MRS Journal of Arts, Humanities and Literature
ISSN *(Online) 3049-1444*
Vol-3, (Special Issue-LITFEST'26)
Journal homepage: https://mrspublisher.com/journals

Three Colours of Conscience: Power, Inequality and Social Pedagogy in *Nirangal Moondru*

Dr. M. Nagalakshmi[1*], Dr. U. Thanesh[2], Dr. A. Ganesan[3]

[*1]Professor & Research Supervisor, Department of English, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai -117

[2-3]Associate Professor, RKM Vivekananda College, Mylapore, Chennai -4

Corresponding Author: ***Dr. M. Nagalakshmi*** *(Professor & Research Supervisor, Department of English, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai -117)*

Received: 16 / 03 / 2026	Accepted: 17 / 04 / 2026	Published: 28 / 04 / 2026

Abstract: This paper will attempt to analyse *Nirangal Moondru* through the conceptual framework of power, discipline, and social control proposed by the French social theorist Michel Foucault. The film, which explores the moral difficulties and institutional interventions in its characters' lives, uses the metaphor of "three colours" to convey the struggle for truth and justice. According to Foucault, "power produces knowledge" and operates through social institutions, rather than repressive power relations (Foucault 27). This study will contend that, in the context of *Nirangal Moondru*, the concept of conscience has been constructed and manufactured by society's disciplinary mechanisms. The film portrays how institutional forces, such as law and public opinion, shape and define the concepts of crime and deviance in society. *Nirangal Moondru*, in its investigation of social hierarchy and inequality, reveals how inequality operates on a subtle level to shape the construction of truth. The film, in its portrayal of the internalisation of surveillance and moral discipline, illustrates the "automatic functioning of power" in society, in which individuals regulate and discipline themselves even in the absence of external power relations, as Foucault has proposed (201). Ultimately, the paper argues that the film operates as a site of social pedagogy, stimulating viewers to interrogate dominant narratives of justice and morality. By bringing to light the invisible circulation of power, *Nirangal Moondru* transforms cinema into a critical space that cultivates awareness of structural inequality and the politics of conscience.

Keywords: *Power, Discipline, Social Control, Inequality, Conscience*

Cite this article: Nagalakshmi, M., Thanesh, U. & Ganesan, A. (2026). Three Colours of Conscience: Power, Inequality and Social Pedagogy in *Nirangal Moondru*. *MRS Journal of Arts, Humanities and Literature, 3,79-84.*

Introduction

Cinema functions not simply as entertainment but as a cultural apparatus that forms public perception of morality, justice, and social order. In contemporary Tamil cinema, narratives centred on crime and ethical conflict often disclose deeper anxieties about power, legitimacy, and inequality. *Nirangal Moondru* participates within this critical tradition by presenting a layered exploration of conscience, guilt, and institutional authority. The metaphor of "three colours" gestures toward multiple versions of truth, suggesting that morality is neither singular nor neutral while mediated through social structures. To understand how these structures operate, this study turns to Michel Foucault's theory of power and discipline. Foucault challenges the established notion that power is concentrated solely within sovereign institutions. Instead, he argues that power circulates through networks of relations, becoming embedded in everyday practices and social norms. As he observes, "Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (*The History of Sexuality* 93). In this view, power is productive rather than merely repressive; it shapes identities, defines truth, and regulates behaviour. Such a framework is particularly relevant to *Nirangal Moondru*, where the distinctions between guilt and innocence are negotiated within institutional settings that claim authority over truth. The film's portrayal of legal mechanisms, social judgment, and internal moral struggle reflects what Foucault describes in *Discipline and Punish* as the emergence of a disciplinary society, in which individuals internalise norms and regulate themselves accordingly. In modern systems of control, Foucault explains, discipline produces "docile bodies" that conform to socially sanctioned standards (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 136).

