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This study aims to discover the triangulation of madness, power and resistance in selected post-war American novels, namely *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) by J. D. Salinger, *On the Road* (1957) by Jack Kerouac, and *The End of the Road* (1958) by John Barth. It is hypothesized in this study that the protagonists of the novels represent different modes of madness and resistance and I aim to analyze how the protagonists react to pressures by the disciplinary power that attempts either to normalize them or cast them into asylums and alienation. Thus, I present three objectives, namely to examine the characters’ entanglement in the disciplinary power system of their society and their different reactions to the status quo, to explore the concepts of madness and a madman as reflected by the characters of the selected texts and to discover how the authors portray the characters’ resistance to the pressures the disciplinary power imposed on them. This approach allows for a textual analysis of the characters of the selected texts based on Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance as the theoretical tool, where Foucault suggests that madness and sanity are socially constructed concepts created by the disciplinary power system to eliminate resistant individuals. My findings demonstrate that the selected authors present those concepts of madness, power and resistance through the characters’ portrayal of visible disagreement with their respective society’s cultural codes of conformity. Thus, the three selected authors share a similar way in depicting mad resisting individuals who respond to society’s disciplinary power through their conducts. However, my findings also reveal that, despite sharing this similarity, the selected texts exhibit different modes of madness and resistance to society’s disciplinary power. For example, the protagonist of *The Catcher in the Rye*, Holden is regarded as mad because of his resistance to accept his society’s disciplinary codes. Thus, in terms of the triangulation of madness, power and resistance, Holden’s resistance to disciplinary power is portrayed as madness. On the other hand, Sal and Dean, the protagonists of *On the Road*, give birth to a new resistance strategy against the 1950s American cultural codes by transfiguring the dichotomy of madness and sanity, where their resistance to accept the disciplinary cultural codes of their society is depicted as madness that actually brings real happiness and prosperity to them. Thus, madness becomes a strategy for Sal and Dean to resist their society’s norms that are established by the disciplinary power system. Hence, the triangulation of madness, power and resistance in *On the Road* is
Sal and Dean’s madness as resistance to society’s disciplinary power. In contrast, Jake, the protagonist of *The End of the Road*, resists the popular culture and mainstream values of the society by getting paralyzed; thus, he is entangled in the psychiatric power from which he has no way of freedom. Conversely, Joe, another major character in the text, is portrayed as a sane character whose obsession in gaining power and his resistance to society’s network of power relations manipulate the concept of madness. Joe resists his position in the network of power and decides to deconstruct the structure of the network by bringing Jake under his control. Thus, in the triangulation of madness, power and resistance, I posit the view that, in *The End of the Road*, the relation is madness to gain power in order to resist disciplinary system. Therefore, my findings show that the triangular relationship between Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance is attained from the selected authors’ depictions of the different modes of madness and resistance to society’s powerful disciplinary norms.
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kegilaan dan kewarasan yang menyebut bahawa resistan mereka yang menerima cara budaya disiplin masyarakat mereka digambarkan sebagai kegilaan yang membawa kebahagiaan dan prosperiti sebenar bagi mereka. Oleh itu, kegilaan merupakan suatu strategi bagi Sal dan Dean untuk menolak norma-norma masyarakat yang telah diwujudkan oleh sistem kuasa disiplin. Oleh sebab itu, triangulasi kegilaan, kuasa dan resistan dalam On the Road ialah kegilaan Sal dan Dean sebagai resistan terhadap kuasa disiplin masyarakat. Sebagai kontras, Jake, watak protagonis dalam The End of the Road, menolak budaya popular dan nilai umum masyarakat dengan menjadi lumpuh; dengan itu, ia terbabit dalam kuasa psikiatrik, iaitu ia tidak mempunyai kebebasan. Sebaliknya, watak Joe, karakter utama lain dalam teks tersebut, ditonjolkan sebagai karakter gila yang memperoleh kuasa dan resistan terhadap hubungan kuasa rangkaian masyarakat dengan memanipulasi konsep kegilaan. Watak Joe menolak kedudukannya dalam rangkaian kuasa dan mengambil keputusan untuk mengkonstruksi semula struktur rangkaian dengan membawa Jake di bawah kawalannya. Oleh sebab itu, dalam triangulasi kegilaan, kuasa dan resistan, kajian ini menganjurkan bahawa, dalam The End of the Road, kaitannya ialah kegilaan untuk memperoleh kuasa bagi menolak sistem disiplin. Dengan ini, dapatan kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa hubungan triangulasi antara konsep kegilaan, kuasa dan resistan Foucauldian adalah lengkap, iaitu melalui gambaran pengarang yang terpilih bagi mod kegilaan dan resistan yang berbeza terhadap norma-norma disiplin masyarakat.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

“For a madman is also a man whom society did not want to hear and whom it wanted to prevent from uttering certain intolerable truths.”
Antonin Artaud (1896-1948)

1.1 Overview: Madness, Power and Resistance

Madness, power and resistance have always been ambivalent concepts in man’s life. Desired or not, these three concepts have strong presence in the history of human beings and they immortalize themselves through the writings of the men of letters who were attracted to them. Madness, power and resistance exist in our life, philosophy, medicine and mind, and one cannot easily deny their influential role in shaping our existence. However, before finding the relation between these three concepts, we have to be able to define the concept of madness since philosophers and psychologists respond differently to the question of madness and they analyze it in relation to different aspects such as mental disorders or society’s segregating policy. This study defines madness as an anomie, which is a sociological madness, and refers to the individuals who are alienated from their societies because of their differences. Anomie is defined as: “sociological madness [that] depicts characters estranged from society's ‘sane’, ‘normal’ or ‘rational’ behaviors” (Rieger 8). Therefore, I will position this study within the philosophical realm of madness that defines madness based on its relation to social norms and conventions. Thus, it is worth reviewing how the concept of madness has been developed from the early philosophical debates until the present time to find out how madness is then defined in relation to the concepts of power and resistance.

Since Plato, madness has been defined differently in diverse contexts. The common point of all these definitions of madness is that the concept of madness in philosophy is definitely different from that of mental illness as introduced by psychiatrists. As Michel Foucault (1962-1984), in History of Madness (2006), states, segregation of madness as mental illness was started in the Renaissance by the creation of “Narrenschiff” or “Ship of Fools” which was a bizarre boat that moved slowly in rivers of Rhineland and round the canals of Flanders (8). This ship, in fact, functioned as the early asylums in which madmen were kept. Another common point amongst the different definitions of madness presented in this study is that madness is posited in relation to truth and reason in assorted contexts. Moreover, social acceptance of madness plays an important role in its different definitions.

In classical Attic, four kinds of madness with divine origin were introduced by Plato (427-347). The first kind of divine madness is the one that is related to philosophy and the wonderful art of fortune telling:
But it is worth mentioning as evidence that the people who made up our language long ago were also of the opinion that madness was not appalling or disgraceful. Otherwise they would not have linked this word, “madness”, with the wonderful art of foretelling the future by calling it “insanity” [manike]. No, they gave this wonderful art its name on the assumption that madness is fine, when it comes from divine dispensation, but people nowadays are ignorant of such nuances and so they insert the “t” and call it “prophecy” [mantike]. (Waterfield 26; par. 244b-c)

This means that the ancient people regarded madness as something precious due to the fact that a madman was endowed with the gift of prophecy. This statement implies that the concept of madness has not always been negative as, in the old times, we did have a positive concept of madness which was connected with the art of fortune telling.

