

Fragmentation and Interruption in Foucault's Concept of the Subject, Power, and Madness

Justina Šumilova

Lithuanian Culture Research Institute
Saltoniškių g. 58, LT-08105, Vilnius, Lithuania
Email: justinasumilova@protonmail.com

Abstract:

The aim of this article is to investigate fragmentation and interruption in Foucault's concept of the subject, power and madness. The research explores the concept of fragmentation in modernity, particularly in relation to subjectivity, power, and madness. It discusses how the shift towards individualism and the erosion of traditional values have led to a sense of disconnection and fragmentation in society. The research states that fragmentation produces multiplicity of meanings and fragments the concept of the subject in which we have a new kind of fragmented subjectivity that is defined by multiplicity. While fragmentation of the subject can lead to madness, it gives an important linear narrative. The research also delves into the role of power in shaping subjectivity and the ways in which language and discourse contribute to fragmentation. Furthermore, it examines the connection between madness and language, as well as the exploration of madness in literature.

Keywords: fragmentation, interruption, subject, madness, power

Introduction

Modernity have resulted in the creation of new human environments, industrialization and new technologies, the acceleration of life's tempo, the expansion of state powers, and the emergence of mass social movements. Alongside the vast physical changes, the world has undergone in Modernity, the way we perceive and comprehend reality has also been altered and a new way of understanding subject and subjectivity evolved.

The older conception of the self as embedded in a holistic but differentiated natural-social-theological order slowly gave way to a "disembedded" selfhood understood to be ontologically prior to and independent of its surroundings (Gordon 2006, 660). Since the mid of 20th century, authenticity and expressive individualism became a common phenomenon in Western societies encouraging people to find their own way and discover their own fulfillment (Taylor 2007, 299).

At the same time, this shift of individualization has also led to a sense of fragmentation and disconnection. Fragmentation is experienced in the form of consumer culture that is trying to embrace authenticity and individuality as well as in the construction of a modern city.

French philosopher Michel Foucault theorized subject as a social construction that is shaped by

language, discourse, and power play in constructing our identities, and how our identities influence the world around us. Subject as a social construct in Foucault's theory that expresses some fragmentary features that are important to explore.

The goal of this work is to discuss the role of fragmentation in Foucault's definitions of subject, power and madness. This work will mainly focus on Foucault's concept of subject and subjectivity, power and madness relating them to Blanchot's concepts of interruption and fragmentary, showing negative and positive aspects of fragmentation. The work argues that fragmentation is an important part of modern subjectivity by using Foucault's concepts.

Fragmentation and interruption in the modern world

Modernity has created fragmentation in various ways. Rapid social change increased economic inequality, racial and ethnic tensions impacted political and religious polarization. These fragmentations affect social, political and economic realms of human life, but in this work the main emphasis lies on changes that impacted fragmentation of the subject.

Modernity has created fragmentation of the subject through the erosion of traditional values, beliefs and the rise of individualism. Fragmentation refers to the way in which religious beliefs and practices have become increasingly dispersed and broken down into smaller, more specific parts impacting the way subject understands one's inner-self and the environment outside the subject.

Religion had a unifying moral role in society, but since the mid of 20th century, it lost this role and became a personal matter. New moral, ethical and spiritual systems replaced traditional religious beliefs and had to give meaning and purpose to people to reach their authenticity and individualism. However, this process can lead to multiple different beliefs coexisting at the same time, and thus inducing confusion and fragmentation.

In the past, identities were often tied to a certain living place that had local community and religion that provided a sense of belonging and identity. But in a modern city, such connections are often more fluid. Cities don't contain silence and openness. Instead, they are full of sounds and movement, and this constant instability can be understood as interruption.

For Blanchot, interruption is a disruption of the continuity of thought, speech, or action which he explains by example of language. Language is not an object or a process, but rather an event. Through our interaction with language, we enter into a relationship of proximity in which nothing is revealed but we cannot avoid engaging with it. Language can interrupt the linear flow of thought when talking or language can be used to construct narratives or stories, but the narrative can be disrupted by those who speak it differently or have experiences that do not fit with the narrative. Blanchot sees discourse as invasive because it "breaks in" from the outside like language; when you speak, somebody interrupts starting you to question certain ideas, beliefs or concepts (Blanchot 1993, 76).

