptoms, while isolation refers to separating individuals who have tested positive or are symptomatic. These measures, though challenging, played a crucial role in reducing the transmission of the virus, ensuring the safety of communities, and allowing healthcare systems to cope with the demands of the pandemic.

Social distancing, quarantine and isolation were the core COVID-19 prevention strategies, thus redefining our earlier notions of 'space'. The organization of social space gained precedence over other areas of everyday life. The pandemic has given the governments the power to categorize individuals, to place them in certain recognizable groups and to locate them in suitable places. Strict spatial partitioning, constant surveillance, the distribution and localization of individuals, constant monitoring and registration of data, and an intensification and diffusion of the exercise of power, epitomize the social organization of the pandemic stricken world. This situation is nothing but an explanation of Foucault's notion of power .

According to Foucault power can be divided into three major types: sovereign power, biopower and disciplinary power. Foucault in his work *The History And Sexuality* demonstrates that the sovereign power can be defined as "right to take life or let to live", this kind of power was most commonly experienced during the medieval period by the authorities, they showed their power through open violence and punishment. But in the modern age, power works differently. From the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries onward, new and more organized ways of controlling people were developed. This new form of power operates primarily through control over human bodies rather than through wealth or material possessions. It focuses on managing time and labor, and functions continuously through systems of surveillance. In contemporary society, power manifests in the form of biopower and disciplinary power. The COVID-19 pandemic served as a crucial moment that revealed how these dynamics operate in the twenty-first century. The concepts of quarantine and lockdown were not

externally enforced through overt coercion; rather, they were internalized by individuals, reflecting the subtle mechanisms of self-regulation and control inherent in Foucauldian power structures.

The concept of disciplinary power focuses on the regulation of individual bodies through institutions such as schools, hospitals, prisons, and the military. It operates through surveillance, normalization, and the imposition of routines, producing what Foucault describes as “docile bodies” that can be controlled, optimized, and utilized efficiently. Biopower, on the other hand, operates at the level of populations, managing life through policies related to health, reproduction, mortality, and hygiene. It seeks not to punish but to regulate and optimize life, ensuring the well-being and productivity of the population as a whole. These forms of power are not mutually exclusive but function together in complex ways, shaping both individual behavior and collective existence.

The COVID-19 pandemic serves as a crucial site for examining the interplay of these forms of power in the twenty-first century. The widespread implementation of lockdowns, quarantine protocols, and social distancing measures exemplifies the operation of disciplinary power, as individuals were required to adhere to strict behavioral guidelines and spatial restrictions. At the same time, the management of infection rates, vaccination drives, and public health campaigns reflects the functioning of biopower, as governments sought to regulate the health and survival of populations. What is particularly significant is that these measures were not always enforced through coercion or violence rather, they were often internalized by individuals, who adopted self-regulatory practices in the interest of collective safety. This internalization of control highlights the effectiveness of modern power structures, which operate through consent, normalization, and the production of knowledge.

Furthermore, the pandemic intensified practices of surveillance and data collection, reinforcing Foucault’s notion of the “panopticon” as a metaphor for modern society. Individuals were constantly monitored through contact-tracing applications, health status updates, and digital passes, creating a system of visibility where behavior could be observed, recorded, and regulated. This constant surveillance was justified in the name of public health, yet it also raised important questions about privacy, autonomy, and the expansion of state power. The categorization of individuals into risk groups such as infected, suspected, recovered, or vaccinated further illustrates how power operates through classification and differentiation, assigning identities and regulating movement based on health status.

In this context, the pandemic can be seen as a moment that both reveals and intensifies existing power structures, making visible the mechanisms through which modern societies govern bodies and populations. The spatialization of power manifested through the organization of quarantine zones, containment areas, and restricted movement demonstrates how space becomes a crucial tool of governance. The division of spaces into “safe” and “unsafe,” reflects a broader logic of control that

extends beyond the immediate context of the pandemic. These spatial strategies not only aim to contain the virus but also to produce disciplined and compliant subjects who internalize the norms and expectations imposed upon them.