Through this Foucauldian lens, the film can be read as a critique of the delicate ways in which inequality shapes the production of justice. Conscience, rather than functioning as an autonomous moral guide, appears as an effect of disciplinary power. By dramatising how authority defines legitimacy and how individuals internalise surveillance, *Nirangal Moondru* reveals the intimate connection between power, inequality, and moral consciousness. This paper, therefore, argues that the film exposes the invisible mechanisms by which power constructs truth and distributes justice unequally. In doing so, it transforms cinema into a space of critical reflection, motivating viewers to interrogate the politics of conscience in contemporary society.

Conceptual Framework: Michel Foucault and the Circulation of Power

Michel Foucault reconceptualises power not as a centralised or purely repressive force, but as a productive network embedded within social relations. In *The History of Sexuality*, he questions traditional juridical notions of power by asserting that "power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (Foucault, *History* 93). Power, in this formulation, is diffuse and relational. It does not operate solely through sovereign authority or legal command but also circulates through institutions, discourses, and everyday practices. This understanding is fundamental for analysing accounts that explore moral conflict and social judgment, as power becomes inseparable from the production of truth itself.

Foucault further argues that power and knowledge are mutually constitutive. He writes, "Power produces knowledge… power and knowledge directly imply one another" (Foucault, *Discipline* 27). Knowledge is never neutral; it is shaped within systems of authority that determine what counts as truth. Legal systems, educational institutions, and media depictions contribute to the construction of normative definitions of deviance, criminality, and legitimacy. Thus, justice is not simply discovered but produced within a framework of institutional authority. Through this lens, moral categories emerge as historically contingent and politically charged rather than universally fixed. Central to Foucault's analysis is the concept of discipline. In *Discipline and Punish*, he describes the emergence of the modern disciplinary society, in which control is exercised via subtle mechanisms of observation and normalisation. Discipline, he argues, "produces subjected and practised bodies, 'docile' bodies" (Foucault, *Discipline* 138), rather than depending solely on overt punishment, modern power functions through training, regulation, and surveillance. Individuals internalise norms and regulate themselves accordingly. The effectiveness of discipline does not lie in visible coercion but in the normalisation of behavioural standards.

The architectural metaphor of the Panopticon further illustrates this internalisation of surveillance. Foucault explains, "The Panopticon induces in the inmate a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, *Discipline* 201). In such a system, individuals behave as though they are constantly observed, even in the absence of a visible authority. Surveillance becomes psychological rather than merely physical. The subject becomes both the object and the vehicle of power, participating in their own regulation. Foucault also questions the notion of the autonomous individual standing outside power. Instead, he asserts, "The individual is not the vis-à-vis of power; he is… one of its prime effects" (Foucault, *History* 98). Identity, morality, and conscience are shaped within discursive structures that define acceptable behaviour. What appears to be personal guilt or ethical awareness may, in fact, reflect internalised disciplinary norms. The subject is produced through systems of classification, evaluation, and judgment.

Importantly, Foucault does not present power as purely negative. Because power is productive, it generates forms of resistance and reflection. As he observes, "Where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault, *History* 95). Resistance does not exist outside power but within its networks. This insight permits cultural texts to be interpreted as sites where dominant narratives can be exposed, contested, or reconfigured. Taken together, Foucault's theory provides a framework for understanding how institutions construct truth, how inequality shapes access to legitimacy, and how conscience is internalised through disciplinary mechanisms. Power circulates through legal systems, social orders, and moral discourse, producing categories of guilt and innocence. Surveillance normalises behaviour, and individuals participate in their own subjection by internalising social norms. Through this conceptual lens, cinematic narratives can be examined as representations of disciplinary society, revealing the invisible mechanisms by which justice and morality are negotiated.

Review of Literature

Scholarship on contemporary Tamil cinema has increasingly foregrounded questions of power, caste, social hierarchy, and institutional violence. Studies on films such as *Jai Bhim* and *Maamannan* have emphasised how cinematic narratives expose structural inequality and confront dominant power structures. Certain critics argue that Tamil cinema in the last decade has shifted from purely commercial storytelling to socially conscious plots that interrogate law, governance, and systemic marginalisation (Sundar 112). These studies showcase the political turn in regional cinema, particularly its engagement with caste oppression and juridical authority.