Blanchot's concept of interruption also resembles the modern culture and consumerist society. Consumerist society advertises authenticity and individuality to people by using techniques of language and creating multiple ads to "find yourself." Both the city and the society are full of

interruptions showing up in the form of noise, whether it is the physical sound or commercials and ads.

Multiple meanings in modernity can become a source of confusion and anxiety, as it can create a feeling of disorientation and lead to an inability to assert one's viewpoint or make decisions. The modern world, starting from 1960s, started to focus more on individuality, self-expression, personal desires and exploring oneself.

Discourse interrupts and forces to rethink your own subjectivity. History of being is not a linear narrative, as the principle of identity can interrupt and disrupt any attempt to construct a narrative. Therefore, the passage implies that history is made up of fragmented moments, with the potential for something to disrupt the flow of narrative at any given moment (Bruns 1996, 133).

The modern culture became more fragmented and suggested different ways to find one's true self, but people can feel overwhelmed by multiplicity of meanings. Fragmentation is experienced in the form of consumer culture. The way modern society exists now is the issue that leads us to fragmentation; society lost its unifying ontological segment and now is too dismantled into fragments.

Another issue of the modern society is the production of fake needs. The modern society creates fake needs that are used as tools of repression, inducing alienation with oneself and loss of personal dimension which emerges a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe (Marcuse 2002, 13-14).

Fragmentation in Foucault's subject. Power and fragmentation

In Foucault, subject has no intrinsic reality or structure because it can be shaped and remodeled by various power structures. Foucault stated that human subject is placed in relation of production and of signification as well as in complex power relations (Foucault 1982, 778). The fragmentation of external sources of meaning, such as religion and culture, induces a more individualized sense of identity. A person must actively create their own unique identity by creating their own values and beliefs, rather than relying on external sources.

Foucault pointed out that objectification happens due to "dividing practices". These practices divide the subject from oneself and from others and thus individual becomes objectified (Foucault 1982, 778). In pre-modern times power was related to the church and aristocrats and thus had a personal character attached to it. In modern times, power lost the personal feature. Human population as a whole started to distinguish norms from abnormalities. New disciplines like psychology, sociology and criminology appeared and established new scientific insights to objectify humans and put them into categories.

Foucault argued that science is one of the most powerful forces in producing and maintaining subjectivity (Foucault 1982, 777). Through classification of groups, individuals, and objects, science creates and reinforces social hierarchies, power structures, and ideologies that shape our subjectivity. Subjectification also occurs through the political, economic and cultural forces of our societies. These forces create and maintain the discourses, practices, and technologies that limit and define subjectivity.

Foucault argued that the process of division is used to create and maintain subjectivity and is carried out through the categorization of individuals and objects into distinct groups, often based on physical characteristics or attributes. By dividing people into categories, subjectification takes place through the construction of stereotypes and power dynamics that shape and define our identities.

Fragmentation is experienced in categorizing certain aspects of life into separate roles that are not united and function as narrative interruptions. We are taught to perceive childhood, old age, work, leisure, the public and private sphere, and the individual's corporate life as distinct and separate forms of life, instead of viewing them in terms of a single unified life journey. All these mentioned aspects are now investigated by specific fields in science which can start to be perceived by the individuals as the most important specific feature of their lives. This leads to a focus on each individual aspect, rather than the overall unity of the individual's experience (Willian 2000, 205).

Subjectification occurs by creating, maintaining and reinforcing power dynamics and distinctions between groups of people. More examples could be the split between healthy and sick people; sane and insane; criminals and citizens. These splits started to justify what makes us sane or insane, criminal or law-abiding, sick or well. At the same time, this objectification spark subjectification in certain ways because by having this knowledge about humans, we become subjects to those investigated acts. Foucault reveals a paradoxical situation: the modern human becomes constituted and constituting at the same time, the one who writes history and historicizes and lives in history.

Human is able to reflect on personal experience, but at the same time, objectify oneself. A human enters an ambiguous state when one is one's own interruption. Blanchot describes interruption as an ontological power that is able to disrupt other's being: "between man and man there is an interval that would be neither of being nor of non-being, an interval borne by the Difference of speech – a difference preceding everything that is different and everything unique" (Blanchot 1993, 298).

Objectification of human beings creates certain norms and standards by which humans should be measured; a norm or a standard is possible only into reference to a group or a certain population.

This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to (Foucault 1982, 781).

