www.TLHjournal.com Literary Herald ISSN: 2454-3365
An International Refereed/Peer-reviewed English e-Journal
Impact Factor: 6.292 (SJIF)

Insanity as Insurgence: Reading Literary Madness and the Politics of Resistance in Select Texts

Veenita Rai
Research Scholar
Dept. of English and Modern European Languages
University of Lucknow

Abstract

This paper explores the intersection of madness and political resistance in literary representations of psychological breakdown, focusing on Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. Drawing on Michel Foucault's theory of madness as a socio-historical construct and R.D. Laing's anti-psychiatry framework, the paper argues that madness, far from being merely pathological, is often a form of ethical and existential insurgency. Both texts feature protagonists whose perceived psychological disturbances are symptomatic of a deeper alienation from dominant cultural norms-be it the institutionalization of conformity through psychiatric control in Kesey's work, or the existential and moral disaffection with postwar consumer culture in Salinger's.

Rather than treating madness as an aberration to be cured, these texts represent it as a response to an oppressive order-one that silences dissent, marginalizes deviance and pathologizes non-normative subjectivity. By reading the protagonists' descent into mental distress as symbolic refusals to integrate into the systems that oppress them, the paper situates madness within a broader political discourse. Utilizing psychoanalytic and poststructuralist theory, the study reveals how Kesey and Salinger construct narratives of madness that challenge not only medical authority but also the ideological underpinnings of modern Western rationality. In doing so, these texts position madness as a space of critical resistance-where breakdown becomes breakthrough and pathology a form of protest.

Keywords: Madness, Resistance, Narratives, Deviance, Pathologize.

Introduction: Madness as the Language of Dissent

Madness, as a conceptual category, is never ideologically neutral. It is a historically contingent discourse that operates not only within the parameters of medicine but also within those of power, knowledge and social order. In Western intellectual history, particularly since the

Enlightenment, reason has been elevated as the foundational virtue of the modern subject, while madness has been exiled to the margins as its irrational, incomprehensible other. This binary-rational versus irrational, sane versus insane-has justified various mechanisms of social exclusion, from psychiatric institutions to cultural stigmatization. Yet, within literature, madness often re-emerges not as a sign of failure or deficiency, but as a potent mode of resistance. It becomes the language through which marginalized or dissenting subjectivities articulate their refusal to comply with hegemonic norms. This paper is concerned with literary madness as insurgent discourse-as a form of symbolic warfare against systems of normalization. Drawing on Michel Foucault's *Madness and Civilization* and the anti-psychiatric interventions of R.D. Laing, the argument advanced here is that representations of madness in certain twentieth-century literary texts do not simply mirror individual psychological disorders, but rather index a structural crisis in the production of subjectivity. Madness, in these contexts, can be understood as a politically charged space where resistance is not only possible but inevitable. The postwar period in America-marked by the expansion of technocratic institutions, the rise of consumer capitalism and the entrenchment of Cold War anxieties-saw a corresponding shift in the cultural imagination. Writers, artists and intellectuals began to probe the costs of such systemic conformity. Amid this backdrop, literature served as a site for countercultural critique, questioning the legitimacy of dominant ideologies and the systems that enforced them, including psychiatry. In this cultural moment, madness came to signify not merely the breakdown of the individual, but the failure of the social order to accommodate dissent and complexity.

To theorize literary madness as a mode of resistance is to engage with what Foucault called the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges"-those epistemologies and lived realities that have been disqualified by dominant narratives of reason. When read through this lens, the "insane" character is not an aberration but a subversive figure, one who refuses the psychic and social conditions of normalization. This framing resituates madness from a clinical symptom to a cultural metaphor: a disruptive voice that challenges the architecture of the symbolic order. The paper examines two emblematic texts of this literary and ideological project: Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. While differing in tone, setting and structure, both novels interrogate the disciplinary forces of modernity through protagonists whose mental instability becomes a critique of the world they inhabit. In each case, madness resists reduction to a psychological label. It becomes, instead, a complex signifier of political dissent, existential crisis and moral clarity. In the sections that follow, I will first outline the theoretical scaffolding necessary to approach madness as a site of contestation-drawing on Foucault, Laing and Kristeva. Thereafter, I will turn to a close reading of the two primary texts, analyzing how Kesey and Salinger deploy narrative form, voice and setting to construct madness not as failure, but as a form of knowing-a counter-discourse to the hegemonies of psychiatry, capitalism and rationality. In doing so, this paper reclaims literary madness as a space of epistemological rupture, ethical interrogation and insurgent potential.