Similarly, film scholars drawing upon Foucauldian frameworks had analysed the relationship between cinema and disciplinary power. Prasad contends that modern Indian cinema frequently stages the courtroom as a site where power produces legitimacy and moral truth (Prasad 84). Such analyses illustrate how cinematic representations of justice reveal the workings of institutional authority. Furthermore, studies influenced by Foucault's theory of surveillance examine how visual media itself mirrors panoptic structures, positioning audiences as observers within systems of moral evaluation (Kumar 57).

In the wider field of cultural studies, researchers have explored how media constructs social knowledge and shapes public consciousness. Hall's theory of representation has been applied extensively to Indian cinema to show how films encode ideological meanings regarding class, gender, and deviance (Rajan 143). These approaches emphasise the constructed nature of truth in media discourses, arguing that cinema participates in the production of normative understandings of morality and social order.

However, while extensive scholarship exists on caste politics, state violence, and identity representation in Tamil cinema, limited attention has been given to the concept of conscience as a socially constructed phenomenon formed by disciplinary power. Most analyses concentrate on external structures of oppression—legal systems, caste hierarchies, or political authority—without sufficiently examining how individuals internalise these structures and reproduce them psychologically. The Foucauldian concept of internalised surveillance, particularly the production of self-regulating subjects, is still underexplored in studies of recent Tamil crime dramas.

Moreover, as a recent film, *Nirangal Moondru* has primarily been discussed in journalistic reviews and media commentary rather than academic scholarship. Existing commentary emphasises the film's narrative and ethical complexity but does not engage deeply with conceptual models that situate it within broader discourses of power and discipline. There is, therefore, a distinct absence of sustained academic

analysis that reads the film through the lens of Foucauldian power relations.

This paper seeks to address that gap by redirecting attention from overt institutional oppression to the subtle production of conscience within disciplinary society. By applying Foucault's theory of power, surveillance, and normalisation, the study argues that *Nirangal Moondru* reveals how inequality operates not only externally through institutions but internally through moral self-regulation. In doing so, it contributes to emerging scholarship on Tamil cinema by highlighting the intersection of power, inequality, and the politics of conscience.

Surveillance and Visual Power in Media

Michel Foucault's concept of disciplinary power has been widely extended into media and visual Culture studies. Thomas Mathiesen reinterprets Foucault's Panopticon in modern society, arguing that contemporary media produce what he calls the "viewer society," in which surveillance is reciprocal, and citizens participate in moral observation (Mathiesen 219). Unlike classical surveillance, visibility in media culture becomes a mode of social regulation. Cinema, therefore, does not exclusively represent power—it circulates it through spectatorship. Mathiesen's expansion of Foucault delivers a framework for analysing how films construct moral judgment through visibility and narrative positioning. While Mathiesen examines surveillance broadly in modern society, he does not address its function within regional cinematic narratives, particularly in South Indian contexts.

Cinema as Moral Knowledge Production

Norman K. Denzin argues that cinema shapes collective moral understanding by constructing emotional identification and ethical framing (Denzin 12). In *The Cinematic Society*, he suggests that filmic narratives organise social experience, guiding how audiences perceive crime, deviance, and justice. Cinema becomes a pedagogical apparatus that produces moral consciousness. This argument is key in understanding how courtroom or crime narratives function not simply as entertainment but as cultural instruction. However, Denzin's analysis is largely Western-centric and fails to examine Tamil cinema's specific social and political context.

Control, Internalisation, and Modern Power

Gilles Deleuze extends Foucauldian thought by arguing that modern societies operate not through enclosed disciplinary institutions but through continuous systems of control (Deleuze 4). In his influential essay "Postscript on the Societies of Control," Deleuze explains that power is diffused, psychological, and internalised. This framework is particularly relevant for analysing films in which characters experience guilt, anxiety, and moral conflict without obvious institutional coercion. While Deleuze affords a compelling philosophical extension of Foucault, his essay does not consider cinematic story structures as specific sites of internalised control.

