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ABSTRACT: If addiction is the disease of the epoch, women are its greatest victims. Not only are they the population most affected by this “disease,” the campaigns and treatments designed to treat women’s addictions are both ineffective and (worse) demonstrably sexist, racist, and misogynist (Greaves, 1996). This paper situates the hermeneutics of (the disease of) addiction and the analysis of appropriate treatments for this “disease” within the broader social and historical contexts that shape gendered paradigms of health and the “healthy free will” (Sedgwick). Following contemporary work in the Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Arts (Greaves, Sedgwick, Hutcheon, Klein, et al.), I shall investigate the ways in which cultural and philosophical systems of representation and social, political and economic systems of inequality contribute to interlacing, often contradictory paradigms of dependency and independency. I shall close with some solutions that utilize a number of faculties to be found in art, literature, and culture.

RÉSUMÉ: Si la dépendance est le mal du siècle, les femmes en sont les plus grandes victimes. Non seulement forment-elles la population la plus touchée par cette “maladie”, mais les traitements destinés à les libérer de leurs dépendances sont à la fois inefficaces et (pis encore) sexistes, racistes et misogynes (Greaves, 1996). Cet article établira une herméneutique de la (maladie de la) dépendance et analysera des traitements appropriés dans les contextes plus larges de société et d’histoire qui forment des paradigmes sexuels de santé et d’une “saine volonté libre” (Sedgwick). À la suite de travaux contemporains dans les domaines des humanités, des sciences sociales et des arts (Greaves, Sedgwick, Hutcheon, Klein, et al.), il examinera les façons desquelles les systèmes culturels et philosophiques de représentation, de même que les systèmes social, politique et économique des inégalités, contribuent au lacis des paradigmes de dépendance et d’indépendance, souvent contradictoires. Il terminera avec quelques solutions qui utilisent les possibilités qu’ón peut trouver dans les arts, la littérature et la culture.

There is today an imperious need to take up modes of theorizing women, culture, and addiction other than those surreptitiously passed off through the patriarchal imperative of compulsory heterosexuality and the reproductive
ideal that we have espoused as real in a cultural imaginary that naturalized and oppresses one half of its population in ways that society has yet to fully account for (Greaves 1996).

In everyday language “addiction” has become another word for how we live and breathe in contemporary society and so we have learned to know it instinctively as our mode of being. We need now to look at the specificities of that mode, particularly as it manifests itself in one of the most life-threatening and difficult if not also enigmatic kinds of addiction — the addiction to cigarettes — and in one of its most symptomatic and peculiar forms: the form of “women’s smoking”.

This paper is in anticipation of the time when the everyday and unsuspected violence against women that the question of smoking has yielded will one day be considered with as much outrage as the more obvious forms of oppression.

Introduction: The Subject of Drugs

The study of addiction as a theoretical and investigative project has hitherto amassed a singularly meager hermeneutic. A remarkable mutism on all fronts parallels a proliferation of discourses about the subject of drugs, a disappearing subject that is fundamentally without a substance. We discover that the diagnostic manual of the American Psychiatric Association avoids the term altogether in favor of “dependency” and “abuse”. All in all “addiction” itself becomes dissolved long before we have begun to grasp it (Gelman 1989, 54).

Unfortunately, however, while on the one hand a rhetoric and a psycho-babble of “dependency” performs the incessant feminization of the subject of drugs to explain addiction, on the other, we are given to a position that continues to hold advertising responsible for drug consumption projected onto a feminized society of “cultural dopes”. Together these have yielded the misogynist and antifeminist position that blames women’s liberation for women’s smoking in a Kantian rhetoric that continues to confound autonomy with responsibility. As I will show the notorious “You’ve come a long way, baby” inscription of Virginia Slims (an echo of the old “Luckies” of yesteryear) is held responsible for women’s dependency on cigarettes in ways that fail to question the paradoxes that ensue when making independence the root problem of dependency (Greaves 1996) and that consequently fail also to consider alternative modes of thinking about addiction.

It is with the idea of beginning to think through a number of issues that are, or should be, properly the domain of a hermeneutics of addiction that I have embarked on what follows. I take as my starting point the idea that addiction emerging at around the time of “modernity” (Thomas de Quincey’s Confessions of an English Opium Eater) and crystallizing around a rhetoric of drugs (Clej 1995), has certain implications for how contemporary culture will interpellate women as subjects.