Theoretical Framework: Madness, Discipline and the Construction of Deviance

To understand madness as a form of literary and political resistance, it is necessary to ground the discussion in critical theories that interrogate the historical, philosophical and discursive constructions of mental illness. Rather than viewing madness as a universal or transhistorical reality, scholars such as Michel Foucault and R.D. Laing have argued that it is shaped by the social forces, institutional structures and cultural anxieties of its time. These thinkers, along with psychoanalytic and feminist critics like Julia Kristeva and Elaine Showalter, offer insights into how madness functions not merely as pathology but as a deeply political and symbolic category. This section draws on these frameworks to position madness as a narrative device through which literature exposes the mechanics of repression, marginalization and normativity.

In *Madness and Civilization* (1961), Michel Foucault provides a genealogical account of how madness has been historically produced as a category of exclusion. He traces the evolution of attitudes toward madness from the Renaissance, when the mad were perceived as bearers of divine insight or cosmic truth, to the Enlightenment, where reason became the sole arbiter of human legitimacy and madness was confined-both physically and ideologically. According to Foucault, the rise of reason in modern Western thought necessitated the silencing of its other: "The language of psychiatry… is a monologue of reason about madness" (Foucault 229). In this framework, the mad are not simply irrational but are rendered unintelligible within the dominant epistemic regime. Crucially, Foucault situates the emergence of psychiatric institutions within the broader disciplinary apparatus of the modern state. These institutions are not spaces of healing but of surveillance, normalization and control. The asylum, like the prison and the school, becomes a mechanism for producing docile bodies and obedient minds. Thus, madness is not simply a psychological condition but a cultural function-a label affixed to those who threaten the social and symbolic order. This insight is particularly relevant to Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, in which the psychiatric ward is a panoptic microcosm of institutional authority and the diagnosis of madness becomes a pretext for erasing dissent.

Building on and diverging from, Foucault's genealogical critique, R.D. Laing-one of the central figures of the anti-psychiatry movement-argued in *The Divided Self* (1960) and *The Politics of Experience* (1967) that what psychiatry calls "mental illness" is often a legitimate response to a pathological world. For Laing, madness is not necessarily a breakdown but a breakthrough-a desperate attempt to reclaim one's selfhood in a context that has denied or fragmented it. He writes: "We are bemused and crazed creatures, strangers to our true selves, to one another and to the spiritual and material world" (*Politics* 12). In this view, the experience of schizophrenia, depression, or psychosis may be forms of existential protest, rather than clinical errors to be fixed. Laing's work challenges the medical model of mental illness by emphasizing its relational and existential dimensions. He saw modern society as alienating, depersonalizing and repressive and understood madness as a form of ontological rebellion-a refusal to accept the alienation imposed by family systems, social expectations and institutional norms. This understanding allows for a more sympathetic and politically conscious reading of characters like Holden Caulfield, whose disorientation and defiance can be read not as juvenile dysfunction but as an intuitive critique of a world that has lost its ethical and spiritual coherence.

Julia Kristeva's *Powers of Horror* (1982) offers yet another way to read madness, particularly in its relationship to language, identity and the symbolic order. Drawing on Lacanian psychoanalysis, Kristeva theorizes the abject as that which exists on the margins of meaning-neither subject nor object, the abject disrupts the symbolic order by exposing its limits. Madness, in her schema, is a confrontation with this abjection-a return of what must be expelled to maintain the illusion of stable identity and social coherence. For Kristeva, the madwoman (or madman) embodies a liminal position, threatening to unravel the boundaries between self and other, sanity and insanity, speech and silence. This concept is particularly illuminating when applied to literary figures whose incoherence, fragmentation, or silence becomes a form of critique. In both *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *The Catcher in the Rye*, narrative voice plays a central role in revealing how madness manifests as an affective and linguistic rupture-a refusal to speak in the language of power.

