



# The Concept of Fragmentation in Poststructuralism

## El concepto de fragmentación en el post-estructuralismo

Justina Šumilova   
Lithuanian Culture Research Institute  
Vilnius, Lithuania  
justina.sumilova@protonmail.com 

**Received:** 16/07/2024 **Accepted:** 15/11/2024  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.69967/07194773.v11i.503>

### Abstract

Fragmentation is a common phenomenon in the postmodern world, yet there is a lack of consistent investigations into its impact on society. In poststructuralism, fragmentation is primarily understood as breaking apart of unified structures and identities, challenging traditional ideas of wholeness, coherence, and totality. Fragmentation is neither inherently negative nor positive; and it is a prevalent and important topic in poststructuralist writings. This research aims to explore the concept of fragmentation in the discourse of poststructuralism. The article presents several points. Firstly, it discusses how, in Derrida's philosophy, fragmentation acts as a borderline or limit process, allowing individuals to create their identities. Derrida's views relate to Deleuze and Guattari's "A Thousand Plateaus," where they argue that fragmentation influences identity formation and that identity is produced through difference. Conversely, in their book "Anti-Oedipus," Deleuze and Guattari link fragmentation to capitalism, associating it with isolation, atomization, and loss of unity. "Anti-Oedipus" also suggests that capitalism leads to fluid identities, preventing the formation of wholeness. The article further reveals Lyotard's association of fragmentation with knowledge and performativity, suggesting that their fracturing prevents the creation of grand narratives, leading to fragmentation. Guy Debord's perspective ties fragmentation to the society of the spectacle, resulting in the atomization of meaning and knowledge. Therefore, it means that fragmentation is related to meaning production, capitalism, alienation and knowledge production in poststructuralism.

**Palabras clave:** fragmentation, poststructuralism, identity, capitalism, isolation, atomization, knowledge.

### Resumen

La fragmentación es un fenómeno común en el mundo posmoderno, sin embargo, existe una falta de investigaciones consistentes sobre su impacto en la sociedad. En el postestructuralismo, la fragmentación se entiende principalmente como la ruptura de estructuras e identidades unificadas, desafiando las ideas tradicionales de totalidad, coherencia y unidad. La fragmentación no es intrínsecamente negativa ni positiva, y constituye un tema prevalente e importante en los escritos postestructuralistas. Esta investigación busca explorar el concepto de fragmentación en el discurso del postestructuralismo. El artículo presenta varios puntos. En primer lugar, se analiza cómo, en la filosofía de Derrida, la fragmentación actúa como un proceso límite o fronterizo, permitiendo a los individuos crear sus identidades. Las ideas de Derrida se relacionan con Mil Mesetas de Deleuze y Guattari, donde argumentan que la fragmentación influye en la formación de la identidad y que esta se produce a través de la diferencia. Por el contrario, en su obra El Anti-Edipo, Deleuze y Guattari vinculan la fragmentación con el capitalismo, asociándola con el aislamiento, la atomización y la pérdida de unidad. El Anti-Edipo también sugiere que el capitalismo da lugar a identidades fluidas, impidiendo la formación de una totalidad. Además, el artículo revela cómo Lyotard asocia la fragmentación con el conocimiento y la performatividad, sugiriendo que su fracturación

impide la creación de grandes narrativas, lo que conduce a la fragmentación. La perspectiva de Guy Debord relaciona la fragmentación con la sociedad del espectáculo, lo que resulta en la atomización del significado y el conocimiento. Por lo tanto, la fragmentación se vincula en el postestructuralismo con la producción de significado, el capitalismo, la alienación y la producción de conocimiento.

**Keywords:** fragmentación, post-estructuralismo, identidad, capitalismo, aislamiento, atomización, conocimiento

## 1. Introduction

Fragmentation is a process that leads to disunity among separate things. It creates gaps and distances between various things, parts, or subjects. In today's world, we experience fragmentation daily, which can fragment our reality, subjectivity, and identity. It acts as an interruption that can alter how we understand and perceive ourselves and others. However, it's important to recognize that fragmentation is interpreted differently depending on the context. Derrida, for instance, notes that "the fragment is neither a determined style nor a failure, but the form of that which is written" (Derrida, 1978, p. 71). As a process, fragmentation reveals the instability and artificiality of the wholeness we create in the form of knowledge, demonstrating that unity is often a construct shaped by certain powers or ideologies.

The concept of fragments and fragmentary writing is not novel and is related to various philosophers, like, for example, Heraclitus and Schlegel. In the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century, there were a lot of writers, poets and philosophers who used fragmentary writing, for example, Hölderlin, Keats, Novalis, Mallarmé, Kafka, Valéry, Proust, Bataille, Beckett (Hill, 2012, pp. 1-2).

The appreciation of fragments and fragmentation can be traced back to early German Romanticism, when the fragment was determined as the central philosophical notion, both as concept and idea of form, through the expression of a philosophical limit and its overcoming (Mojsilović and Milenković, 2018, p. 517).