My object is to argue for a mode of analysis the aims of which are: 1) to treat head-on the question of drugs: a burning political, medical, economic, racial, feminist, sexual, national issue of increasingly frightening proportions; 2) to relate the patterns of addiction (narcomania) and withdrawal (narcophobia) to changing sexual, economic, and political realities for women; 3) to examine how a society hooked on being hooked is a society which, in the words of a recent article in the popular women’s magazine Bazaar entitled “Women on Drugs,” continually finds new ways to plug “the often large spaces that lie between what a woman is and what she’s meant to be” (Darling 1995, 234).

En-Gendering Narcotic States: Women on Drugs

To begin with, the way a culture (modern culture) interpellates its women through drugs is evident in the way each decade sets up a different paradigm of beguiling behavior for women. A “moving equilibrium” (Gramsci’s notion of hegemony developed in Hedige’s wonderful book Subculture, 1989) between medical rhetorics of addiction and patterns of consumption, production, and circulation of drugs is expressed articulate a series of changing representations of the position of women in society.

That in the last 50 years drugs offer up a mirror for changing patterns of what society wants from women is articulated in the transition from the “can-do positiveness of prozac” to the “languorousness of heroin” (Darling 1995). Heroin, we are told, has become “something of a status symbol for those in a position to do nothing—and do it comfortably” (ibid.). This tale is emblazoned in Calvin Klein’s ad for a new perfume where a framed and narcoleptic Kate Moss appears beside a completely black page with nothing on it but the lower case phrase: “just be”. A new twist on Nike’s “Just Do It!” prescription for success, this fully derelict ontological imperative pulls up good all the old-fashioned ennui into a radical chic of désespoir. We have entered the age where narcotics articulates a quiver between history, ontology, and desire.

1. Part of a larger project in which I explore the intersecting cut between psychoanalysis, cultural analysis, and “the structures of addiction,” my immediate object is to look at the intersection of sexuality and narcotic desire as this plays itself out in the Neoconservative rhetoric of drugs. For more on the value of an altered strategy for reading Freud’s theory of the unconscious, see my forthcoming article on “Freud’s Pharmacy: Cocaine and the Corporeal Unconscious,” in Alexander and Roberts (forthcoming).
Downers in the '50s, uppers in the '80s: “the demure housewife” (of the 50s) makes way for the sexual hedonist (of the 60s and 70s); the glamorous jetsetters of the '80s yield to “the disaffected denizen of the ‘90s”. “Mother’s little helpers” such as Miltown, amphetamines, barbiturates, Librium, Valium (the most popular and widely available drugs in the '50s and early '60s when a woman’s place was in the home), through the can-do positiveness of a drug like prozac during the '80s, bring us now to the wanton, undisciplined, and abused cultural appeal of heroin for contemporary women.

Studies such as those of Lorraine Greaves (1996) on the cultural meaning of women’s smoking show how the production, consumption and circulation of cigarettes in Canada and the US has undergone several transformation, and it reflects important changes in the social definition of women’s role in industrial societies without nevertheless challenging the patriarchal family (Greaves), the society’s (the nation’s, the culture’s) veritable mainstay.

Historically, the proliferation of (medical and legal) discourses on addiction was by end of the 18th century in Europe influenced by the construction of middle-class norms of the body and sexuality. It demonstrates how codes of bourgeois morality could facilitate the emergence of a socio-economic and cultural context designated as ‘toxic’ by interpellating women. Following Eve Sedgwick, who in her brilliant article “The Epidemics of the Will” (Sedgwick 1992) first reflected upon the 19th century emergence of a hermeneutics of (the disease of) addiction, the analysis and understanding of what constituted appropriate treatments for this “disease” took place within the broader social, and historical contexts that shaped Enlightenment paradigms of health and the “healthy free will”.

Epithets like ‘weak-willed,’ ‘narcissistic,’ ‘anxious,’ ‘immature,’ ‘regressive,’ ‘genitalized,’ ‘oral,’ ‘self-obsessed,’ ‘self-destructive,’ ‘lacking confidence,’ and ‘dependent,’ write the toxic personality in the psycho(logizing)-babble of a discourse on woman: her sexual.ity, her body, and her desires. A body un-whole, fragmented and contaminated by the introjection and incorporation of a viral and foreign substance, woman’s toxic body figures as the imaginary domain — indeed a figuring of an entire social “body” as “foreign” — that is to be expelled, reformed, and dispossessed of its contaminating forces. (When drug guru William Burroughs suggested that addiction was a viral infection that could be cured through vaccination and anti-bodies, he saw clear into the “War on Drugs” that has ravaged America during the latter part of this century; see the 1963 re-edition of his drug manifesto Naked Lunch).