Law and Spectacle in Indian Cinema

Lawrence Liang examines how Indian cinema transforms legal processes into moral spectacle, arguing that courtroom plots often streamline intricate legal realities into emotionally charged performances (Liang 30). Cinema, according to Liang, shapes popular perception about justice by privileging ethical virtue over procedural complexity. This perspective is necessary for analysing films that depict legal institutions as sites of ideological negotiation. However, Liang's work focuses broadly on Indian popular Culture and does not specifically analyse contemporary Tamil crime films through Foucauldian disciplinary theory.

Gender, Justice, and Courtroom Representation

Oishik Sircar explores how courtroom representations in Indian cinema construct moral binaries, particularly around gender and social respectability (Sircar 122). He argues that cinematic justice often reinforces dominant ideologies rather than challenging structural inequality. This insight is useful in examining how cinematic narratives produce legitimacy and delegitimise certain voices. Nevertheless, Sircar's focus largely remains on gendered representation, leaving space for further exploration of power/knowledge dynamics within Tamil crime narratives.

Tamil Cinema and Political Power

M.S.S. Pandian's landmark work on Tamil cinema demonstrates how film culture in Tamil Nadu is closely linked with political identity and ideological production (Pandian 48). He argues that cinema does not simply mirror politics, yet actively constructs political subjectivity. This argument is significant for situating contemporary Tamil films within a longer history of ideological negotiation. However, Pandian's study concentrates primarily on star politics and Dravidian ideology, leaving contemporary crime narratives under-theorised.

Research Gap

While existing scholarship on Tamil cinema has extensively examined caste politics, institutional authority, and ideological representation, it has paid limited attention to the internal mechanisms by which power produces moral consciousness. Most studies foreground structural inequality and external oppression, while overlooking how disciplinary power shapes individual conscience and self-regulation. Furthermore, recent films such as *Nirangal Moondru* remain underexamined within academic discussion, particularly through a Foucauldian lens. There is thus a significant gap in analysing how contemporary Tamil cinema represents the internalisation of surveillance, the construction of guilt, and the production of moral truth within unequal social systems. This study attempts to address this gap by applying Michel Foucault's theory of power and discipline to examine the film's politics of conscience.

Research Objectives

- To examine the representation of **disciplinary power** in *Nirangal Moondru* through a Foucauldian conceptual framework.
- To analyse how the film constructs **moral conscience** as a socially produced and regulated phenomenon.
- To investigate how **inequality (class, caste, institutional hierarchy)** influences the production of truth and justice in the narrative.
- To explore how surveillance, visibility, and internalised guilt function as mechanisms of control within the film.
- To evaluate the film as a form of **social pedagogy** that determines viewers' understanding of morality and justice.

Research Questions

- How does *Nirangal Moondru* represent power as dispersed and disciplinary rather than centralised and coercive?
- In what ways does the film depict conscience as formed by institutional and social forces?
- How are inequality and social hierarchy reflected in the film's portrayal of justice and moral accountability?
- How does the narrative structure support or contest dominant constructions of truth?
- Can the film be interpreted as a pedagogical text that critiques contemporary systems of surveillance and moral regulation?

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative interpretative methodology grounded in Foucauldian discourse analysis. Rather than employing empirical data collection, the research conducts a close textual analysis of *Nirangal Moondru* to examine the representation of power, inequality, and conscience.

Institutional Power and the Production of Truth

Michel Foucault fundamentally reorients our conception of power by arguing that modern institutions do not simply repress individuals; they actively produce knowledge and shape what counts as truth. In Discipline and Punish, he writes, "Power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth" (Foucault 194). This insight gives a crucial entry point into understanding the institutional mechanisms at work in *Nirangal Moondru.*

In the film, legal and investigative institutions are not neutral mechanisms for uncovering the objective truth. Rather, they are structured spaces in which truth is narratively assembled. Courtroom scenes, interrogation sequences, and testimonial exchanges operate as ritualised performances in which competing accounts are reorganised into legally admissible narratives. The institutional setting legitimises certain forms of speech while disqualifying others.