This study, therefore, seeks to explore how the COVID-19 pandemic illuminated and intensified Foucauldian notions of power, particularly in relation to spatial organization and the governance of bodies. By examining the practices of social distancing, quarantine, and surveillance, this paper aims to demonstrate how modern power operates through the regulation of space and the management of life. It argues that the pandemic did not merely introduce new forms of control but rather exposed the underlying structures of power that have long been embedded in modern society. Through a Foucauldian lens, the pandemic can be understood not only as a health crisis but also as a critical moment that reveals the intricate relationship between power, space, and the human body in the contemporary world.

Disciplinary Power

One of the most significant contributions of Michel Foucault to modern critical theory is his conceptualization of disciplinary power, a form of power that operates not through overt coercion or violence, but through subtle, continuous, and often invisible mechanisms of control. Unlike sovereign power, which is exercised through the authority to punish and enforce laws, disciplinary power functions through the regulation of everyday practices, the structuring of spaces, and the normalization of behavior. In this sense, power is not merely something imposed from above rather, it is diffused throughout society, embedded within institutions, and internalized by individuals. Foucault's analysis fundamentally challenges traditional notions of power by shifting the focus from repression to production power does not simply constrain individuals, but actively produces them as subjects. Foucault elaborates this concept extensively in his seminal work *Discipline and Punish*, where he traces the historical transformation of power from the spectacle of public punishment to the quiet, calculated mechanisms of discipline. He argues that modern societies have developed new techniques of control that are more efficient and pervasive than earlier forms of sovereign power. These techniques operate through institutions such as schools, prisons, hospitals, and military organizations, which function as sites for the training, observation, and correction of individuals. Within these institutions, disciplinary power is exercised through a range of practices, including surveillance, hierarchical observation, normalization, and examination. These mechanisms collectively aim to produce what Foucault terms "docile bodies" individuals who are compliant, productive, and self-regulating. Foucault in his work *Discipline and Punish* convey that :

“We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it excludes, it represses, it censors, it abstracts, it masks, it conceals. In fact, power produces reality, it produces domains of object and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production”. (Foucault 120)

The old normal became the new abnormal, and the old unusual became the new usual. Travel restrictions, closure of theatres, parks, malls and religious institutions, Work from Home, Online education all became the new normal. The governments even had the power to restrict individual movements and confine them to fixed places. If this is not the disciplinary power, what else?

Disciplinary power does not rely on force or coercion; instead, it controls subjects through hierarchical surveillance, normalizing judgment, and constant examination. Power is exercised not through direct observation but through the internalization of the gaze, whereby individuals regulate their own behavior as if they are being continually watched. Similarly, during the COVID-19 pandemic, even though individuals were not under the direct observation of any authority, there existed a pervasive sense of control. This internalized awareness compelled people to conform to governmental regulations and social norms, demonstrating the subtle and pervasive nature of Foucauldian disciplinary power. The relevance of Foucault’s theory of disciplinary power becomes especially evident in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. The global health crisis created conditions in which new forms of regulation and control could be implemented on an unprecedented scale. Governments across the world introduced measures such as lockdowns, travel restrictions, social distancing guidelines, and mandatory mask-wearing, all of which required individuals to alter their behavior in accordance with public health directives. While these measures were justified as necessary for containing the spread of the virus, they also exemplify the functioning of disciplinary power in contemporary society.

Panopticism

A notable concept associated with disciplinary power is ‘panopticism’. Foucault uses Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon as a metaphor to illustrate how disciplinary power functions. The Panopticon is a prison design where a central watchtower allows constant surveillance of all prisoners, even though they cannot see if they are being watched. This design creates a self-regulating mechanism, as individuals internalize the possibility of being observed and adjust their behaviour accordingly. Panopticism highlights the power of surveillance and the internalization of disciplinary norms in modern society.