In and through the toxic state — a “state” described in the rhetoric of the body-as-organism and gendered feminine — a rhetoric of addiction attaches to the body of women and acts as the invisible support for a series of other (moral, ideological, political) messages that endorse a social body’s (nation, society, culture) self-identity. From this perspective, the emergence in the early 20th century of new public identities for women as workers, consumers, and political leaders raises significant and unanswered questions about the relationship between popular culture, nationalism, women’s political movements and changes in the representation of addiction from a rhetoric of deviancy to one of dependency.

Interestingly, female solidarity emerged in the West after the first wave of nationalist fervor receded. Working for such issues as suffrage, welfare, reproductive rights, the women’s movement challenged the vision of a ‘common’ nationhood (Parker et al. 1992, 7). Merging together European nationalism and “respectable” sexuality medical and legal discourses on feminine addiction (drug dependencies) seem to work against the grain of women’s independence and in odd (though predictable) collusion with a concealed agenda of national interests (the need to keep women dependent and “in their place,” raising good citizen-subjects). The peculiar slide from a medical to an economic condition of dependency, read alternately as toxic and as moral, thus engenders a lexicon of body rhetorics and controls that is fully feminized.

Grafted onto the medical and legal discourses of our modern epoch that alternately medicalize and criminalize it, this composite body gendered feminine is then harnessed to a changing series of drug products to form the backdrop of a veritable pharmacy of social, national, cultural, and political interests.

As addiction becomes the object of a discursive intensity, it is this imaginary and toxic body, filtering its way through the dank corridors of cultural phantasmagorias of ‘the addict’: as sick, deviant, or criminal. It is this body that governs and governmentalizes a nation’s toxic subjects through policies, health and educational campaigns. The idea of ‘health’ and good old ‘common sense’ is applied to a body-rhetorics of toxicity and re-propagates the body-as-organism as an ensemble of national and political interests is shored up alongside a open chain of anti-feminist and misogynist positions: the anti-abortion movement, the anti-obscenity and anti-pornography movements, the defences of the family against any number of inappropriate others from feminists to other assorted ‘deviants’ (gays, lesbians, queers, etc.). In a parade of ‘lifestyle’ or ‘cultural’ questions, a series of subjectivity battles are waged that can no longer be separated from questions of politics. The implications of this for issues of freedom, autonomy, independence, and liberation are immense; especially when for a society that has become an addict, ‘escape’ and ‘liberation’ are synonymous with each other and work synchronically to close the large and empty spaces between what a body is and what it’s “meant to be”.

Indeed the cultural political issue of addiction, as it surfaces in political, as well as medical and legal campaigns, is fundamental. Its importance in addressing the condition of women and the appropriation of gender struggles
for a neoconservative position cannot be underestimated; neither can the implications of this kind of positioning of gender for the constitution of ‘democracy,’ ‘freedom,’ and the (post)colonial rhetorics of ‘dependence’ and ‘independence’ any longer be ignored. A marked shift from Old Left concern with class struggles to the more opportune New Right understanding of the question of values as “the actual lines of force in late capitalist society” (Massumi 1992, 127) has now taken hold. That in these “lines of force” the pressure is now applied to rallying against addiction indicates that a new threshold has been reached, calling for altogether new forms of resistance and change.

**Smoking out Freedom: The Neoconservative Politics of Blaming Women’s Liberation**

Typically, the medicalization and pathologization of women-on-drugs, takes its cue from women’s social function as producers of the nation’s citizens. It can be seen in the array of messages that circulate in, for example, educational, medical, and political campaigns against women’s smoking.

From the start, in Canada and the US, drugs in general and smoking in particular, can be seen to respond to a spirit of national cohesion and identity. From the time of the Second World War when women joined the labor force, the links between cultural identity (nationalism) and addiction played havoc on the relation between discourses of dependence and independence when it came to women’s smoking.