Fragmentation is a tool for power to control how subject is shaped. Power chooses certain aspects of subjectivity that are highlighted in the society, while others are neglected or considered to be unacceptable, like the discourse of sexuality. This way, subjects are encouraged to develop only certain, power approved features of identity, while the unapproved ones remain hidden and repressed. Power can act as a negative component in some discourses rejecting certain ways of subjectivity and creating gaps that act as power by not allowing to integrate certain aspects into one's identity:

It [power] never establishes any connection between power and sex that is not negative: rejection, exclusion, refusal, blockage, concealment, or mask. Where sex and pleasure are concerned, power can “do” nothing but say no to them; what it produces, if anything, is absences and gaps; it overlooks elements, introduces discontinuities, separates what is joined, and marks off boundaries. Its effects take the general form of limit and lack (Foucault 1978, 83).

These gaps and absences can become unintegrated parts of the subjects that are neglected due to power’s impact on subject formation. Power also revolved around controlling discourses and language about certain topics. Some discourses were silenced or considered taboo, these discourses are not fully formed and appeared in the form of undeveloped fragmentary gaps. The nature of fragment is that it cannot have a center and it cannot be referred to an origin (Blanchot 1993, 152). Censorship mechanism can use silence as a tool to fragment certain narratives to prevent their formation into a discourse and sustain the power.

It may well be true that adults and children themselves were deprived of a certain way of speaking about sex, a mode that was disallowed as being too direct, crude, or coarse. But this was only the counterpart of other discourses, and perhaps the condition necessary in order for them to function, discourses that were interlocking, hierarchized, and all highly articulated around a cluster of power relations (Foucault 1978, 30).

As Foucault points out, sex discourse was reduced to “silence” because sex discourse is the insidious presence that speaks in a voice so muted and often disguised that one risks remaining deaf to it (Foucault 1978, 35). Discontinuity of discourse can manifest in silence within a conversation that allows for a true exchange of ideas between two people (Blanchot 1993, 77). However, in other cases, silence can form a narrative when silence is a pause. Despite silence complicating the dialogue, silence’s interruption is beneficial for formation of words and ideas (Blanchot 1993, 77). Foucault’s analyzed sex discourse shows that language is a tool of interruption because it can control the spread or silencing of certain narratives, or it can be used to highlight certain narratives to confuse and distract people.

Modern world idea of authenticity is another example of fragmentation and power control. The modern era has been saturated by dream that your true self remains available to reach if you can find a certain social group or personal style to belong to. According to this model, the individual is self-contained and complete, and society presses in on it from the outside, frustrating its dreams and restricting its ability to express itself (Mansfield 2000, 54). Such model presents a “finished“ subject identity that is possible to discover and putting the responsibility for your own process of subjectification.

It creates the fake feeling of control over who you are, but one can choose only certain established and societal power-approved categories to become the individual that is defined and categorized. Effects of power constitute individual and the individual is an effect of power and at the same time an element of its articulation (Mansfield 2000, 54). Power creates the subject and controls via subject – subject is like a medium for power to show itself. Subject is interrupted by power-induced mechanism of control in which subject forms oneself in the way power allows one to be formed. This

form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks one by one's own individuality, attaches one to one own identity, imposes a law of truth on one which one must recognize and which others have to recognize in that person.

Technique of power is a way of turning a person into a specific, desired subject. Not all people are able to separate themselves from techniques of power because they believe that this power is their idea or volition. This is a subtle and tacit power of subjectification that makes a person behave in certain ways that becomes normal and unchangeable.

Madness, language and fragmentation in Foucault

In *The Order of Things*, Foucault argues that language gives us the ability to recognize, categorize, and understand reality by imposing meaning and structure on our thoughts and experiences. Language is key to understanding how and why humans form relationships between concepts, words, and material items, and how this shapes our experience of the world.

Language occupied a fundamental situation in relation to knowledge because only by the medium of language things can be known – not because it was a part of the world, ontologically interwoven with it, but because it was the first sketch of an order in representations of the world, because it was the initial, inevitable way of representing representations (Foucault 2002, 322). Language may not look like the things it describes, but this doesn't mean that it is isolated from the world. In a different form, it is still a place of discovery and plays an essential role in establishing the truth.

Within language, there can be more than one “language”. There can be the language of identity, which tries to make the other similar to itself, and the language of temporality or of sensibility, which makes what was once the same become “other” than its original self. Language does not unite us, as if it were a bond or a whole that contained us both, language separates us because it is itself uncontainable within any totality and language becomes the interruption of every union (Bruns 1996, 137).