This enclosed , segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and the periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which each individual is closely located, and distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead- all this constitutes a compact model of disciplinary mechanism.... This is the utopia of the perfectly governed city. (Foucault 198)

The pandemic has bestowed the governments with immense power, which allowed the authorities to look into the everyday activities of the individuals. To prevent the spread of the disease, ‘route map’ of COVID -19 patients was prepared. The places they visited, people they met, surfaces they touched all were recorded. The state became too vigilant in recording the daily activities of several individuals and imposed heavy restrictions upon them. The ordinary men could not escape from the panoptic schema of the state. Believing in the myth of the perfectly governed city, people internalized the authoritarian disciplinary norms. Apps for contact tracing, CCTV in public spaces and drones reinforced the gaze of authority during the curfews. Citizens began wearing masks and using sanitizers voluntarily, without any external enforcement, thereby transforming themselves into agents of their own discipline. The notion of the “abnormal” gradually became the new normal, as these practices were incorporated into the daily routines and rituals of everyday life.

Biopower

According to Foucault, biopower refers to the ways in which power operates on bodies and populations, focusing on issues related to life, health, and well-being. Biopower involves the management and regulation of populations through various techniques, including public health policies, medical practices, and governmental interventions. It entails the control and normalization of bodies at both the individual and collective levels, emphasizing the intersection of power and biology. Foucault asserts, “For the first time in history, biological existence was reflected in political existence; the fact of living was no longer an inaccessible substrate that only emerged from time to time, in the event of death; it was now taken charge of by political power” (*The History of Sexuality*, 142). Through statistics, demography, and medical discourses, the state gains the capacity to manage life collectively. The shift from the sovereign right of death to the biopolitical management of life marks a transformation in the mechanisms of governance.

The medical gaze operates in a far more subtle and widespread manner than one might normally think. The medical gaze radiates throughout the social body. Under the regime of the healthy society, individuals were subject to increased regulation and registration, located in identifiable places, monitored and catalogued. Vaccination became mandatory to lead an ordinary life and a clear demarcation occurred between the vaccinated and the non-vaccinated during the COVID-19 period. Non-vaccinated people were restricted from taking part in social life. Travel restrictions too were imposed upon those who were not vaccinated. Mask, Sanitization and Social distancing proved to be tools of power. The government invoked emergency powers to enforce spatial controls, framing them as protective. Here Foucault's notion of biopower is transformed into a kind of security that manages the control of risk due to the COVID virus.

Firstly, the pandemic highlighted how governments exercised control over individual bodies through disciplinary mechanisms. Measures such as mandatory mask-wearing, sanitization, quarantine, and social distancing regulated everyday behavior. These practices illustrate how bodies were trained to follow norms in the name of public health, reflecting Foucault's idea that power operates through discipline rather than direct force. Individuals internalized these norms, often regulating themselves even without constant supervision.

Secondly, at the level of populations, biopower functioned through large-scale strategies aimed at managing life collectively. Governments relied on statistical data, daily case counts, mortality rates, vaccination percentages to make decisions and justify interventions. Policies such as lockdowns, travel bans, and vaccination campaigns were designed to control the spread of the virus and optimize the health of the population. This aligns with Foucault's notion of *biopolitics*, where the state governs through the management of life processes.

Another significant aspect during COVID-19 was the expansion of surveillance and the medical gaze. Contact tracing apps, health monitoring systems, and digital tracking extended the reach of power into both physical and virtual spaces. Individuals became part of a monitored network where their movements and health status could be recorded and analyzed. This reflects a panoptic structure, where the possibility of being observed leads individuals to conform to expected behaviors.

Moreover, the pandemic demonstrated how biopower operates through normalization and moral pressure. Being vaccinated, wearing masks, and following guidelines were framed as responsible and ethical actions, while non-compliance was often stigmatized. Power thus worked not only through laws and enforcement but also through social expectations and collective responsibility.

Spatialization and the Disciplinary Society

The spatial organization of power is a key theme in Foucault's work. He explains in *Discipline and Punish* how people are dispersed, categorized, and watched in contemporary societies through "the organization of a serial space" (143). Controlling visibility and space is how the contemporary disciplinary institution functions. He contends that power is "exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility" (187). This dynamic creates a spatialized system of control where individuals become both subjects and objects of surveillance.