Before its recent calumny as the ultimate death potion, women’s smoking was imaged in a positive relation to patriotism: during the war, cigarettes were sold as an instrument of freedom, independence, and national sentiment, an incitement to women to take up the position of the (absent) men by joining the labor force. They were marketed as an “erotic prop” of heterosexuality and symbol of upward mobility in the ’40s and ’50s. In the ’90s they have resurfaced as a symbol of reward and pleasure, of leisure and relaxation after a hard day’s night for over-stressed women in the labor force (Greaves 1996).

This was a transformation of the 1800s to the 1920s, when cigarettes were the “occupational symbol” of the prostitute; homemakers and mothers did not smoke (ibid., 18-19). Following the nationalistic incentive of the War period, early feminism forfeited this binarism by reworking the rebelliousness and marginality of the “fallen women” into a discourse on freedom and liberation that depend upon a peculiar recourse to cigarettes: the 1929 Easter parade in New York City, lit by smoking women in protest of women’s inequality (ibid., 19), launched the image of cigarettes as the notorious little “torches of freedom” that symbolized the state of “emancipation,” liberation, and freedom.

From being the mark of outsiderness, marginality, and “the fallen woman” in the 19th century, women’s addiction to cigarettes smoking moved to a central position as an instrument of nation unity through two contradictory currents: 1) the masculine relation to patriotism, and 2) the feminine relation to heterosexuality as an erotic prop: As Greaves points out: “women’s smoking as it relates to gender relations...moved from a symbol of being bought by men (prostitute), to being like men (lesbian/mannish/androgynous), to being able to attract men (glamorous/heterosexual) (ibid., 21-22).

The apparent conflict between smoking as a symbol of subversion (freedom, independence) and smoking as one of compliance (unfreedom, dependency) is historically reflected in the antagonism between images and representations of the good girl and the bad girl, images condensed around ‘the whore’/‘the slut’ (the transgressive, deviant, or ‘fallen’ woman) on the one hand, and ‘the madonna’/‘the homemaker’ on the other. To the extent that the rise of the women’s movement confuses this antagonism, it has inaugurated a different response from forces of cultural/national integrity as the task of resetting limits has shifted from a tropism of deviance to one of ‘dependency’ and ‘abuse.’ This shift is evident in the New Right’s absorption of the simplistic yet popular association between smoking and women’s liberation — which itself reveals “a rather ironic uncritical absorption of the industry’s message ‘You’ve come long way, baby!’” (Greaves 1996, 13). As Lorraine Greaves astutely points out in her ground-breaking study “Smoke Screen: Women’s Smoking and Social Control” (ibid): “If this is the case of smoking, then anyone interested in the status of women would see the cure as more worrisome” (ibid., 13).

Put simply: the figure of the toxic state emerges as a powerful instrument in the management of the social and national body. Articulated to the state of dependency embodied by a confusion between woman’s desiring and woman’s reproductive body, it calls for a wholly new kind of narcoanalytic thinking; one that articulates the structures of desire and power and in such a way as to make of the subject of drugs a fully govermentalized and desiring subject of consumption and culture.

**Resisting the Cons: No to Just Say No!**

One of the most fecund, innovative, and comprehensive approaches to drug addiction to date emerges in the nineties and has been afforded by a study of the cultural appreciation of drugs in the history of literature, philosophy, and the arts (Klein 1993; Derrida 1993; Ronell 1992; Clej 1995; Rudgley 1993; Sedgwick 1992; Hutcheon 1996; inter alia). See especially the forthcoming collection _High Culture: Reflections on Addiction and Modernity_ (Alexander and Roberts, forthcoming) featuring essays by some of the above as well as
new scholars in the field. In my own work I have been addressing the articulation of language, sexuality, and narcotic desire for some time beginning with my article “Supplementing the dangerous supplement: auto-(bio)graphical fragments from the diary of a female cigarette addict” (Antonopoulos 1990; Alexander 1997). I argue for the effectivity of writing as a cure for smoking, an effectivity which emerged in the auto-biographical writing experiment that enabled my quitting smoking and wherein writing about smoking doubled both as self-history and as substitution. For a practical guide to keeping a journal for women who smoke see Holmberg-Schwarz (1990).

In Cigarettes Are Sublime (Duke University Press, 1993), undoubtedly this century’s most remarkable contribution to a cultural appreciation of smoking, a book whose origins he attributes to an “urgent desire to stop smoking” (ibid., ix), Richard Klein, distinguished professor of French at Cornell University and editor of the literary journal Diacritics, remarks: “To intervene in this conundrum, an altered — more paradoxical, more hypocritical — strategy is necessary: not aiming to discourage smoking, in order to discourage it” (ibid., 2). It is in the name of such strategies of “non-address” that I propose we undertake research into the theoretical underpinnings for an alternate approach to treating women’s drug addictions and related “dependencies”.