Fragmentation causes fissures in structures of language. Foucault argues that modern world has multiple discourses that don't lead to anything finite and organized. Tension between self and subjectivity inside oneself is discovered, and one's tension manifests in one's relationships with others; this inner tension leads to fragmentation and dissociation ending in madness (Reich 1999, 148).

Languages plays a big role in understanding subjectivity because people are considered to be objects of knowledge and individual subjects at the same time. Human is able to reflect on one's own experience, but at the same time, objectify oneself. The schizophrenic moves from feeling empowered and self-determining to powerless and ineffectual, much like man in the modern age who shifts between being a product of the past and impacting the future, but in an increasingly unpredictable and tumultuous way. Foucault also pointed out that the speech of the madman has always been rejected, denied and suppressed – they either fell into a void – rejected the moment they were proffered – or else men deciphered in them a naive or cunning reason, rationality more rational than that of a rational man (Foucault 1988, 217).

This specific and neglected language of the madman is an important component of madness because language of madness helps to organize its own form. A mad person contains fragments that isolate the man from oneself and reality in such a way that fragments form unreal unity of a hallucination, it's derangement of the imagination (Foucault 1988, 93). These fragments exist in person's mind, and one uses language to rationalize and guide one's reason according to those fragments that are based on person's experience. A certain fragment becomes the dominant aspect of someone's identity, but it functions like a repetition of thought that does not lead to any kind of unity, it functions like an interruption. Fragment is not self-sufficient and not capable to talk about it, fragment cannot be combined with other fragments to form a complete thought making fragment a repetition of thought (Blanchot 1993, 153).

Fragments of madness are like "silence pauses" – this fragment functions like silence in discourse and does not permit the exchange because it cannot be integrated, it can only function as unreason that guides one's understanding of the world (Blanchot 1993, 75). Here, fragment functions in a similar way as it does in Blanchot when explaining fragmented speech. Fragment in speech is not self-sufficient and not capable to talk about it, fragment cannot be combined with other fragments to form a complete thought (Blanchot 1993, 152).

Madness didn't necessarily mean an absence of reason, but rather a less rational method of thinking and responding. Subjectivity is related to madness in a way that madness was the individual's experience of their own mental behavior that created a subjective understanding of the world signified by using language. Signification is related to power because power signifies certain traits or characteristics in a human being. Human contains various signifieds that one uses to describe oneself, while power is implemented in the form of language. Foucault argued that by labeling certain behaviors and individuals as "mad", these power structures seek to repress and control them, thus fragmenting them from the larger social order.

Language and madness. Subject overload

The art of language was a way of 'making a sign' – of simultaneously signifying something and arranging signs around that thing; an art of naming, therefore, and then, by means of a reduplication both demonstrative and decorative, of capturing that name, of enclosing and concealing it, of designating it in turn by other names that were the deferred presence of the first name, its secondary sign, its figuration, its rhetorical panoply (Foucault 2002, 48).

The previous chapters investigated the relationship between fragmentation, power and subject, and this chapter focuses on the way language fragments subject and leads to a new type of madness of subjectivity, focusing on the issue of multiple meanings in signification. In today's world, people can experience madness in a non-traditional way. There are many powers and ways to construct one's subjectivity, people can become overloaded with multiple meanings, deny or suppress certain aspects of identity and thus experience fragmentation and interruption of consistent subjectivity.

In the modern age, we experience multiple meanings in discourses and language and in the

world around us. There is no one correct or right path, there are thousands of those paths which lead of floating and endless signifieds revealing inefficiency of language and discourse which leads to overloaded signifier. The disunity of language can cause the crisis of disintegration of the subject.

“Signifier overload” is a process when signifier has too many signifieds and too many meanings, especially in social context. Signifier overload is related to subject fragmentation in our world. The modern way of living encourages disconnection with one’s subjectivity because certain aspects of human’s life are categorized by acceptance or denial by powers forming the subject.

Ideology needs subjectivity as a technique to produce and sustain people who support the ideology. Institutions reproduce the logic of the capitalist system values and indoctrinating them on people to create subjects who become instruments and bearers of this ideology (Mansfield 2000, 53). This is a method of control – divided and thus controlled – and it creates fragmentation because people do not see unity, they seek to be individual and unique, and this seeking actually becomes fragmentation in the form of division and separation. Subject is disorganized by too many possible ways of signification, requiring an interruption in forming an identity because multiple meanings induce the feelings of being lost and confused, unable to reach unity.