These theoretical frameworks share a common concern with the mechanisms through which deviance is constructed and contained in modern societies. Whether through the diagnostic categories of psychiatry, the disciplinary functions of institutions, or the symbolic boundaries of language, madness is continually produced as a problem to be managed. Yet literature often subverts this production, portraying mad characters not as anomalies but as canaries in the coal mine-figures who perceive and articulate truths that the dominant order refuses to acknowledge. In the literary tradition, madness has long served as a means of speaking the unspeakable-from Shakespeare's Lear and Ophelia to Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov and Woolf's Septimus Smith. What unites these characters is not simply their psychological distress but the ways in which their madness becomes a lens through which the social world is rendered strange, violent, or absurd. In this tradition, Kesey's McMurphy and Salinger's Holden Caulfield emerge as insurgent figures whose breakdowns are simultaneously acts of political resistance. Thus, to approach madness as insurgency is to reject its pathologization and to affirm its disruptive potential. It is to see in the "insane" subject a form of counter-hegemony-a challenge to the structures of knowledge, power and identity that define and delimit human experience. The next sections of this paper will demonstrate how these theoretical insights play out in two literary texts that reimagine madness not as failure but as a force of resistance.

Madness and Masculinity in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*

Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962) is a novel situated at the ideological crossroads of madness, masculinity and institutional control. Set in a psychiatric hospital, the novel uses the trope of the asylum not as a medical sanctuary, but as a dystopian metaphor for social regulation, mechanized conformity and the emasculation of deviant subjectivity. Madness in this novel is not only a clinical label but a cultural code for rebellion. The psychiatric hospital, headed by the cold and calculating Nurse Ratched, becomes a disciplinary regime aimed at producing compliant, desexualized and docile bodies. In contrast, Randle Patrick McMurphy's arrival marks the intrusion of a distinctly insurgent masculinity-playful, sexual, performative and ultimately subversive. His trajectory within the narrative dramatizes the tension between

authoritarian systems and anarchic vitality and his fate invites complex reflection on the cost of resistance within institutional structures.

The central irony in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* is that the hospital, ostensibly a space for healing, functions as an apparatus of oppression. Nurse Ratched, who symbolizes the institution, uses psychiatric language and bureaucratic routines to control and manipulate the patients. She creates an atmosphere of guilt and surveillance, reducing adult men into infantilized dependents. Through Chief Bromden's narration, the ward is described as part of a "Combine," a vast machinery of social control that reduces individuals to interchangeable parts: "The ward is a factory for the Combine. It's for fixing up mistakes made in the neighborhoods and in the schools and in the churches" (Kesey 40). In this context, the diagnosis of madness becomes a rhetorical tool of containment, pathologizing dissent and criminalizing nonconformity. Drawing from Foucault, the hospital operates as a microcosm of the carceral society, where power functions through surveillance and categorization. McMurphy, whose placement in the hospital stems from manipulative self-interest rather than psychological breakdown, quickly realizes that sanity and insanity are not objective conditions but political categories. His spiritedness, laughter and sexuality mark him as a threat to a system that demands uniformity, obedience and self-effacement.

McMurphy's insurgency is deeply gendered. From his entrance into the ward-boisterous, irreverent and sexually provocative-he reintroduces masculine agency into a space that has been rendered sterile by Nurse Ratched's feminized authority. He tells jokes, gambles, sings and tells tales of conquest and defiance. More than just a character, McMurphy becomes a performative spectacle of unruly masculinity. He insists on his right to pleasure, expression and risk, all of which are deemed pathological by the institutional order. Through McMurphy, Kesey appears to critique not only the psychiatric establishment but also postwar American ideals of domesticity, productivity and emotional repression. This reading finds support in Laing's view of madness as a revolt against an inauthentic social world. For Laing, "Madness need not be all breakdown. It may also be break-through" (*Politics of Experience* 106). McMurphy's madness-or, more precisely, his role as a labeled madman-allows him to stage an ontological rebellion. He is not seeking a cure, but liberation-from a society that punishes emotional excess, sexual energy and non-normative thought. Moreover, McMurphy's challenge is not abstract; it is targeted. He directly contests the power of Nurse Ratched, whom he views as a mechanical enforcer of the Combine. Their battle is one of embodied politics-her authority is manifested through cold discipline, while his rebellion is physical, loud and humorous. He calls her a "ball-cutter," a term that literalizes her symbolic castration of male autonomy. The narrative thus constructs a clear dichotomy between masculine resistance and institutional-feminine repression, a problematic binary that has attracted feminist critique, but which nonetheless foregrounds madness as a gendered contest for power.