The second type of madness is in relation to purification and it has a healing and purifying function. It is stated by Plato that there is a dreadful disease that afflicts some certain families because of a guilt they committed sometime in the distant past (Waterfield 26; par. 244d). Thus, madness enters with its power of prophecy to find a way for the relief of the illness (Waterfield 26; par. 244d). The third form of madness comes from the Muses, the Greek goddesses of arts, and it inspires songs and poetry:

A third kind of possession and madness comes from the Muses. It takes hold of a delicate, virgin soul and stirs it into a frenzy for composing lyric and other kinds of poetry, and so educates future generations by glorifying the countless deeds of the past. (Waterfield 27; par. 245a)

Accordingly, seven arts would not be created without this form of madness. Again, madness in this context is glorified as a source of inspiration for artists. The fourth form of madness has been related to memory by Plato:

By making correct use of reminders of these things a man, being constantly initiated into the most perfect rites of all, becomes the only one who is truly perfect. But since he is remote from human concerns and close to divinity, he is criticized by the general run of mankind as deranged, because they do not realize that he is possessed by a god. (Waterfield 32-33; par. 249c-d)

This type of madness is the most rational one since it relates the person to the power of remembering. In terms of the fourth type of madness, a Philosopher is the maddest and simultaneously the most rational (Güven 27). Cohesively, it is stated by Plato that:

This fourth kind of madness is the kind that occurs when someone sees beauty here on earth and is reminded of true beauty. His wings begin to grow and he wants to take to the air on his new plumage, but he cannot; like a bird he looks upwards, and because he ignores what is down here, he is accused of behaving like a madman. So the point is that this turns out to be the most thoroughly good of all kinds of
This statement shows that the fourth kind of madness is precious as well because it works as a reminder for people to not forget true beauty. Therefore, the concept of madness presented by Plato has two implications. In the explanation above, madness is posited as another form of reason; therefore, it is a positive concept. Moreover, social acceptance loses its importance in classical Attic because it is believed that even if divine madness is not comprehensible by an observer, nothing is eliminated from its positivity. By also relating madness to prophecy, purification, Muses and memory, madness is not posited as the opposite of reason; yet, divine madness is understood to be in a superior position to reason even if it belongs to an individual. Therefore, in classical Attic, what elevates madness is its divine origin rather than its social acceptance or its commonality.

The concept of madness evolves in later periods and it is defined as a necessary phase to achieve perfection by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831):

Hegel holds that “insanity [is] an essential... [and] necessarily occurring form or stage...in the development of the soul” not, of course, in the sense that we are all inevitably destined to derangement, but rather because madness represents a constantly threatening and yet seductive possibility prepared for by our encounter with the fundamentally alienating character of life.

(Berthold-Bond "Hegel on Madness and Tragedy" 71)

Therefore, in this definition of madness by Hegel, madness has been overcome by reason and has been considered as THE OTHER through the course of history. This view of madness is extended until modern time as in the Foucauldian definition of madness that refers to the silencing of madness by reason. However, madness and sanity are not considered as two opposing statuses in Hegelian view and their relation is described as waking and dreaming:

The self-possessed and healthy subject has an active and present consciousness of the ordered whole of his individual world, into the system of which he subsumes each special content of sensation, idea, desire, inclination, &c., as it arises, so as to insert them in their proper place. He is the dominant genius over these particularities. Between this and insanity the difference is like that between waking and dreaming: only that in insanity the dream falls within the waking limits, and so makes part of the actual self-feeling. (205; sec. 408 [037- 038])

In this regard, the difference between the madman and the sane man is that the madman cannot distinguish between dreams and reality. Likewise, as I will explain extensively in Chapter Three, madness is considered only as a “dazzlement” of reason by Foucault in History of Madness:
If our intention now is to reveal classical unreason on its own terms, outside of its ties with dreams and error, it must be understood not as a form of reason that is somehow diseased, lost or mad, but quite simply as reason dazzled. Dazzlement is night at noon, the darkness that reigns at the heart of all that is excessive in the radiance of light. (Foucault, History of Madness 243)

Hence, madness is not regarded as a form of reason that is unhealthy but is defined as only a dazzled reason by Foucault. Nevertheless, these two views of madness, despite sharing some similarities, bear differences in some certain points. For example, the concept of a madman in Foucauldian view is that of a man who is not out of mind and reason and it refers to an individual whose way of reasoning is different from society’s majority. As I will discuss in Chapter Three, madness in Foucault’s term is defined as:

The absence of reason, but an absence that takes on a positive form, a quasi-conformity, an almost identical resemblance that is never totally convincing. The madman leaves the path of reason, but by means of the images, beliefs, and forms of reasoning that are equally to be found in men of reason. The madman therefore is never mad to his own way of thinking, but only in the eyes of a third person who can distinguish between reason and the exercise of reason. (Foucault, History of Madness 184)

What is salient in the statement above is that madness is defined according to social acceptance. When a way of reasoning is not accepted by the majority, it will be called madness, no matter how reasonable it looks to the supposed madman. Hence, this view of madness is different from Plato’s divine madness where social acceptance or rejection of madness does not evaluate it. Hegel also believes that madness is not a loss of reason. However, the difference between Foucauldian and Hegelian view of madness is that Hegelian regarded it as a disease that can be cured:

The right psychical treatment therefore keeps in view the truth that insanity is not an abstract loss of reason (neither in the point of intelligence nor of will and its responsibility), but only derangement, only a contradiction in a still subsisting reason;—just as physical disease is not an abstract, i.e. mere and total, loss of health (if it were that, it would be death), but a contradiction in it. (206; sec. 408 [038-039])

On the contrary, a normal state of reasoning is regarded as a social construct by Foucault and he debunks psychiatry for its normalizing function:

The psychopathology of the nineteenth century (and perhaps our own, too, even now) believes that it orients itself and takes its bearings in relation to a homo natura, or a normal man pre-existing all experience of mental illness. Such a man is in fact an invention. (History of Madness 129)

Therefore, psychopathology is not criticized in Hegelian view because of its function in providing order to the disordered mind of madness:
This humane treatment, no less benevolent than reasonable (the services of Pinel towards which deserve the highest acknowledgment), presupposes the patient's rationality, and in that assumption has the sound basis for dealing with him on this side—just as in the case of bodily disease the physician bases his treatment on the vitality which as such still contains health. (206; sec. 408 [039])

Consequently, there is a presupposition of a madman’s rationality; thus the psychiatrist’s task is to cure the madman’s disorder. Furthermore, the concept of habit is introduced by Hegel and it is explained that all our attitudes and system of thought and body are formed and shaped by habit. Therefore, habit is regarded as the fundamental element of naturalizing human activities and mind:

The form of habit applies to all kinds and grades of mental action. The most external of them, i.e. the spatial direction of an individual, viz. his upright posture, has been by will made a habit—a position taken without adjustment and without consciousness—which continues to be an affair of his persistent will. (210; sec. 409 [043])

This concept of habit, which gives meaning and order to human beings, is condemned as a normalizing function of society by Foucault. As I will discuss in Chapter Three, in *Discipline and Punish* (1995), Foucault asserts:

The constant division between the normal and the abnormal, to which every individual is subjected, brings us back to our own time, by applying the binary branding and exile of the leper to quite different objects; the existence of a whole set of techniques and institutions for measuring, supervising and correcting the abnormal brings into play the disciplinary mechanisms to which the fear of the plague gave rise. All the mechanisms of power which, even today, are disposed around the abnormal individual, to brand him and to alter him, are composed of those two forms from which they distantly derive. (199-200)

He suggests that a disciplining society creates measurements for normality by controlling institutions where whoever that does not fit into this criterion is regarded as abnormal and must be excluded as the other. Therefore, Hegelian concept of habit, despite having similar definition to Foucauldian concept of normalization, bears a more positive view.

In Hegelian view, the connection between the concept of habit and the concept of madness is the creation of an ideal image of a perfect man in the human mind. Man habitually tries to reach his perfection by training and practicing, just like an athlete who tries to gain his ideal shape and weight by exercising. Thus, madness is referred to as failure in reaching perfection because, in this view, when a mind is unable to accomplish its ideality, it degenerates into madness:
It is still susceptible of disease, so far as to remain fast in a special phase of its self-feeling, unable to refine it to “ideality” and get the better of it… In this way the subject finds itself in contradiction between the totality systematized in its consciousness, and the single phase or fixed idea which is not reduced to its proper place and rank. This is Insanity or mental Derangement. (204; sec. 408 [036-037])

Here, it is believed that there is a role model for perfection and ideality in every society and all members attempt to do their best to reach that ideal phase. However, when one fails to achieve that perfection, his mentality will be deranged and he falls into madness. Therefore, madness is considered a physical and mental disease that can be cured: “Insanity is therefore a psychical disease, i.e. a disease of body and mind alike. The commencement may appear to start from one more than the other, and so also may the cure” (205; sec. 408 [037]). This view is denounced by Foucault for its function of creating “docile bodies”, which is a method for eliminating the individuals. In Foucauldian view, disciplinary power creates docile-bodies who are in total homogeneity with society by enforcing constant coercion and practice on people (Discipline and Punish 137). This political anatomy is defined as:

How one may have a hold over others’ bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, ‘docile’ bodies. (Discipline and Punish 138)

This means that a disciplinary system holds control over subjects’ bodies and governs them to behave the way he wishes. In this way, docile bodies with less ability to resist are created. Nevertheless, the concept of curing the madman is not accepted in Foucauldian view because, as I will further discuss in detail in Chapter Three, sanity and normality are considered as social constructs. It is discussed that the psychiatrist’s efforts are aimed at homogenizing individuals who are regarded mad because of their differences. That is why Foucault says: “madness, without ever being cured, had a restraint placed upon it” (History of Madness 483). Thus, psychopathology is on a wrong foundation, in Foucauldian views, because it believes in the pre-existence of a normal man in its methods of curing the madman.

Gradually, the concept of madness finds different understandings through the passage of time. For example, it is defined in relation to time by Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) where the madness of the thinkers is considered to be a different form of truth that is not comprehensible to ordinary people (Güven 102). As we go further, the concept of madness is defined as a necessary state and a “great health” by Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). However, although the concept of madness is not discussed explicitly by Nietzsche, it has a highly positive meaning in his view. It is stated in The Gay Science (2007) that: “the great health, a health that one doesn’t only have, but also acquires continually and must acquire because one gives it up again and again, and must give it up!” (Nietzsche 246). Thus, by this evaluation, disease is the closest companion to genuine health and it is a necessary element for self-perfection (Berthold-Bond “On Madness and the Unconscious” 200). Regarding great health, Nietzsche states: “[one] which cannot do without even illness itself, as an instrument and fishhook of
knowledge . . . which permits paths to many opposing ways of thought” (qtd in. Berthold-Bond “On Madness and the Unconscious” 200). Moreover, it is further elucidated in *The Gay Science* that the gift of illness bestows one with a new skin, metaphorically, and a new joyful life:

> From such abysses, from such severe illness, also from the illness of severe suspicion, one returns newborn, having shed one's skin, more ticklish and malicious, with a more delicate taste for joy, with a more tender tongue for all good things, with merrier senses, joyful with a more dangerous second innocence, more childlike, and at the same time a hundred times subtler than one had ever been before. (7)

Therefore, we can conclude that health and disease are two opposing concepts in Nietzsche’s view; nevertheless, disease is valued over health. Like what I have briefly discussed earlier on the preference of divine madness over sanity, madness is defined by Nietzsche as “any way of thinking that calls the common value of ‘rationality’ into question” (qtd in. Berthold-Bond “Madness and the Unconscious” 200).

So far, in outlining the development of madness in philosophy, we have observed how the definition of madness has developed through the passage of time and we understand that, in modern time, the concept of madness is regarded as a social construct by Foucault. He also suggests that madness is created by the disciplinary power system to punish and normalize the resistant individuals. In this view, madness is defined in relation to the concept of power and resistance and the concept of the madman is regarded as the creation of a disciplining society.

### 1.2 Statement of the Problem

The 1950s is considered an important decade in the American history due to its role as a significant phase between The Great Depression (1929-1939), World War II (1939-1945) and the counter-culture movements of the 1960s. That decade finds its importance in its post-war aspects and the rapid growth of the industry and economy, which were a blessing after the hard times of the depression and war. America’s 1950s was an era of social normality and prosperity and a comfortable time for Americans (Davis 199). However, this social normality and comfort results in the creation of two crucial cultural codes: conformity to the established norms and consumerism:

> A common stereotype of the 1950s is that it was a decade of conformity: the decade of the cookie-cutter "Organization Man," of rows of identical boxes in the housing tracts of suburbia, of corporate research teams that suppressed individuality even in scientific research, of mass consumerism that led everyone to follow fads and fashion trends in unison, of "the bland leading the bland" in politics. (Dunnar 1)

Therefore, the American society of the 1950s came into the conclusion that in order to maintain social prosperity, all members of the society must be homogenized towards the mutual aim of conforming to the cultural codes of consumerism; there was a common belief that by consuming more, America will be more powerful. Accordingly,
this deploying view of conformity brought forward the concept of otherness and the alienation of anyone who did not support the so-called ideal life.

This study explores the resistant individuals’ experiences in confronting their society’s propagated cultural codes of consumerism and conformity that are portrayed in the selected novels of the writers of that decade, namely Jeremy David Salinger (1919-2010), Jack Kerouac (1922-1969), and John Barth (b. 1930). In order to capture the critical situation of the characters, I use Michel Foucault’s concepts of madness, power and resistance. This conceptual framework provides a path to discover how the individuals submit their resistance to their society’s disciplinary power pressures that aim to homogenize them towards the goal of docility. Foucauldian concept of madness helps to analyze the characters’ madness and the concept of power in Foucauldian views provides the ability to comprehend the nature of the power system that the characters are entangled in. Moreover, Foucauldian concept of resistance offers the opportunity to discuss the characters’ resistance and individual self in the conformed era of their societies.