Another case is when fragmentation impacts multiplicity of split identities. A proper noun does not effectively describe the fragmentary constitution of the subject – this happens when one signifier is not enough to express the plurality of signifieds, because signifier assumes different signifieds that depend on social, cultural, economic context in different situations. The multiple identities accumulate and are not attenuated, thus becoming senseless meanings trapped in the mind that can lead to madness (Foucault 1998, 90-91). Subject experience disembodiment from societal and historical being, loose one’s touch with society, culture and history and carry multiple senseless meanings that are not interconnected. Signifier overload can lead to madness manifesting in subject disembodiment from societal and historical being and subject can become senseless meanings.

There is linguistic instability in which signification is relative and infinite – words assume different meanings when said by different people in different social contexts (Reich 1999, 151). The social constitution and formation of the subject is important and related to disintegration of narratives. Individual’s identity crisis is provoked by realization of the individualization procedures society employs to objectify the subject by objectifying the speaking subject, dividing practices when the subject is divided inside oneself or from others and subject’s self-formation (Reich 1999, 152). Division of practices is something that creates dissociation and exclusion of subject’s identity forming units.

Subject then is not able to identify oneself because one is either dissociated from certain meanings and signifieds or the subject is overloaded with too many signifieds to relate to. Different social roles can be given separate linguistic identities that are divided, therefore these divided linguistic alters can accompany one in social settings.

In the modern times, due to setting of life, one’s character’s self-development can be self-annihilation because human experiences multiplications of oneself which could be called “a new form of madness” that manifests in multiple fragments and loss meaning and unity. It is the experience of

the desubjectification, but it is worth to note that it does not happen in all cases. Desubjectification can have a positive aspect and function as construction of oneself.

Madness in literature: exploring other ways of subjectivity?

Foucault investigation of madness showed that human nature is fractured and revealed the power of dividing practices that saw madness as a threat to “imagined” stability. Foucault’s goal was to uncover the madness in history of western civilization. Foucault also understood madness as a part of our nature that is repressed and rejected from the concept of humanity. Foucault connects the concept of madness with literature and that madness can be a language for the work of art because:

Through madness, a work that seems to drown in the world, to reveal there its non-sense, and to transfigure itself with the features of pathology alone, actually engages within itself the world's time, masters it, and leads it; by the madness which interrupts it, a work of art opens a void, a moment of silence, a question without answer, provokes a breach without reconciliation where the world is forced to question itself... in the time of that work swamped in madness, the world is made aware of its guilt (Foucault 1988, 288).

Madness allows to create a space of literature in which certain ideas of the work of art can be presented to the audience. The madness in a work of art forces to create a pause, a blank space without resolution, leaving the world with a question it cannot answer. Interruption introduces waiting – this waiting may not necessary be understood as silence or a blank, but its most important effect is the change in the form or the structure of language (Blanchot 1993, 77).

Interruption is necessary to component of writing because this intermittence and discontinuity in the text allows to better grasp and understand the text. This moment of profanation disrupts the flow of time, allowing the work to seize control of it and to make its own non-sense meaning within the context of its pathology. Fragmented writing is a way to become “one’s own disorder”, to close up upon one’s own self in a contented isolation. There is no pure self in the process of fragmentary writing.

Foucault’s notion of madness in the work of art could be related to Blanchot’s understanding of fragmentary writing. It is worth to point out that both Foucault and Blanchot focused on breaking the limits in their works, and Maurice Blanchot saw in Foucault’s work his own experiment with a form of writing that explored limits and defined a new literary space (Dosse 1997, 155). Foucault, following the path of Maurice Blanchot, in his works emphasized the forgotten and repressed, giving the voice to the ones that history forgot, as well as going beyond limits and expressing new discourses.

Just like Foucault’s idea of madness and literature, Blanchot in his writings invited his audience to engage with his work on their own terms, allowing them to make their own interpretations. By focusing on smaller, disconnected ideas, he hoped to create a mosaic of perspectives that could come together to form a more complete understanding of reality. For example, in work “The Writing of the Disaster” Blanchot demonstrates fragmentary writing that

tries to break totalizing structures of language and tries to accomplish articulation of silence (Wallace 2016, 293-294). Fragmentation in writing is a way to restructurize the written text and rebel against the oppression of certain powers and this helps to unwork writing practices aimed at the silence anterior to language – a silence that constitutes interior communication (Wallace 2016, 293).