In the face of a sexual politics of drugs and a neoconservative narcopolemics of addiction and in the context of the fact that it is women who are most at risk in the rising toll of figures surrounding the deaths and diseases due to smoking (for example), it is high time for such an “ingenious” remedy, an “altered strategy” (Klein 1993), and a more “hypo-critical” approach to treating the problem of addiction, one committed to the care of the whole body of woman rather than to a proliferation of cures that leave it straddled and wanting.

Filtering new pathways through the fields of bio-medical ethics, cultural analysis, and contemporary theories of desire, such a “strategy” opens toward the possibility of an alternative mode of representing the addicted state than that which we see couched inside a neoconservative rhetoric of drugs and its patriarchal appropriation of women’s bodies and desires: of women’s polymorphous desires for freedom, for emancipation, for liberation, or for just simply for a place of ‘exit,’ an ingenious or necessary ‘way out,’ a “spectacular escape” (Ronell 1993, 59).

This approach calls upon us to look more deeply into the structures of desire and language, to consider (for example) theories of the subject compatible with “the libidinal autonomy” (Ronell) of narcotic desire. It anticipates a theoretical project that examines the structures of subjectivity and language in relation to a different model of desire: that of narcotic desire, its incorporations and losses as figured through a different body-subject: one marked, altered, transformed by conditions of existence that move it and bind it to changing structures of existence that it forms, resists, accepts, rejects. It would have to also begin with a philosophy of decision and choice that inaugurates the possibility of a new autonomy, a new “will,” and another “body,” indeed: an altogether other, even times supplementary, “nature”: a nature that bends and orients itself through an unfigurable economy of prosthetic “needs” and an essential repertoire of “wants”: wants not felt (or figured) through the structure of a mimetic order of loss and prohibition, but through an “intentional tissue” build into the very structures of its organism and into the order of its language, what Judith Butler and others have called a “primary mimesis” (Butler 1991, 26 ff.).

Indeed to think in terms of the “structures of addiction” enables us to think about addiction in terms of an altered model of autonomy and responsibility, one based on narcotic desire’s implications for an other ‘freedom’ and an other ‘health.’ Articulating freedom, drugs, and the feminine condition in ways that suggest the need for a radical dissociation of autonomy and responsibility, an association that is traceable to our epoch since Kant, such a strategy would thereby show up the ambiguous link between smoking and women’s freedom, on the one hand, and smoking and the “loss of freedom,” on the other; a link which need not remain unchallenged and unexamined.

An altered strategy also forces us to think about addiction in general, and women’s addiction to smoking in particular, in terms of the nature of “freedom,” and of narcotic desire’s implications for freedom. For as Richard Klein points out: “the passionate excessive zeal with which cigarettes are everywhere stigmatized may signal that some more pervasive, subterranean, and dangerous passions are loose that directly threaten our freedom” (Klein 1993).

At the same time such a mode of analysis opens up to the possibility of a new approach to questions of cultural identity, nationhood, democracy, and individual rights. Moving us closer toward the possibility of a cure, working against the current misogynist and anti-feminist perspectives, positions, arguments, this “strategy” also inaugurates a thoroughly hard-hitting and very radical critique of much tobacco policy as well as the cultural economic, and psycho-social underpinnings of this most challenging from of social and self-regulatory control.

In sum: following this kind of “paradoxical,” ambiguous, or “hypo-critical” strategy we can begin to make sense of our everyday struggles to name and identify (politically, medically, culturally) the structures of deviance, desire and power that animate the beast that is given to us in a puff of smoke... make sense of the violence of that everyday act that kills but that also sustains so many and so much... ; and above all, respond to the longing, craving, and dying for one’s drug that gives meaning to the idea of being ‘hooked’ and that is nested in a feeling of sublimity, transcendence and
transport: "a little rush of infinity that alters perspectives, however slightly, and permits albeit briefly, an ecstatic standing outside oneself" (Klein 1993, 16).