Interestingly, McMurphy's madness is not only oppositional; it is generative. His presence catalyzes transformation among the other patients. Billy Bibbit begins to assert himself; Harding speaks openly about his sexuality; Chief Bromden finds his voice. In this way, madness becomes

contagious-not as a disease, but as a form of insurgent energy. McMurphy's refusal to internalize shame, to be silenced, or to submit to institutional logic has a therapeutic effect on others. He creates a temporary counter-space within the ward where joy, agency and mutual solidarity become possible. This communal aspect of madness resonates with Kristeva's notion of the abject-that which is expelled from the symbolic order but nevertheless returns to haunt it. The patients, previously rendered abject by society, begin to reassert their subjectivity through acts of speech, laughter and resistance. The boat trip, orchestrated by McMurphy, stands as a ritual of reclamation, where the patients encounter a world outside institutional surveillance and rediscover their embodied selves.

Yet Kesey does not offer a utopian vision. The institution responds to McMurphy's insurgency with increasing violence. He is subjected to electroshock therapy and eventually, a lobotomy-literally silencing his mind and body. This denouement starkly underscores Foucault's thesis that madness is controlled through the silencing of the body, a process in which psychiatry becomes indistinguishable from punishment. And yet, in a final act of symbolic triumph, Chief Bromden smothers McMurphy's inert body and escapes-suggesting that while the system can annihilate the body, it cannot extinguish the idea of rebellion. McMurphy thus becomes a Christ-like figure, whose suffering redeems others. His madness, far from being a personal failure, becomes a collective awakening. In Bromden's words, McMurphy "ain't no loony. He's a man" (Kesey 250). The implication is profound: to be a man, to be fully human, is to resist dehumanization-even at the cost of one's life. In a world where sanity is defined by submission, madness emerges as a site of moral clarity.

Holden Caulfield and the Adolescent Politics of Refusal in *The Catcher in the Rye*

J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) offers a more interior, less institutional portrayal of madness, yet one no less entangled with the mechanisms of social power and conformity. Unlike the overt disciplinary space of the psychiatric hospital in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, Salinger's narrative unfolds in the diffuse, invisible architecture of postwar American life, where consumerism, professionalization and moral duplicity constitute the ideological terrain. Holden Caulfield, Salinger's sixteen-year-old narrator, does not encounter formal psychiatric control until the margins of the text-where his confinement in a mental facility is implied-but he constantly negotiates a society that pathologizes difference, aesthetic sensitivity and emotional intensity. His breakdown, while deeply personal and affective, is not a retreat from reality but a refusal to assimilate into a world he perceives as disingenuous, alienating and ethically hollow. Holden's madness is an adolescent insurgency, a politically charged expression of existential disobedience.

Holden's rebellion is rooted in his relentless invocation of the term "phony," a word that recurs over thirty times throughout the novel. Though critics have often dismissed this as juvenile petulance, the term operates as a profound moral indictment of a society that privileges appearance over authenticity, consumption over connection and institutional success over inner truth. As he wanders through New York City-refusing to return to his prep school, avoiding

contact with his parents, oscillating between adult settings and childlike fantasies-Holden performs a ritual of non-belonging. He is not mentally ill in the clinical sense, but he occupies a liminal space between adolescence and adulthood, desire and despair, speech and silence. Salinger's narrative structure reinforces this sense of marginality. The novel is framed as a retrospective confession from within an institutional space, yet the reader is never granted full access to that setting. Instead, Holden's voice-unreliable, digressive and emotionally raw-becomes the medium through which madness is both represented and resisted. Drawing on Julia Kristeva's theory of the abject, Holden can be read as a figure who hovers on the threshold of intelligibility. He is expelled from multiple schools, avoids sexual contact, refuses upward mobility and is repulsed by adult sexuality and hypocrisy. He inhabits the cultural and psychological "borderline" that Kristeva associates with the abject subject-one who exposes the limits of social normativity and the symbolic order.