The pandemic's emphasis on spatial control quarantines, isolation, and restricted movement recalled Foucault's description of the "plague-stricken town," a metaphor for disciplinary order. In his account, during a plague, the town is divided, movement is regulated, and each citizen becomes visible to authority. Foucault writes, "The plague is met by order; its function is to sort out every possible confusion: that of the disease, which is transmitted when bodies are mixed together; that of evil, which is increased when fear and death overcome prohibitions" (*Discipline and Punish*, 198). Though Foucault's plague town is historical, it prefigures the spatial logic of modern control systems, where surveillance, classification, and discipline are intertwined.

The "spatialization of power" becomes, as Foucault suggests, a defining feature of modernity. Power is not only exercised over individuals but also inscribed in the very organization of space. Schools, hospitals, and urban planning become instruments of discipline. The pandemic's reconfiguration of public and private spaces, homes turned into workplaces, digital platforms replacing physical gatherings illustrates how spatialization continues to be central to the logic of control in the postmodern condition. The concept of space got a new definition during the pandemic. The concept of work from home and online classroom paved a new way of spatialization.

Governmentality and the Rationality of Power

By the late 1970s, Foucault introduced the concept of *governmentality*, a synthesis of "government" and "mentality," to describe the rationality behind modern governance. In his 1978 lecture series *Security, Territory, Population*, Foucault defines governmentality as "the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific, albeit complex, form of power" (102). Governmentality extends power beyond institutions to the management of conduct. It governs populations through freedom rather than through strict coercion.

Governmentality operates by shaping the choices of individuals so that they willingly align with the objectives of the state. It functions through normalization, persuasion, and self-regulation rather than violence. The management of health, risk, and security exemplifies governmental power, which transforms individuals into responsible subjects who monitor and regulate their own behavior. The pandemic provided a stage where this rationality of power became evident. People stick to restrictions not only because of legal enforcement but also due to an internalized sense of moral obligation. Yet this theoretical insight does not depend on the event itself; rather, the pandemic reveals how Foucault's theory of governmentality captures the essence of power's subtlety: its ability to govern through freedom, to shape life under the guise of care.

From another perspective, the power exercised by the government instilled a sense of self-awareness among the populace. The fear of punishment and social consequences reinforced the practice of spatial distancing. It was the rational and administrative power of the state that maintained control over its citizens during the pandemic, ensuring compliance not through direct coercion but through the internalization of authority and regulation.

The Postmodern Condition: Knowledge, Space, and Power

The pandemic, viewed through a Foucauldian lens, mirrors the postmodern condition characterized by fragmentation, simulation, and surveillance. Foucault's insights into the relationship between knowledge and power anticipate the postmodern network society, where control is decentralized and mediated through information. He writes, "We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth" (*Power/Knowledge*, 93). The circulation of knowledge, medical, political, or technological becomes a means of organizing life. The boundaries between knowledge, authority, and truth blur, generating what Jean-François Lyotard later called the "incredulity toward metanarratives."

In the postmodern order, power operates not through fixed hierarchies but through fluid, networked relations. Surveillance becomes ubiquitous yet diffuse, internalized within digital and social structures. Foucault's spatialization of power thus extends into virtual realms, where visibility and data replace physical observation. The postmodern subject, constantly visible and self-aware, embodies the culmination of the panoptic logic. Even in theory, Foucault's framework allows us to see how spatial and epistemic transformations redefine autonomy, identity, and freedom in late modernity. The individual is no longer simply oppressed but integrated into power relations through participation, performance, and normalization.

Despite his meticulous analysis of power, Foucault does not regard resistance as futile. On the contrary, he insists, “Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power” (*The History of Sexuality*, 95). Resistance is immanent to power; it arises from within its very circuits. The awareness of surveillance and normalization thus opens possibilities for critical reflection and transformation. Foucault’s later works, particularly his studies on the *care of the self*, suggest an ethical dimension to resistance, one that lies in cultivating alternative practices of subjectivity.