Concluding Remarks

It is too soon to say with certainty that one has fully understood how to conduct the study of addiction and, in particular, how it may bear upon women. Addiction is a field which has hitherto disclosed itself as no more than a felt "lack". Much like the urge which governs "our narcotic modernity" this lack creates, produces, invents the compelling and supplementary need within the social body for an analysis which is imperious.

However to get at the ethics and politics of certain key issues affecting women in our society, one has to step outside the pearly gates of Academe as much as to get inside the gates of what we take to be "common sense" or popular knowledge.

Thus in the face of countless arguments and the received certainties that addiction are the result of targeted advertising campaigns promising freedom or a correlate of women's liberation, I propose to elaborate an alternative line of analysis that examines addiction in relation to what theorists such as Greaves, Klein, and others have examined as the comfort and solace it provides, thereby taking into account the social benefits of drugs, their purposefulness as "technologies of the self": practices of self-medication, self-governance, self-fashioning, and the like.

This means to effectively break with paradigms that treat addiction as an individual problem, or gender as a discrete and autonomous construct, capable of grounding either culture/nationalism or addiction. To do so, we must fight against the way in which health and educational campaigns are targeted specifically at women as carriers of nation's babies — future citizens of the nation — without being particularly sensitive to women as citizens/subjects themselves. The ageist, sexist, racist, and altogether misogynist nature of these campaigns is now becoming more fully documented both in Canada and the US (Greaves 1996; Klein 1993), particularly as pertains the New Right's playing havoc with an insistence on popular associations between women's smoking and women's liberation.

To take up Lorraine Greaves' argument that this kind of simplistic association needs to be rejected (Greaves 1996, 114) in favor of a new understanding of addiction in general and smoking in particular differently: as a method of "self-medication" (ibid., 110), one that enhances the development of women's identities and enables them to "fit" with the prevailing values and political realities (ibid.2).

In contemporary Western cultures, where inequalities continue to exist (wage gaps, unequal division of household labor and child-care options, violence against women), women are nevertheless explicitly encouraged to perceive themselves as autonomous and self-supporting. Self-medication as a strategy of survival, as Greaves' study has shown, is almost inevitable.

This gives the lie to the neoconservative arguments that blame women's liberation for women's smoking addiction. Indeed, it can be seen how the New Right's agenda of keeping women in patriarchal positions and in the service of traditional roles is actually bolstered by a state of dependency in the name of independence. If smoking challenges at the same time as it succumbs to the patriarchal positioning of women — and tobacco companies have become adept at responding to the need for both — the present war on cigarettes, aligns a neoconservative return to traditional values at the same time as it blames and persecutes.

In closing, let me say that an investigative strategy and a theoretical project such as this would have to engage with an ethics and a politics of care based on decision and choice, an ethics that inaugurates the possibility of a new autonomy, articulating freedom, drugs, and the feminine condition in ways that must refuse the association of autonomy and responsibility. This association, characteristic of our epoch and traceable to Kant, underwrites the ambiguous link between smoking and women's freedom, on the one hand, and smoking and the "loss of freedom," on the other. It need not and must not remain unchallenged and unexamined. As Richard Klein points out: "the passionate excessive zeal with which cigarettes are everywhere stigmatized may signal that some more pervasive, subterranean, and dangerous passions are loose that directly threaten our freedom" (Klein 1993).

From this perspective, such an altered strategy can begin to consider the structures of alterity (and feeling) that occupy the intersecting cut between women, culture, and addiction by way of 3 considerations related to "freedom" and the nature of altered subjectivity: 1) how drugs make women (feel) free; 2) how drugs mirror what a culture wants from its women; 3) how this is mirrored by a constant play of discourses of freedom and dependency, autonomy and independence grafted onto women's bodies, their bodies' situations, and their bodies' feelings in ways that continue to fill, occupy, fulfill, block, and stop up the enormous and atypical spaces between "what a woman is and what she's meant to be".

---

2. A state of affairs that emerged, Minerva-like, as "nationalism" and "sexuality," with modernity and a "modern form of subjectivity" that, as Alina Clej argues most convincingly, was inaugurated with de Quincey (a form of sensibility one also finds in French contemporary thought).
It might also begin by acknowledging the difficult but challenging proposition that the ‘fix,’ the ‘high,’ the shot of ‘junk,’ the hit of love, the illicit or any one of a thousand little acts seen by no one and which count for no one (else), belong to a ‘being-on-drugs’ and a ‘being-hooked-on-drugs’ that is still ontologically and phenomenologically to be discovered.
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