The concept of individual characters in the conformed atmosphere of America in the 1950s has been the concern of many American writers who respond to the confining function of the cultural codes in their writings - writers such as Saul Bellow (1915-2005), David Riseman (1909-2002), Salinger, Kerouac and Barth. The common themes of their writings are alienation of an individual, anxiety of a generation, and criticism of the dominant culture of the conformity (Davis 399-400):

One of the most striking things about the fifties fiction was that it discussed alienation at all. That this was the major theme of the decade's writing was proof of the main culture's failure to reach totalitarian proportions. Not everyone was hypnotized (Douglas and Novac 376).

This study shows that Salinger, Kerouac and Barth agree about the strong presence of a disciplinary power in society by creating anti-social characters who respond differently to disciplinary pressures. The dominant themes of these selected texts are madness, power of social pressures and resistance. Nevertheless, my research shows that previous studies on the selected texts that analyzed them based on Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance are limited. Thus, the presence of a gap is felt here because Foucault’s theories in this respect are of great advantage in creating a unique space for finding a close relationship between the characters’ madness and resistance and their society’s disciplinary power. Therefore, this space poses a significant problem in grasping the full understanding and appreciation of the selected characters, their motivations and dispositions. Hence, I postulate that there is a triangular relationship between Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance and, in this study, I attempt to explicate this triangulation by analyzing the characters in the selected texts. Furthermore, in my analysis of the selected texts, scholars’ paradoxical views about the characters’ behaviors will be answered.
The previous researches of the selected texts in this study have been studied in depth but they still pose some deterrents in fully understanding the characters. Reviewed earlier studies on *The Catcher in the Rye* show that there are two opposing views regarding Holden’s madness where Holden has been described as a mad character, and focus has been on the root of his mental problems and madness (Bryan, Ferguson, Achariyopas, Baer and Gesler, and Bloom). For example, Holden’s madness is analyzed within the Freudian framework by Bryan and Ferguson and they present two reasons for that. It is discussed that Holden has repressed sexual desires and, unconsciously, he wishes to have incest with his surrounding women like his sister Phoebe. Thus, these suppressed desires are the cause of his madness and problematic behaviors (Bryan 1069). On the other hand, it is argued that Holden’s lack of intimacy with his father and his oedipal complex towards his mother are the cause of his madness and confinement (Ferguson 811).

In contrast, other scholars have not considered Holden a mad character from their respective studies of the text and they have explained his problems in different ways (Shaw, Privitera, Chen, Wakefield, Ghasemi and Ghafoori, Dromm and Salter, Edwards, and Cheever). As an example, it is discussed that Holden’s crises are because of the common adolescence’s psychological problems that happen to have similar schizophrenic symptoms: “certainly, this is the one period of life in which abnormal behavior is common rather than exceptional” (Shaw 99-100). Likewise, it is argued that Holden is not a madman and he is just as phony as the society he condemns. Hence, Holden is regarded as an unreliable narrator who pinpoints his surrounding phoniness while he himself unconsciously acts phony most of the time (Edwards 554). Nevertheless, although there are divergent views about Holden’s individual and non-conformist character by scholars such as Heiserman and Miller, and Marcus, all the scholars who have examined Holden’s character psychologically agree that Holden is a problematic character who is not able to adhere to his society’s established common norms. Therefore, the reviewed limited studies regard Holden a normal man who suffers from society’s chaotic order. Then again, there are even less researches conducted on Holden’s depiction of madness that employ Foucauldian framework of madness, power and resistance. In this study, I hypothesize that Holden is not mad; he comprehends his society’s pressures of the disciplinary power but resists conforming to its disciplinary norms. Based on Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance, I hypothesize that Holden’s resistance to conform to society’s social and cultural codes is considered as madness.

The critical views on *On the Road* show that this novel generated a lot of controversial discussions after its publication. For example, the difference between the real American society and the one that was propagated by the medium was discussed (Cresswell, Richardson and Carden) in previous studies on the text. It is claimed that two parallel ideologies are presented in *On the Road*: one that emphasizes on the American Dream and another that presents America as a land of ramblers, outlaws and tramps (Cresswell 260). On the other hand, the text is considered a search for identity by Hunt whilst it is regarded as an escape from responsibility and conformity by Vopat. Nevertheless, there are limited studies done which focus on the protagonists’ madness that contradicts society’s sanity, even though the protagonists Sal and Dean, repeatedly in the novel, refer to their madness and the pleasures it endows. Thus, I
hypothesize that Kerouac frames Sal and Dean’s anti-social behaviors within the boundary of madness as a strategy to resist the accepted norms imposed by the society’s disciplinary power on the American society in the 1950s. Through this, I also theorize that they create new cultural codes based on a distinctive madness that sharply contravenes the common concepts of sanity: their madness is defined as their resistance to the disciplinary system of their society. It is worth mentioning that there are some references to the protagonists’ resistance to the American cultural codes in studies by Cresswell and Richardson; however, studies that analyze resistance within Foucauldian framework in relation to madness and power are inadequate.

My research also shows that Foucauldian concepts of madness, power, and resistance are scarcely applied to critically examine *The End of the Road* and scholars have overlooked the role and impact played by Barth’s portrayals of the characters’ implicit madness. There are only a few descriptive reviews by scholars, such as Harris, Noland and Greene, on the text and a gap for deeper analysis is perceivable. In this study, I hypothesize that the characters of *The End of the Road* indulge themselves in the Foucauldian web of power where they exercise and experience power simultaneously. Therefore, all have limited positions in the network of power that no one is able to resist or risk facing harsh punishments for insubordination. Accordingly, two of the characters in the text, Jake and Joe, are harshly punished for their resistance to accept their positions in the power network. In *The End of the Road*, the concept of madness is not explicitly used; I postulate that Joe is implicitly mad to gain power and bring more people under his control. I hypothesize too that since his aim in obtaining power is against his society’s disciplinary network of power, his madness to accumulate dominance is a form of resistance to accept that disciplinary power.

In this study, I attempt to present a new understanding of the characters in the selected texts; to do so, Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance have been employed so as to look at the characters from different lens; i.e. from the social and cultural perspectives. The concern of this study is on the concepts of madness, generally, and mad character, particularly, in relation to the notions of power and resistance. Thus, Foucault’s theories in this respect are of great help in creating a unique platform to ascertain the close relationship between madness, society’s disciplinary power and resistance.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

The framework of this thesis is based on the principal theory of Michel Foucault (1962-1984), the modern French philosopher, on madness, power and resistance. As presented earlier, many thinkers, from Plato to modern philosophers, have discussed madness in different contexts. However, what distinguishes Foucault from the other thinkers is his attitude towards accepting the existence and reality of madness. Foucault does not believe in the existence of madness and he insists that psychiatry is a social construct. Furthermore, he defines madness in relation to power and resistance; thus, his concepts of madness, power and resistance are suitable for this study’s purposes. Foucault believes that the history of madness began with the ruling powers of society who have always endeavoured to reinforce their regularities and limitations via diverse
exploitative methods attuned to the existing atmosphere of the time - physical punishment in earlier periods and norms creation in modern times. I put forward that man, who never forgets his obsession for liberty, has always attempted to find ways to resist these prohibitions and limitations. History never fails to record the revolutionary behaviours of men in different periods of time who strive to question the legitimacy of those restrictions. How does the ruling power of the society retaliate against these subversive behaviors? The first answer that comes to mind is punishment.