Fragment is usually defined as a negative force that destroys unity, reveals authority and norms. However, poststructuralists had a slightly different understanding of fragmentation and fragments. In the context of poststructuralism, fragmentation refers to the breaking apart of unified structures and the destabilization of fixed meanings, identities, and narratives. The occurrence of fragmentation in many poststructuralist philosophers shows that it is not yet an explored concept which plays a key role in poststructuralism.

This article aims to investigate the concept of fragmentation in poststructuralist philosophy. The goal of this article is to investigate how fragmentation in the context of poststructuralism challenges ideas of totality, coherence, identity and capitalism. The article situates fragmentation in poststructuralism by focusing on multiplicity, discontinuity, identity and instability of interpretation.

## 2. Derrida: Fragmentation in Deconstruction, Identity and Limits

Fragmentation has been linked to negativity – it has been related to disruption of wholeness, as separation and isolation. However, in Derrida's philosophy, fragmentation is revitalized and understood as something heterogeneous and plural. Fragmentation has a different role in deconstruction which seeks to destroy hierarchy and at the same time it seeks to find a core foundation. Fragmentation challenges traditional notions of coherence, unity and hierarchical structures.

The movements of deconstruction do not destroy structures from the outside. They are not possible and effective, nor can they take accurate aim, except by inhabiting those structures. One always inhabits, and all the more when one does not suspect it, so they must inhabit them in a certain way. To paraphrase Derrida, the enterprise of deconstruction always falls prey to its own work in a certain way, operating necessarily from the inside, borrowing all the strategic and economic resources of subversion from the old structure structurally, that is to say without being able to isolate their elements and atoms (Derrida, 1997, p. 24).

Fragmentation disrupts logocentric thought, providing spaces for new ways of experiencing and perceiving. In this perception, terms and propositions are revised, provoking a questioning of hierarchies (Gairaud, 2005, p. 15). In deconstruction, fragmentation is not negative or destructive. Instead, it exposes the logocentrism of Western thought which privileges unity and fixed meaning. Also, Derrida's notion of the trace where fragmentation highlights the absence of the ultimate foundation proving that meaning is contingent and relational.

Deconstruction also gives the qualifications of a necessary practice which accounts for the appreciation of difference within systems, promotes the idea of plurality and expands the types of relationships among all forces that compose a social system or group.

Derrida stated that the signified is a trace that is always already in the position of the signifier. It is the apparently innocent proposition within which the metaphysics of the logos, of presence and consciousness, must reflect upon writing as its death and its resource (Derrida, 1997, p. 73). This is crucial because deconstruction also seeks to invert the Saussurean sign. This means that deconstruction is investigating the difference of signs as fragments. Ideas about fragmentation analyse new perceptions about relationship in micro-systems and in macro-system which give a wide range of opportunities to interpret and theorize experience threatening paradigms (Gairaud, 2005, p. 16). Derrida's *différance* is also related to fragmentation because what we have in between meaning of words are empty gaps that function as an absence. This absence is crucial for knowledge and meaning production because only thanks to a gap which is a *différance* we can create meaning by dividing it from other components.

Fragmentation provides the space for identity construction, a place for transformation in which the self and the other negotiate their own identity. It is a process which creates a space for transformation and hybridization in the question of the self and other. Such place is a space of borderlands in which one is able to become and change, and this space is specifically provided by the fragments that interrupt the continuity of identity (Gairaud, 2005, p. 17). The borders of fragments are where identity is constituted in Derrida's philosophy which means that subjects can construct themselves in fluid and pluralistic way.

When the meaning or signification becomes impossible, it starts to signify something that is beyond meaning. Such dispersion of meaning happens in the limit experiences when the human can experience something extraordinary or something that is impossible to put into the frames of meaning, for example, the animal consciousness and animal being in the world which is impossible to experience for humans.

Limits and borders define what we can understand and integrate into our worldview. The things that stay outside of it are fractured and incomprehensible because they stay in the form of fragmentary elements that do not have any links whatsoever. Fragmentation can be understood as a process that is a limit experience itself for humans.

In such cases, the self becomes the liminal experience in which one is constantly changing. Fragmentation can open up the becoming or possibilities for the reinvention of the self and transformation. Fragmentation's created flux as well as deconstruction allows the person to recreate oneself from existing fragments. It becomes the imaginary and metaphorical borderland for the subject who becomes a space of new identification and changes.

The borders of fragments are the space of relating and constructing identity. The process of construction of identity emerges from the practices of fragmentation and differentiation

because of the interaction of multiple factors and traits within a hybrid context (Gairaud, 2005, p. 18). The limits of fragments range from individual traits (what one is) to the reflection of the traits of the other (what one is not). By drawing the distinct lines between fragments, one is able to constitute one's identity and understanding who one is.

A certain fragment represents one's personal limits and differences, while its border signifies the space where other fragments are recognized. Metaphorically, in our postmodern world, we live at these borders as a way of embracing differences; limits are diverse recognitions of the self through difference (Gairaud, 2005, p. 18). Therefore, we construct our identities and postmodern subjectivities from differences found at the borders of these fragments. It is at these border points where transformation and learning occur, and where individuals build their identities.