In Holden's case, madness is less a breakdown than a withholding-a refusal to perform the roles scripted for him by capitalist society. He mocks career ambition, scoffs at institutional education and withdraws from social relations. His desire to be the "catcher in the rye," saving children from falling into the "phony" adult world, is a fantasy of suspended innocence-a metaphor for preserving authenticity in a world that rewards its erasure. The rye field is not just a pastoral dream; it is a utopian alternative to a society driven by commodification and instrumental rationality. Holden's journey can also be interpreted through R.D. Laing's existential psychiatry, which emphasizes that mental disturbance often emerges as a coherent protest against an incoherent world. Laing writes: "The condition of alienation, of being asleep, of being unconscious, of being out of one's mind, is the condition of the normal man" (*The Politics of Experience* 24). By this logic, Holden's estrangement is not pathological but revelatory. He is, paradoxically, more sane because he perceives the madness embedded in social life. His constant questioning, affective instability and rejection of social norms mark him as a seer in crisis-one who intuits the loss of meaning beneath the polished surface of postwar affluence.

Holden's voice, while central to the novel's impact, is also fractured and paradoxical. He is verbose but inarticulate, expressive but evasive. His language frequently loops back on itself-"if you really want to hear about it…"-as if resisting narrative closure. This resistance can be interpreted as a literary enactment of what Foucault describes as the "disqualified knowledge" of the mad: a form of truth that cannot be accommodated within normative discourse. Holden's voice interrupts the language of adult authority and replaces it with a minor literature-intimate, idiosyncratic and opaque. This narrative style mirrors what psychoanalyst D.W. Winnicott termed the "true self"-a self that resists adaptation, refuses false compliance and risks incoherence in order to preserve authenticity. Holden's inability to articulate his pain fully, or to engage in structured therapeutic dialogue, does not render his suffering illegible; rather, it makes legible the very failures of institutional language to accommodate complex inner lives. His silence about his brother Allie's death, his horror at the sexual advances of Mr. Antolini and his longing for Phoebe's innocence all point to a crisis of language-where trauma can be neither spoken nor forgotten.

The ethical core of Holden's madness becomes clear in his relationship with Phoebe. When she appears in the final third of the novel, Phoebe becomes a mirror of Holden's yearning for purity and emotional truth. Their conversation in the museum and later at the carousel, serves as a symbolic reclamation of meaning in a world bereft of it. For a moment, Holden's spiral of alienation pauses-not because he has been cured, but because he has found a fleeting connection that validates his resistance. Holden's desire to protect innocence is not regressive but prophetic. It gestures toward a moral sensibility that recognizes the violence of socialization and seeks alternatives. His madness, in this light, is an ethical stance: he refuses to become what he hates. In resisting adulthood, he is also resisting instrumental rationality, emotional repression and systemic hypocrisy. His exile is voluntary, his breakdown a pilgrimage through the moral ruins of his society. Thus, Holden Caulfield embodies a non-institutionalized form of madness-a quiet but forceful refusal to collude with the mechanisms that produce "normal" subjectivity. He does not fight the system directly, as McMurphy does, but his psychic disintegration becomes a passive act of subversion. He is the seer-madman, the adolescent mystic, whose pain is both a critique and a consequence of a society that no longer makes sense.