The concept of punishment has developed and progressed through the course of history in synchronicity with man’s evolution and development. In his book entitled *History of Madness*, Foucault asserts that Western society in the eighteenth century came into the conclusion that crime and nonconformity could not be avoided through the reinforcement of the law. Thus, it would be more advantageous to make morality more domineering through social gaze and condemnation of the taboo breakers (Foucault, *History of Madness* 448). In this way, the ruling power indirectly imposes the desired punishment on the alleged wrongdoers through the loyal members of the society by making them the judge, jury and executioner. In this way, people are free to judge whoever looks different from society’s mainstream, without even notifying the hidden power behind their so-called norms and taboos; so to speak, they label them as mad, asocial and abnormal.

The asocial man of the society now has to face the bitter reality of segregation as the result of his nonconformity and resistance. By shifting the responsibility from the source of power to the shoulders of the citizens, the same recurrent patterns of banishment and alienation of madness of the old times reappeared in this age of reason by their branding as *the other*. In this respect Foucault states:

> The madman is the other in relation to the others, the other, in the sense of an exception, amongst others, in the sense of the universal. All forms of interiority are therefore banished: the madman is self-evidently mad, but his madness stands out against the backdrop of the outside world, and the relation that defines him, exposes him wholly, through objective comparisons, to the gaze of reason. (*History of Madness* 181)

Following this, the madman is expelled from the so-called sane society because in the eyes of reason, he is against what is accepted as sanity. Therefore, Foucault, in the *History of Madness*, notes that since then, the citizen, as a representative of common reason, has been perfectly justified in relegating the madman due to his unreason and insanity (445).

Foucault’s following statement shows that in his view, the madman is the figure who breaks up the established conventions of the society and consequently brings upheavals and unrests. Thus, he is more an asocial factor than a mind empty of reason and recognition:
[The madman] break[s] down the fastidious conformity that our education, social convention, good behaviour and proprieties introduce. If a madman appears in company, he is like yeast that ferments, restoring to everyone a portion of their natural identity. He shakes and stirs everything up, he brings praise and blame, he reveals who is good and he unmasks rogues (*History of Madness* 346). [My Brackets]

Thus, the madman is a bearer of truth because he does not attempt to hide nor suppress his animalistic nature and savagery. Hence, we can consider the madman as a person whose ideals are not compatible with the rest of the society that, consequently, he resists the established norms. Foucault explains that since the madman projects the reality of human’s inner self, he brings upheavals in the society and he must be excluded. Moreover, Foucault in *Psychiatric Power* (2006) elucidates the appearance of a new form of power named disciplinary power, which commenced from the emergence of the religious institutions’ function of managing individuals. Step by step, this power has been developed and deployed in the society by the controlling institutions (Foucault, *Psychiatric Power* 41).

In Foucauldian view, what the disciplinary power has in mind is that the subjects’ bodies have the ability to adapt to any shape via training and practicing to achieve specific goals (*Discipline and Punish* 136). Therefore, since the eighteenth century, administrators have started developing a political technology of the body. This means that through practice and coercion, the subjects believe in the stated norms as the reality and, consequently, this knowledge of the body then enters the phase of the souls of the subjects (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 30). In this regard, the characteristics of the subjects who have been indoctrinated changed: they are no longer being juridical. The fact is that the subject does not break the law for fear of punishment, but rather he submits to the norms for reason of social pressures. Disciplinary power constitutes a submissive subject who integrates the norms because he is believed to do so (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 56).

In short, by creating norms, the disciplinary power governs the society not by force but by homogenizing it and excluding resistant individuals. Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* states that the disciplinary power benefits also from another strategy that create docile bodies out of the members of society. This strategy puts individuals under constant surveillance so as to make them obey the rules of the society. Foucault explains:

He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection. (*Discipline and Punish* 202-3)

Subsequently, under the pressures of the disciplinary power, the society starts to label and, eventually, exclude anyone who resists accepting its social norms. By building a
circle, the majority of the society punishes and banishes anyone who is not homogenous with the insiders. Foucault states:

It emerges as a concrete reality in the existence and the norms of a group. But more than that, it is given as a choice, an inescapable choice as one is either in one group or the other, within or without. But this choice is indeed a false one, as only those who are inside the group have the right to decide who is to be considered an outsider, accusing them of having made the choice to be there. The merely critical consciousness that those outsiders have somehow deviated rests on the consciousness that they have chosen a different path, and there it finds its justification, at the same time becomes brighter and obscure, turning into unmediated dogma. (*History of Madness* 165)

Hence, society’s created norms and groupings enforce the subjects to choose from the limited options of the groups: either be in the group or be marked as outsiders. Foucault asserts that this choice is fundamentally false because only those inside the group are the ones deciding who will be deemed as the outsider. However, some non-conformists resist the pressures of the society resulting in their confinement in different disciplinary institutions to get normalized. Foucault’s idea about normality is critical as well. He blames psychiatry for neglecting the fact that normality is a social construct. In *History of Madness*, Foucault debunks psychiatry by asserting that:

The psychopathology of the nineteenth century (and perhaps our own, too, even now) believes that it orients itself and takes its bearings in relation to a homo natura, or a normal man pre-existing all experience of mental illness. Such a man is in fact an invention. (129)

Thus, there is no pre-existing normal man and the psychopathology’s notion runs on the wrong path.

I will further explain in Chapter Three that as soon as a madman is expelled to an asylum, he confronts another source of power that is the psychiatric power. Foucault in *Psychiatric Power* proclaims that absolute power reigns over the asylum: “This authority within the asylum is, at the same time, endowed with unlimited power, which nothing must or can resist” (3). The madman is confined in the asylum to be normalized; however, this process of normalization is feasible only through pure submission of the patient to the psychiatrist and his modes of treatments and therapies. Foucault in *Psychiatric Power* states that the relationship between the madman and his psychiatrist is more a relation of power and objectivity than a relation of knowledge. When the madman is brought under the control of psychiatry, for the sake of being treated and cured, he is forced to abandon his reasoning that is called delirium (*Psychiatric Power* 3). Therefore, there is no room for resistance nor objection to the psychiatrist’s will. The psychiatrist is the absolute power of the asylum and the madman, who once refuses to acknowledge the power of society, is forced to surrender to the power of psychiatry.
According to Foucault, the psychiatrist follows two important objectives to bring the madman back to the state of normality. First, he turns the madman into a docile body by dethroning him from his kingdom of deliriums. Foucault explains that:

The patient, in fact, must accept the doctor’s prescriptions. But it is not just a question of subjecting the patient's wish to recover to the doctor's knowledge and power; establishing an absolute difference of power involves above all breaking down the fundamental assertion of omnipotence in madness. In every madness, whatever its content, there is always an assertion of omnipotence, and this is the target of the first ritual of the assertion of a foreign and absolutely superior will. (*Psychiatric Power* 147)

This means that the patient has no choice other than to accept the doctor’s prescriptions. Thus, to ensure the doctor’s dominating power over the patient, the first objective is to break down the madman’s power and omnipotence. The second objective, in Foucault’s term, is “the reuse of language.” Here, the strategy is to compel the patient to know and remember the names of everyone who holds any responsibility and role in the asylum like doctors, nurses, and even the doctors’ students. According to Foucault, the psychiatrist accomplishes his aim to teach the patient the hierarchy of the asylum and eventually subdues his resistance with this strategy. In this way, the patient can feel the presence of power in each member of the psychiatric team and learns how to behave (*Psychiatric Power* 149). Regarding the second objective, Foucault states:

In this series of operations, which basically focus on language, it seems to me to be, first of all, a matter of correcting the delirium of polymorphous naming and of constraining the patient to restore to each person the name by which he gets his individuality within the disciplinary pyramid of the asylum…the apprenticeship of naming will be an apprenticeship in hierarchy at the same time…This is, of course, a matter of occupying the mind, of diverting the delirious use of language, but it is equally a matter of re teaching the subject to use the forms of language of learning and discipline, the forms he learned at school, that kind of artificial language which is not really the one he uses, but the one by which the school’s discipline and system of order are imposed. (*Psychiatric Power* 150)

In this light, the patient learns the hierarchy of power by repeating the names and positions of each dominating figure of the asylum. This conditioning strategy moulds the patient into following the asylum’s discipline and induces him to submit to the psychiatrist’s order. Accordingly, the definition of a modern man that Foucault puts forward in *Psychiatric Power* is worth pondering after what has been discussed above. Foucault states that:

What I call Man, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is nothing other than the kind of after image of this oscillation between the juridical individual, which really was the instrument by which, in its discourse, the bourgeoisie claimed power, and the disciplinary individual, which is the result of the technology employed by this
same bourgeoisie to constitute the individual in the field of productive and political forces. From this oscillation between the juridical individual—ideological instrument of the demand for power—and the disciplinary individual—real instrument of the physical exercise of power—from this oscillation between the power claimed and the power exercised, were born the illusion and the reality of what we call Man. (58)

This means that Foucault considers man as a wandering figure in-between the realms of illusion and reality, which eventually becomes an instrument in the hands of the different powers that impose pressures on him. According to what has been explained so far, we can comprehend that Foucault believes the disciplinary power is created in the society in order to normalize the subjects excellently. Based on this analysis, what is the position of resistance in the power society with regards to Foucauldian view?

Foucault in *History of Sexuality* (1978) answers this question by stating that resistance does not mean an escape from the source of power. Its characteristics are similar to power; therefore, it is not unified and simple (96). In explaining about the diverse forms of resistance, Foucault mentions that resistance is produced in the form of plurality. There are resistances that are possible and necessary while others are spontaneous and violent, alongside its other forms that are sacrificial (*History of Sexuality* 96). Foucault continues that by giving these definitions, he does not mean they are only reactions to the dominant power with the knowledge of being destined to permanent defeat, but they are just an integral part of power relations (*History of Sexuality* 96). Hence, Foucault introduces two forms of resistance: tactical reversal and aesthetics of existence. Foucault favored the latter of the types in his final years and he devoted his studies to finding out how this form of resistance could form the basis for a non-fascistic form of society (Thompson 114-15). Tactical reversal means the form of resistance that is spontaneous and can make a break in a power system immediately. Street protests, breaking laws and acting against the accepted norms can be examples of this form of resistance (Thompson 116). On the other hand, aesthetic of existence refers to the resistances that utilize the power system strategies’ weak points in order to make a breach in the totality of power system:

An “aesthetics of existence” means then that just as any technician, artisan, or artist, always crafts a new work under the guidance of critical scrutiny, examining what has been achieved thus far, recalling the rules of the art itself, and comparing the former against the latter. So are we, for Foucault, to fashion new sorts of non-fascistic subjectivities, working under the direction. (Thompson 124-25)

In Foucauldian view, tactical reversal sprung from the idea that conflict is inherent in power relations; therefore, a particular form of power and knowledge can be shattered by reversing the power mechanism (Thompson 116):

Foucault rejected the model of tactical reversal because it is predicated on a conception of power that he judged to be insufficient on both historical and conceptual grounds…the shift to the model of
the “care of the self” occurred because it enabled Foucault to get at the subtle mechanisms of power and because it accorded the concept of autonomy what he believed was its historically central role in resistance. (Thompson 114-15)

Accordingly, Foucault rejects tactical reversal because it is not conceptually in consistency with power, which consequently results in harsh punishments. Thus, Foucault shifts to the care of the self, which is aesthetics of existence, because it is more in synchronization with the concept of disciplinary power.

1.4 Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- To examine the selected characters’ entanglement in the disciplinary power system of their society and their different reactions to the states quo.
- To explore the concepts of madness and the madman as reflected by the characters of the selected texts.
- To discover how the authors portray the selected characters’ resistance to the pressures of disciplinary power imposed on them.

1.5 Research Questions

The following are the research questions:

- How is the society’s disciplinary power projected in the characters of the selected texts?
- How are the characters’ madness portrayed in relation to society’s disciplinary power?
- How are the characters’ resistance presented in relation to their madness and society’s disciplinary power?

1.6 Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to Salinger’s The Catcher in the Rye (1951), Kerouac’s On the Road (1957), and John Barth’s The End of the Road (1958) and aims to examine how social pressures and power relations impact the members of the society as well as to understand how it can turn the non-conformists into madmen and abnormal figures. I also limit this study to the selected male characters of the selected texts only and none of the female characters. Furthermore, I limit this study to just exploring the concepts of madness, power and resistance through sociological analysis. To accomplish this goal, I use Michel Foucault’s concepts of madness, power and resistance, especially the concepts of disciplinary and psychiatric power. Therefore, other concepts and theories presented by Foucault are beyond the limitations of this study and they will not be discussed here. Finally, this study is primarily limited to analysing the concepts of madness, power and resistance philosophically and not psychologically.
1.7 Justification of the Texts Selection

This study analyses selected American novels of the 1950s, namely Jeremy David Salinger’s (1919-2010) *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951), Jack Kerouac’s (1922-1969) *On the Road* (1957), and John Simmons Barth’s (b. 1930) *The End of the Road* (1958). These novels are most appropriate to my aim of examining the triangular relationship between the concepts of madness, power and resistance as well as the disciplinary society’s pressures of conformity. I have chosen these novels because each of them reflects the characters’ madness in relation to society’s disciplinary power system and their resistance to it. The selected authors are then chosen from one decade and one country in order to give a unified view of the characters’ situation in a disciplinary system. There are other texts written in the 1950s that criticizes the pressures of society and its cultural codes on the subjects as well. Texts such as Ralph Ellison’s (1914-1994) *The Invisible Man* (1952) emphasizes the society’s cultural code of superiority of the white people over the black people, and Sloan Wilson’s (1920-2003) *The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit* (1955) scorns the loss of individuality in a conformed society. Additionally, writers such as Joseph Heller (1923-1999), Hubert Selby (1928-2004) and Chester Himes (1909-1984), amongst others, present the concept of madness in their texts by the failure of the characters to adhere to the society’s cultural codes.