For Foucault, freedom is not the absence of power but the capacity to engage with power differently. It involves recognizing how one is constituted as a subject and seeking new ways of being. In his essay *The Subject and Power*, he writes, “Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are but to refuse what we are” (785). This refusal implies a critical attitude toward the forms of governance that define modern life.

Power Beyond Coercion: The Internalization of Control

According to Foucault, power is only effective when it can make itself invisible. “Power is acceptable only if it conceals a significant portion of itself,” he says. The degree to which it can conceal its own mechanisms determines how successful it is (*The History of Sexuality*, 86). Because of this invisibility, power can function as normalization rather than repression. People become agents of their own subjugation when they internalize the expectations and norms that are placed upon them. The threat of being watched is enough to guarantee compliance in the disciplinary society; surveillance need not be ongoing.

The shift from external authority to self-surveillance is signified by this internalization. People apply the disciplinary gaze to both themselves and other people, becoming its bearers. Thus, Foucault’s Panopticon turns into a metaphor for a society in which self-regulation is the means by which power operates. “The perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary,” he notes (*Discipline and Punish*, 201). The pandemic revealed how much people have internalized control mechanisms, not just through compliance but also through voluntarily joining normalization regimes. Theoretically, this dynamic is a perfect example of Foucault’s assertion that modern power functions by producing submissive, normalized subjects rather than by dominating.

Conclusion

In the wake of the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, organization and regulation of space took center stage as one of the most important aspects of our lives, overshadowing many others. The organization of public and private spaces was carried out in a web of surveillance, regulation, and

control in which people were placed in a meticulously controlled social space. In this process of social organization and regulation, power was not just something that came from outside but was dispersed through institutions and practices.

The idea of disciplinary power, panopticism, and biopower helped form a new arrangement for the way society is organized. Disciplinary power was exercised through various institutions such as hospitals, schools, and state institutions, and regulated certain behaviors by means of surveillance and control. The ideas related to panopticism were embodied in various actions such as tracking people's contact, monitoring through various digital means, and morally policing those who deviated from public health norms. On the other hand, biopower was exercised through the regulation of populations by means of statistics, vaccination programs, health policies, mortality rate, and so forth. All these elements combined to create a spatial arrangement whereby control was not exercised only on bodies but also movement and interactions between them.

The Foucauldian theoretical approach calls for going beyond the traditional conception of power and freedom as mutually exclusive concepts. In contrast, their interdependence and mutual constitution emerge in the process of analyzing their relationship within social structures. The realization of power dynamics within social contexts creates conditions for resistance to emerge not only through open confrontation but also through the development of critical thinking, ethics, and the restructuring of social relations. Therefore, resistance is inherent in the power structure and is revealed through constant interrogation, accommodation, and negotiation.

As modern societies struggle with global issues, it is crucial to acknowledge the importance of the theoretical contribution of Michel Foucault. His concepts can be perceived as more than a historical perspective on the processes taking place in society. On the contrary, the proposed approaches help comprehend the mechanisms of governance by regulating individual bodies, managing populations, and controlling space. Thus, it is necessary to consider the current COVID-19 crisis as not an anomaly but a critical moment that helps uncover the mechanisms of power that exist in contemporary society.

Works Cited

“COVID-19 Cases | WHO COVID-19 Dashboard.” *WHO COVID-19 Dashboard*. World Health Organization, data.who.int/dashboards/covid19/cases.

“Discipline and Punish – Panopticism –.” *Michel Foucault, Info.*, 20 July 2024, foucault.info/documents/foucault.disciplineAndPunish.panOpticism.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1977.

---. *History of Madness*. Routledge, 2006.

---. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1990.

Nichols, Robert. "Postcolonial Studies and the Discourse of Foucault: Survey of a Field of Problematization." *Foucault Studies*, Sept. 2010, pp. 111–44. DOI: 10.22439/fs.v0i9.3062.