Conclusion: Subversive Consciousness and the Ethics of Madness

In a world governed by the imperatives of conformity, efficiency and order, madness emerges as a rupture-a tear in the social fabric that exposes the operations of power and the fragility of reason. As this paper has demonstrated through a close reading of Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, madness is not merely a clinical condition or psychological dysfunction. It is, rather, a symbolic and political discourse-a space in which subjects articulate their estrangement from and resistance to, dominant norms. The madman, far from being a passive victim, becomes an active figure of dissent, whose suffering reveals the violence inherent in systems of normalization. In Kesey's work, McMurphy's descent into institutional madness stages a masculine, embodied rebellion against the disciplinary structures of modern psychiatric control. His charisma, sexuality and humor destabilize the ward's regime of silence and repression. His eventual lobotomy underscores the brutal lengths to which institutions will go to neutralize threats to their authority. And yet, the novel's final gesture-Chief Bromden's escape-reconfigures McMurphy's defeat as a moral victory. The madman becomes a martyr, a sacrificial figure whose defiance awakens others. Kesey thus constructs madness as insurgent subjectivity, one that resists the medicalization of non-conformity and reclaims the right to disorder, spontaneity and ethical revolt. In contrast, Salinger's Holden Caulfield enacts a quieter, more existential resistance. His madness takes the form of affective estrangement-a refusal to speak the language of capitalist adulthood, to participate in the rituals of phony social life, or to bury trauma beneath conventional narratives. Holden's disjointed voice, cynical perceptions and deep emotional attachments destabilize the very notion of psychological health. What Salinger offers is a portrait of madness that is introspective and lyrical, where breakdown becomes a testament to the soul's unwillingness to normalize loss, grief and alienation. Holden's madness is the cost of remaining authentic in a world that rewards betrayal of self. In this sense, he occupies a similar position to McMurphy: a reluctant rebel whose deviance is less a choice than an inevitability in a disenchanted world.

What unites these texts is their shared investment in portraying madness not as a personal flaw but as a form of knowledge-as a counter-epistemology that challenges the regime of reason, productivity and normative citizenship. Drawing from Foucault, Laing and Kristeva, we can understand these protagonists as occupying positions of epistemic and social abjection. They are abjected not because they are irrational, but because they reveal too much: the irrationality of the rational order, the violence beneath therapeutic care, the emptiness at the heart of postwar prosperity. Their marginality is imposed, but it also becomes a site of vision-a space from which to imagine other modes of being. The implications of this reading are significant for both literary and cultural studies. First, it suggests that literary depictions of madness must be read through the prism of power-not merely as representations of mental states, but as critiques of the forces that define, regulate and marginalize those states. Second, it challenges the boundaries between health and illness, normality and deviance, suggesting that these categories are fluid, constructed and often complicit in the maintenance of oppressive structures. And finally, it affirms literature as a space where madness can speak-where the silenced can find voice, the irrational can narrate and the excluded can claim meaning. In reclaiming madness as insurgency, these texts do not romanticize mental illness. Rather, they insist that we look beyond the clinical gaze to see the politics of psychic pain. They invite us to recognize that sometimes, to break down is to resist; to unravel is to refuse; and to go mad is, paradoxically, to stay human in a world that demands inhuman adaptations. In this sense, madness becomes a moral and political act-a refusal to be well-adjusted to a profoundly sick society.

Works Cited

Bloom, Harold, editor. *J.D. Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye: Modern Critical Interpretations*. Chelsea House, 2000.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane, University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Translated by Richard Howard, Vintage Books, 1988.

Kesey, Ken. *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Penguin Classics, 2005.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Columbia University Press, 1982.

Laing, R. D. *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*. Penguin Books, 1990.

Laing, R. D. *The Politics of Experience and The Bird of Paradise*. Penguin Books, 1990.

Porter, Roy. *A Social History of Madness: Stories of the Insane*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.

Pratt, John Clark. "Introduction." *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest: Text and Criticism*, by Ken Kesey, edited by John Clark Pratt, Viking Critical Library, 1996, pp. ix–xxxvii.

Salinger, J. D. *The Catcher in the Rye*. Little, Brown and Company, 1951.

Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830–1980*. Virago, 1987.

Szasz, Thomas. *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of a Theory of Personal Conduct*. Harper Perennial, 2010.

Tanner, Tony. *City of Words: American Fiction 1950–1970*. Harper & Row, 1971.

Winnicott, D. W. *The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment: Studies in the Theory of Emotional Development*. International Universities Press, 1965.