*The Catcher in the Rye*, with Holden Caulfield as its protagonist, portrays a picture of the American culture in the 1950s where Holden’s madness, as a result of his resistance to the cultural stereotypes of his society, can be well justified through Foucault’s concepts of madness, power, and resistance. Holden is a teenager whose ideals and demands are different from the rest of his society and he has the courage to express his ideas and display his dislikes. Thus, he is considered as a non-conformist student, a characteristic that is considered a big flaw because the 1950s in America is the decade of conformity. Society then regards Holden a madman and confines him in an asylum to be cured and normalized. Here, the concept of madness and the characters’ anti-social behaviours exist in almost all of Salinger’s works. However, the importance of *The Catcher in the Rye* for my study lies in Salinger’s powerful challenge of the cultural stereotypes of that decade and the way he depicts Holden’s strategy of resistance that immortalizes his individuality.

For my second novel, I have selected *On the Road* by Jack Kerouac since Kerouac is recognized as the key figure in the Beat Generation, who gives a new identity to the American society of the 1950s. There are other Kerouac’s contemporary Beat writers such as Allen Ginsberg (1926-1997) and William Burroughs (1914-1997); nevertheless, Ginsberg’s works are poetry, which deviates from the scope of this study whilst Burroughs’ works are not compatible with the aim of this study, which is exploring the triangular relationship between madness, power and resistance. Hence, I preferably select Kerouac’s *On the Road* rather than his other works and other Beat writers’ texts because *On the Road* presents a new concept of madness that opposes the commonly accepted definition of madness. It is through this new concept of madness that Kerouac challenges the society’s demands of conformity to its cultural codes. Moreover, research shows that none of Kerouac’s other writings had similar influence like *On the Road* has on the youth culture of the decade:
Generations of American youth have, in imitation of Kerouac (knowingly or not), taken to the road with a backpack, hitching across the continent, often adopting the novel’s antic (if not frantic) mood… *On the Road* altered, and expanded, the consciousness of countless Americans, even when they didn’t know it. (Parini 295)

Likewise, it is explained that how youths dress up like Kerouac, in their casual shirts and chinos, and although they might not have read *On the Road*, they try to imitate Kerouac’s vision of a Beat life by sleeping on the road, zigzagging across America in rental cars, and living in cheap motels (Sayers 11). Therefore, Kerouac’s protagonists resist conforming to their society’s norms and they propagate their resistance through their mad behaviours.

Finally, for my third novel, I have selected *The End of the Road* by John Barth because it also portrays the concept of madness, power and resistance for my third novel. Barth started his literary career at the end of the decade and just two of his novels have been published in the 1950s, which are *Floating Opera* and *The End of the Road*. Both novels follow almost the same theme but, for the purpose of this study, I have chosen *The End of the Road* because of its characterization and relation to psychiatric power. In this novel, Barth tries to reveal the power of psychiatry in shaping individuals to be beneficial to the totality of society. Jacob Horner and Joe Morgan are related through the society’s disciplinary power where each has his own position in the network of power. Therefore, the concepts of madness, power and resistance depicted in the narration make it expedient for the purpose of this study.

What all these three novels have in common is the characters’ relationship with their society. All the characters are stranded between their own ideologies and the established norms and they are adrift in a world of dazzlement and perplexity. Salinger, Kerouac and Barth have created characters that are under constant pressure of the society’s disciplinary power and each are labelled mad and abnormal in one way or another. These characters reflect differently to the homogenizing pressures of their respective societies. However, all of them endeavour to liberate themselves and manifest their own ideology via their own unique way of resistance: in *The Catcher in the Rye*, Holden Caulfield resists submitting to the school’s rules; while *On the Road*, Sal and Dean resist submitting to their society’s cultural codes; whereas in *The End the Road*, Joe and Jake resist submitting to the disciplinary power system. Correspondingly, I have chosen Holden Caulfield as the representative for the adolescents, Sal and Dean for the youth group, and Jake and Joe for the mature adults in order to have a wider perspective of the conditions of the men in the 1950s.

### 1.8 Significance of the Study

The primary objective of my study is to establish the triangular relationship between Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance from analysing the characters of the selected texts. The subject of my study and the theoretical frame work I use are attempts to provide more understanding on the society’s disciplinary power pressures on individual subjects who resist submitting to the social norms. So far, my study
reveals that researches conducted on the selected texts still lack the proper analysis with regards to the concepts of power, madness, and resistance. The three selected novels of this period also share a common concern pertaining to a new conceptualization of how a disciplinary society looks at madness, in general, and mad people, in particular. The significance of my study is that the writers of the selected texts present the concept of madness, in relation to disciplinary power, as resistance to the cultural codes of the decade. Therefore, I hypothesize that in the selected texts, we deal with a triangular relationship between madness, power and resistance - a point that has never been mentioned by scholars who have analyzed the selected texts thus far.

In addition, research shows that the previous studies on the selected texts only focused their attentions on Holden’s madness in *The Catcher in the Rye* but did not mention the characters’ madness in *On the Road* and *The End of the Road*. Not only that, Holden’s madness has been limitedly studied within the Foucauldian framework of madness, power and resistance because all previous studies only analyzed his madness psychologically. Consequently, this study aims to examine the characters’ entanglement with their society’s disciplinary power from which they attempt to find a way to freedom. Thus, they present different reactions to their society’s disciplinary pressures. Finally, I will discuss the writers of the selected texts’ presentations of the characters’ madness in order to establish their resistance to society’s disciplinary pressures where different characters use different strategies to resist their respective society’s disciplinary power.

As I have stated earlier, Foucault is the only philosopher who defines madness in relation to the concepts of power and resistance. More importantly, Foucault is the only thinker who believes that the concepts of madness and sanity are a result of a social construct and are created by disciplinary society to eliminate resistant individuals. Therefore, I intend to analyze the selected texts through Foucauldian lens since it provides a fitting ground for scrutinizing the selected characters’ madness in connection to their resistance to society’s disciplinary power.