Foucault describes the disciplinary apparatus as "a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it" (138). This is precisely what occurs in the film's investigative processes. Characters are dissected psychologically and morally through questioning, re-framed through institutional discourse, and repositioned within categories such as suspect, victim, or perpetrator. The process is less about identifying a hidden truth and more about constructing a coherent story that satisfies procedural logic.

Cinematically, this process is reinforced through visual hierarchy. Authority figures are frequently framed in positions of compositional dominance—centred in the frame, elevated in angle, or surrounded by institutional symbols (benches, files, legal insignia). In contrast, those under scrutiny are frequently framed in tighter, more restrictive shots, visually communicating containment and vulnerability. This aesthetic arrangement represents what Foucault identifies as the normalisation process: institutions classify, compare, differentiate, and hierarchise individuals (Foucault 183).

Moreover, the courtroom does not simply adjudicate actions; it evaluates character. Foucault observes that modern punishment shifted from the body to the soul, focusing on the individual's interiority (16). In *Nirangal Moondru*, questions posed to characters frequently exceed factual inquiry and probe moral disposition. The legal discourse becomes psychological, assessing intention, remorse, and credibility. Thus, justice in the film operates through moralisation.

The film thereby dramatises the Foucauldian proposition that truth is inseparable from institutional power. What appears as "truth" in the narrative is less an objective revelation than a stabilised version of events sanctioned by authority. By bringing this process to the fore, *Nirangal Moondru* implicitly critiques the assumption that institutional truth is impartial, disclosing its structural embeddedness in hierarchy and normalisation.

Surveillance and the Internalisation of Guilt

Foucault's analysis of surveillance in the Panopticon remains one of the most influential ways to understand modern disciplinary society. He explains that the power of surveillance does not lie in constant physical observation. However, in the psychological effect it produces: "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" (201).

In *Nirangal Moondru*, surveillance is not always literal or technological; it operates symbolically and psychologically. Characters experience visible anxiety and moral unrest even in the absence of immediate institutional presence. This suggests that surveillance has already been internalised. The fear of exposure, judgment, or accusation functions as a regulating force.

Foucault further notes that modern disciplinary power "is exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility" (187). The film visually conveys this principle through lighting and framing. Characters under moral strain are often placed in stark lighting contrasts or reflective environments—mirrors, glass surfaces, shadowed interiors—suggesting both exposure and fragmentation. Even private spaces seem symbolically penetrated by public scrutiny.

Importantly, the film's portrayal of guilt is not purely an ethical awakening. It emerges in the context of institutional confrontation. After interrogation or social accusation, characters retreat into periods of silence and self-reflection. These scenes dramatise what Foucault calls the internalisation of disciplinary norms. The subject becomes "the principle of his own subjection" (203). Once internalised, power no longer requires constant enforcement; it becomes self-regulating.

This mechanism destabilises the notion of an independent moral conscience. Rather than presenting guilt as a spontaneous inner voice, the film suggests that conscience is activated by visibility. The awareness of being judged—legally or socially—triggers moral conflict. In this sense, surveillance precedes confession. Additionally, the film's narrative pacing reinforces this psychological surveillance. Prolonged pauses, close-up shots of vacillation, and fragmented dialogue create an atmosphere of tension that represents panoptic uncertainty. The viewer, too, participates in this surveillance structure, observing characters

under moral strain. Thus, spectatorship becomes complicit in disciplinary power.

By showing how characters internalise judgment and regulate themselves, *Nirangal Moondru* embodies Foucault's argument that modern power operates most effectively when it becomes invisible and embedded within subjectivity. Surveillance in the film is not simply external monitoring—it is the shaping of conscience itself.

Inequality and the Politics of Justice

Foucault insists that modern justice systems do not operate outside power; rather, they function as means through which power is rationalised and normalised. In *Discipline and Punish*, he observes that "the judges of normality are present everywhere" (Foucault 304). Justice, therefore, does not exclusively punish crime—it evaluates individuals against socially constructed norms. This conceptual insight is key in reading *Nirangal Moondru.*

In the film, institutional authority appears formally neutral, yet its operations are socially inflected. The courtroom scenes, interrogation sequences, and narrative framing subtly differentiate characters by social position. Those occupying higher social or institutional status are granted discursive authority—their statements carry weight, their conduct signals credibility, and their accounts are structurally foregrounded. Conversely, marginalised characters are often shown defending themselves within spaces visually coded as restrictive or isolating.