Madness is the absolute break with the work of art; it forms the constitutive moment of abolition, which dissolves in time the truth of the work of art; it draws the exterior edge, the line of dissolution, the contour against the void (Foucault 1988, 287). Madness is the definitive point of divergence between art and reality, the moment that separates truth from untruth and erases the boundaries between the two. It creates a void, a line of demarcation that suggests an end to the work, while at the same time opening up a realm of possibilities beyond. Madness, just like fragmentary text, allows to express plurality of existence of various ways how to view or understand the text.

Blanchot, via analyzing Sade's writings, points out that madness can be a form on writing. Madness expresses itself in the movement of writing and it can give an escape from conventions of the everyday helping to free oneself and reach greater understanding. Madness is associated with both joy and suffering; it is a place of solitude and alienation, but also of clarity and understanding (Blanchot 1993, 220). The positive aspect of madness is that it can give voice to unspoken narratives.

Madness can be a necessary component of one's subjective deconstruction and reconstruction – madness can lead to a new form of subjectivity being born and expressed in the form of text, shifting from subjectivity to non-subjectivity and vice versa. Blanchot developed a concept called the Neuter that defines something that does not fall into the standard categories of being, it is “nothingness coming into being”. It is impossible to give a sign to neutrality, so we find ourselves faced with the questions of knowledge that are presented to us when the unknown appears as neutrality, that is, when we see the experience of neutrality embedded in every relationship with the unknown (Blanchot 1993, 299). Madness can be described as a mode of the Neuter, it is incomprehensible to the human reason, but it can give a start to new type of subjectivity and experimentation of subjectivity.

Conclusions

Fragmentation in the modern world is experienced via loss of unity and multiplicity of meanings. Interruptions are discontinuities of thought that produce fragmentation of the subject because society is divided into certain segments of which some are highlighted and advertised, while others are rejected and controlled. Power divides and rejects certain forms of subjectivity which contributes to fragmentation of identity. Gaps and discontinuities are the tools of fragmentation for power to control the formation of the subject.

In the modern world, science leads to investigation of human nature and categorization of human experience. Scientific narratives contribute to fragmentation because they create roles that are not united and dispersed, focusing on individuality, rather than a unity of subject experience.

For Foucault, language has a crucial role in subject formation and manifestation of madness. Fragmentation and dissociation from one's own subject can lead to madness. Fragmentary form of

madness can become the most important linear narrative to human that starts to constitute one's whole identity neglecting other identity features.

There are multiple interpretations of discourse and language, and this extends beyond the literal meaning. Our language is overloaded with signifiers, without clear signification, which in turn can lead to a crisis of the disintegration of individual identity. This process can be defined as signifier overload which manifests in having too many signifieds and too many meanings. Signifier overload also occurs when one identity is not enough to define the subject. Multiple identity crisis can lead to disintegration of the subject and madness.

Foucault's combination of madness and literature resonates with Blanchot's concept of fragmentary writing by which Blanchot wanted to express the multiplicity of meanings in a text. Madness in literature is a positive concept, allowing to express the unexpressed in new ways as well as contributing to positive subject formation by creating a space for experimentation and allowing "nothingness to come into being" to form new form of subjectivity.

References

- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Infinite Conversation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Bruns, Gerald L. "Blanchot/Levinas: Interruption (on the conflict of alterities)." *Research in phenomenology* (1996): 132-154.
- Dosse, Francois. *History of Structuralism. The Rising Sign, 1945-1966*, Volume I. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Foucault, Michel. "The subject and power." *Critical inquiry* 8.4 (1982): 777-795.
- Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization. A history of Insanity in The Age of Reason*. New York: A Division of Random House, 1988.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things. An archeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Gordon, Peter E. "The Place of the Sacred in the Absence of God: Charles Taylor's 'A Secular Age'." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 69.4 (2008): 647-673.
- Mansfield, Nick. *Theories of the Self from Freud to Haraway*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 2000.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *One Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Mathews, William. "The Fragmented Self/Subject." *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* 3 (2003): 205-223.
- Reich, Jacqueline. "The Disorder of Things: Foucault, Pirandello and Subject Formation in the Modern Age." *Forum Italicum* 33. 1 (1999): 146-160.
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2007.