### 1.9 Definition of the Terms and Concepts

#### 1.9.1 Madness

In my study, the concept of madness and the madman are used interchangeably because they are utilized as such in the selected novels as well as in Foucauldian views. Madness, in this study, is defined as anomie, a sociological lunacy that refers to individuals who are rejected from society because of their differences. However, Foucault believes that madness and sanity are a social construct and the disciplinary power of society created this concept of madness in order to confine the deviants. Therefore, Foucault defines the madman as the one who breaks the conformity that education, good behaviour, and social convention introduce. The presence of a madman in the society shakes everything up and he restores to everyone a portion of their natural identity. In fact, the madman reveals who is good and he unmasks scoundrels (*History of Madness* 346).
1.9.2 Power

Power is another key concept of this study and it refers to the society’s pressures in normalizing the individuals. For this study, I use Foucauldian concepts of both disciplinary and psychiatric power. Foucault defines disciplinary power as a system of panoptic panopticism which establishes norms as the principle of division and normalization (Psychiatric Power 55).

Therefore, disciplinary power is a discreet power which, by creating norms and homogenizing society, expels resistant individuals as outsiders of the society. On the other hand, Foucault defines psychiatric power as a normalizing power, which function is to naturalize the individuals who are segregated by the disciplinary power. Foucault states that the authority inside the asylum has unlimited power which nothing can resist. This authority functions as the source of power and it is obviously a medical authority which functions as power before it functions as knowledge (Psychiatric Power 3).

1.9.3 Resistance

Resistance in this study denotes the subjects’ reactions to the imposing pressures of power. Here, Foucault defines two forms of resistance. One is named tactical reversal, which means the form of resistance that is spontaneous and that can make a break in a power system instantly. Street protests, law breaking, and acting out against the accepted norms are examples of this kind of resistance (Thompson 116). The other type of resistance is called aesthetics of existence, which alludes to the resistances that utilize the power system strategies’ weak points to breach the totality of the power system. Foucault argues that “aesthetics of existence” is a form of resistance that belongs to men of art who always crafts a new work under the guidance of critical scrutiny to modify the norms (Thompson 124-25).

1.10 Methodology

This study aims to discover the triangulation of madness, power and resistance in selected American novels written in the 1950s, namely The Catcher in the Rye (1951) by J. D. Salinger, On the Road (1957) by Jack Kerouac, and The End of the Road (1958) by John Barth through contextual and character analyses. However, it is worth to explore other American texts of the 1950s that have been studied based on the Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance. My research shows that there are limited American texts of the 1950s that were analyzed based on Foucauldian views of madness, power and resistance. For example, Eichelberger in Prophets of Recognition (1999) analyzes the concept of power in Invisible Man (1952) by Ellison and Seize the Day (1956) by Bellow, whereas Pepper in “State Power Matters” (2005) analyzes Naked Lunch (1959) by Burroughs based on the Foucauldian concepts of power and resistance.
Eichelberger contends that Foucault in *Power/Knowledge* (1980) presents the individual as the effect and the vehicle of power (7); hence, the same idea can be traced in the characterization of the protagonists in *Invisible Man* and *Seize the Day*. He continues that in the society of *Invisible Man*, concepts of racism and oppression have become part of the accepted norms, and even though Ellison’s narrator is aware of their inconsistency, he accepts them as the inevitable society’s cultural codes (8). Hence, Eichelberger suggests that African-Americans’ consent to society’s culture of racism makes it clear that culture has the power to shape an individual’s consciousness (8). Likewise, Eichelberger follows the same trait in *Seize the Day* in which she posits the view that the power of the norms leads people to organize their life based on society’s privileges and not for their own benefits. On the other hand, Pepper analyzes Burrough’s *Naked Lunch* with regards to Foucault’s concepts of power and resistance. Here, Pepper affirms that the power which is portrayed in the text has a web-like network and it is exercised by numerous figures (476). In Pepper’s view, the concept of power is always favored over the concept of resistance; thus, *Naked Lunch* lacks the strategy of resistance to society’s imposing power (478).

Accordingly, this study employs literary conceptual and character analysis with a close reading of Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*, Jack Kerouac’s *On the Road* and John Barth’s *The End of the Road*. Findings from the analysis of these selected texts, with examples extracted from the novels as evidences, will be used to clarify the manner in which the characters react to the concept of Foucauldian power presented in the texts. As I will discuss in Chapter Two, the selected novels have not been truly analysed according to selected Foucauldian concepts; therefore, this study stresses on the necessity of conducting such conceptual analysis on the texts. Heading towards this aim, I will use the concepts of madness, power and resistance advocated by Michel Foucault as the analytical tool. I will also focus on these concepts as conveyed in *History of Sexuality* (1978), *Power/Knowledge* (1980), *Discipline and Punish* (1995), *History of Madness* (2006) and *Psychiatric Power* (2006). Through close reading of the texts, I will look carefully at what the characters say and do in order to uncover the problems in their lives as subjects of a disciplinary system. Since each character reacts differently to the imposed power, different modes of madness appear in the selected texts and, consequently, different strategies of resistance are used.

Subsequently, I attempt to visualize a relationship between the concepts of madness, power and resistance based on the selected texts’ analyses. The writers of the selected novels, by depicting the protagonists in defiance of the social norms and dominant ideology, attempt to unravel the truth behind the prevalent dogma for the readers in order to coax them to scrutinize the norms more critically.

Characters of the selected texts may be seen having a revolutionary potential of changing the static conformity of their society by presenting their individual self in resistance to society’s disciplinary power. This individual self allows them to evade the restrictiveness of the disciplinary logic, and, at the same time, threatens them with an imposed madness. Each character of the selected text responds to society’s imposed madness in different ways and thus they present different strategies to confront it.
In this light, the present study attempts to explore Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance to provide further understanding of the characters’ madness and resistance to society’s disciplinary power system. The exploration of madness in the selected texts is based on the characters’ resistance to accept society’s disciplinary power which tries to homogenize them towards conformity to social norms. This madness, which varies in each selected text, originates from their constant resistance to accept social and cultural codes created by society’s disciplinary power system.

For this reason, I will argue that, since each character of the selected texts responds differently to society’s pressures of disciplinary power, we can observe different modes of madness and resistance. Thus, Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance may find different relations in different contexts. Based on close reading the texts and contextual and character analyses, I will argue that the selected texts create a triangular relationship between Foucauldian concepts of madness, power and resistance through different depictions of contexts by the respective authors.

1.11 The Structure of the Thesis

This study has seven chapters including the Introduction section as Chapter One. Chapter One begins with a brief overview of the history of the concept of madness in philosophy. Then, the purpose, significance and limitations of the study are explained. Additionally, an introduction to the theoretical framework that will be used as the analytical tool is also presented in this chapter. Chapter Two begins with an overview of the American history in the 1950s together with its literature and major themes. Furthermore, short biographies of the selected writers with corresponding literature review of the previous studies on the selected texts are included. A review on Michel Foucault’s works as well as the theoretical framework based on his concepts of power, madness and resistance are discussed further in Chapter Three. Chapter Four presents the analysis of the selected texts based on Foucauldian concept of power. Chapter Five focuses on the analysis of the selected texts with emphasis on Foucauldian concept of madness. And Chapter Six is the analysis of the selected texts with regards to Foucauldian concept of resistance. Chapter Seven, which is the last chapter, gives an entire account of the whole thesis and consists of the conclusion of the study. In this chapter, guided by the research questions, I will address the objectives and discuss their answers in order to bring forward the conclusion of the main points presented in the research.
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