This association reflects Foucault's assertion that "power and knowledge directly imply one another" (27). Knowledge—legal interpretation, investigative findings, moral labelling—is not separate from power; it is produced within institutional hierarchies. In the film, truth is not discovered but negotiated within these asymmetrical structures. Certain voices become authoritative not because they are inherently truthful, but because they are institutionally sanctioned. Furthermore, the film exposes how inequality shapes vulnerability. Characters positioned outside dominant social frameworks are more likely to be suspected and subjected to moral scrutiny. Justice thus emerges not as an abstract principle but as a socially mediated process. The cinematic language—lighting contrasts, camera angles, spatial arrangements—visually encodes these hierarchies, underlining the idea that inequality structures both narrative visibility and moral evaluation.

Through this lens, *Nirangal Moondru* does not simply depict crime and punishment; it interrogates how justice itself is stratified. The film's politics of justice reveal that moral legitimacy is unevenly distributed, in accordance with Foucault's understanding of disciplinary societies as systems that normalise difference through classification.

Conscience as Social Construction

Traditional moral philosophy often treats conscience as an internal, autonomous moral standard. However, Foucault radically rethinks subjectivity by arguing that individuals are constituted through discursive and institutional practices. In his words, disciplinary power produces "docile bodies" that internalise norms and regulate themselves (Foucault 136). Conscience, in this sense, is not purely personal—it is socially manufactured.

In *Nirangal Moondru*, moments of guilt, hesitation, and confession do not emerge in isolation from institutional pressure. Instead, they follow sequences of interrogation, surveillance, or social accusation. This suggests that moral awareness in the film is triggered by visibility and judgment. Characters begin to experience guilt not solely because of intrinsic moral failure, but also because they become aware of their position within a network of evaluation.

Foucault describes the Panopticon as a structure that induces "a state of conscious and permanent visibility" (201). The brilliance of this mechanism consists in its psychological effect: even when direct surveillance is absent, the subject behaves as though observed. The film mirrors this phenomenon. Characters exhibit internal conflict in private spaces—with reflective framing, shadow play, or silent pauses—suggesting that institutional judgment has already been internalised.

Thus, conscience in *Nirangal Moondru* is not portrayed as innate purity or corruption. It is shown as layered, formed through family expectations, legal discourse, social reputation, and institutional authority. The metaphor of "three colours" may symbolically represent these competing moral registers: personal guilt, social stigma, and institutional condemnation. By depicting conscience as socially constructed, the film aligns with Foucault's claim that modern power operates most effectively when it becomes self-regulating. The subject becomes "the principle of his own subjection" (203). In this context, moral conflict is not only ethical but political—revealing how deeply power penetrates individual identity.

The Film as Social Pedagogy

Beyond representing power, *Nirangal Moondru* participates in its circulation through spectatorship. Cinema, as Norman Denzin argues, "organises moral feelings" and structures in which audiences interpret social conflict (Denzin 12). The film does not simply narrate events; it positions viewers within an ethical framework that promotes reflection, judgment, and critique. The narrative structure avoids simplistic binaries of innocence and guilt. Instead, it presents layered perspectives that compel the audience to question institutional certainty. This self-reflexive storytelling transforms the viewer into a participant in moral adjudication. In doing so, the film operates pedagogically—it teaches viewers to interrogate how justice is constructed rather than merely consumed.

Foucault reminds us that power circulates rather than emanates from a single source. Similarly, the film redistributes interpretative authority to the audience. By exposing contradictions within institutional discourse, it destabilises the assumption that law equates to truth. The viewer is encouraged to recognise the instability of moral categories. Moreover, the film techniques—shifts in colour tone, parallel editing, contrasting character arcs—reinforce the metaphor of multiplicity embedded in the title. The "three colours" suggest that morality is not singular but relational. Through this structure, the film becomes a site of ethical education, supporting critical consciousness about inequality and disciplinary regulation.

Therefore, *Nirangal Moondru* functions as a cultural text that not only represents disciplinary power but also urges resistance to its unquestioned acceptance. It transforms cinematic spectatorship into a space of critical engagement, in line with Foucauldian thought, which holds that knowledge production is inseparable from power relations.

Conclusion

Nirangal Moondru ultimately reveals that justice, morality, and conscience are not fixed ethical absolutes but products of disciplinary power. Through a Foucauldian lens, the film demonstrates that institutions do not simply regulate crime—they construct truth itself. As Foucault argues, "Power produces reality" (*Discipline and Punish* 194), and in the film, legal and investigative structures generate socially sanctioned versions of truth through classification, normalisation, and hierarchical authority.

The analysis has shown that institutional power in the film functions through ritualised procedures that reorganise individuals into categories of innocence and guilt. Surveillance—whether literal or psychological—creates conditions of "conscious and permanent visibility" (Foucault 201), compelling characters to internalise judgment. Conscience emerges not as a purely private moral faculty but as a socially mediated response to visibility and regulation. Individuals become, in Foucault's terms, "the principle of [their] own subjection" (203), expressing the internalisation of disciplinary norms. Inequality makes this structure more complex. Justice in *Nirangal Moondru* is unevenly distributed, determined by social hierarchy and institutional legitimacy. The authority to define truth is not equally accessible; it circulates through systems of power that privilege certain voices over others. In this way, the film critiques the myth of impartial justice and exposes its embeddedness within socio-political structures.

Beyond representation, the film performs a pedagogical function. By destabilising singular narratives of guilt and innocence, it elicits viewers to examine the politics of moral judgment critically. Cinema becomes a site of knowledge production, in line with Foucauldian thought, which holds that power and knowledge are inseparable. The audience is positioned not as passive spectators but as reflective participants in ethical evaluation. Thus, *Nirangal Moondru* operates simultaneously as narrative, critique, and pedagogy. It dramatises how modern disciplinary societies shape individuals through visibility, normalisation, and internalised regulation. In doing so, the film goes beyond crime drama toward philosophical inquiry, exposing the fragile boundaries between law and morality, power and truth, judgment and conscience.

References

1. Cavell, Stanley. *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film*. Harvard UP, 1979.
2. Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October*, vol. 59, 1992, pp. 3–7. JSTOR, https://doi.org/10.2307/778828
3. Denzin, Norman K. *The Cinematic Society: The Voyeur's Gaze*. Sage Publications, 1995.
4. Dickey, Sara. *Cinema and the Urban Poor in South India*. Cambridge UP, 1993.
5. Dugaje, Manohar. Indomitable Spirit of Black Woman in Gloria Naylor's The Women of Brewster Place. International Journal of Engineering Science and Computing. Volume 6 Issue No.10, Pg. 2656-2658, Oct-2016.
6. Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
7. Gorringe, Hugo. *Untouchable Citizens: Dalit Movements and Democratisation in Tamil Nadu*. Sage Publications, 2005.
8. Liang, Lawrence. "Cinema, Law and the Public Imagination." *Law and Culture*, edited by Austin Sarat, Routledge, 2011, pp. 25–42.
9. Mathiesen, Thomas. "The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' Revisited." *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1997, pp. 215–234. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003
10. *Nirangal Moondru (Three Shades).* Directed by Karthick Naren, starring Atharvaa, R. Sarathkumar, and Rahman, Ayngaran International, 2024.
11. Nussbaum, Martha C. *Poetic Justice: The Literary Imagination and Public Life*. Beacon Press, 1995.
12. Pandian, M. S. S. *The Image Trap: M. G. Ramachandran in Film and Politics*. Sage Publications, 1992.
13. Ricoeur, Paul. *Oneself as Another*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey, University of Chicago Press, 1992.
14. Sircar, Oishik. "Spectacles of Justice: Gender and the Courtroom in Popular Indian Cinema." *South Asian Popular Culture*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2009, pp. 119–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746680902920607