Thus, fragmentation challenges the notion of a single, unified meaning, revealing the multiplicity and instability of signification. The borders of fragments are metaphorical spaces where differences arise and identities are formed, as these are sites of interaction and transformation.

### **3. Deleuze and Guattari's fragmentation: from *différance* to rhizomes**

The topic of fragmentation is important in Deleuze and Guattari's book "Thousand Plateaus". Similarly to Derrida, fragmentation in this particular work of Deleuze and Guattari is presented as a transformative plural force that is able to construct the world from its paradoxical point of atomization and division. Deleuze and Guattari talk about rhizomes that have some similarities (as well as crucial differences) to fragmentary writing and fragments. Rhizomatic writing is decentered into other dimensions and other registers (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 8) which is similar to Derrida's *différance* in such a way that difference is also decentered and has multiple points of entry. Rhizome type of poetics produce opposite movements, and the fragmentation of forms and images becomes one of its basic principles. Unlike Derrida's notion of fragmentation, traces and *différance* that are crucial elements of the process of signification, rhizomatic writing does not aim to primarily signify. Instead, Deleuze and Guattari relate rhizomatic writing to surveying and mapping as rhizome is able to create a structure that is not apparent:

The rhizome pertains to a map that must be produced, constructed. This map is always detachable, connectable, reversible, modifiable, and has multiple entryways and exits and its own lines of flight. It is tracings that must be put on the map, not the opposite. In contrast to centered (even polycentric) systems with hierarchical modes of communication and preestablished paths, the rhizome is an acentered, nonhierarchical, nonsignifying system without a General and without an organizing memory or central automaton. It is defined solely by a circulation of states (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 21).

Rhizomatic structures are based on absence of structure and logic, therefore they belong to the realm of non-being and invisibility. Rhizomatic writing functions as a deterritorializing agency that dislodges the subject from his or her sense of unified and consolidated identity. It produces a sparse and fragmentary identity in the text. The scattered rhizomatic identity, on the other hand, functions as unbridged and disconnected multiplicity. Just like nomadic subject, rhizomatic writing pushes the subject to one's limits:

Becomings are like writing. It is a composition, a location that needs to be constructed together with in the encounters with others. Becoming pushes the subject to his or her limits, in a constant encounter with external, different otherness. Such nomadic subject as a non-unitary entity is simultaneously self-propelling and

outward-bound (Braidotti, 2013, p. 348).

Such multiplicity doesn't have one main point of one's identity or a stable and defined self; instead, it is diverse in its nature. This identity is liminal, relational and possible to perceive in a moment when it appears. The rhizome functions as a metaphor for non-hierarchical and non-linear systems because rhizomes are networks of connections without a central point. This identity is constituted by difference rather than by unity. Deleuze and Guattari also point out Maurice Blanchot's work on fragments and fragmentation:

Maurice Blanchot has found a way to pose the problem in the most rigorous terms, at the level of the literary machine: how to produce, how to think about fragments whose sole relationship is sheer difference—fragments that are related to one another only in that each of them is different—without having recourse either to any sort of original totality (not even one that has been lost), or to a subsequent totality that may not yet have come about? (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 37)

Deleuze and Guattari were influenced by Blanchot's work and their goal is to find out how to think fragments and how can they constitute an identity. The issue of identity constitution shows that there are other possible ways to think about one's identity. Instead, such identity is floating and only seen via the difference, just like in Derrida's case.

Rhizomatic writing and thought destabilize the subject's sense of a singular, consolidated self, creating an identity that is fragmented, fluid, and constantly becoming. Such identity is similar to a nomadic subject, which is understood as unitary entity that is in constant motion, dealing with external otherness and flux. Therefore, Deleuze and Guattari's thoughts on rhizomes and fragmentation are in a way similar to Derrida's position on fragmentation as fragmentation in all philosophers functions as a meaning production mechanism from the perspective of differences and division.

#### **4. Deleuze and Guattari II: Fragmentation, Identity and Capitalism**

Deleuze and Guattari differ from Derrida as they also discuss fragmentation in the realm of capitalism. Capitalism thrives on fragmentation, deterritorialization, and constant flows of desire that disrupt traditional social structures. Desire constantly couples continuous flows and partial objects that are inherently fragmentary and fragmented (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 5). Deleuze and Guattari use the concept of desire to discuss deterritorialization and the creation of new connections and configurations by rearranging fragments. By emphasizing the ability to continually rearrange fragments in different patterns or configurations, they highlight the importance of breaking away from fixed structures.

Desire is inherently fragmented, and capitalism appropriates this by redirecting these flows into the production of commodities where people get addicted to fragmented objects and experiences. Capitalism thrives on the constant rearrangement of fragments, creating new patterns and configurations. It is able to reterritorialize and reorganize fragments into new systems which ensures that the fragmented flows of desire are production are controlled.

The ability to rearrange fragments continually in new and different patterns or configurations causes an indifference toward the act of producing and toward the product, toward the set of instruments to be used and toward the overall result to be achieved (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 7).

The indifference toward the act of producing and the product, as well as the instruments used and the overall result, can be seen as a rejection of traditional notions of linear progression and predetermined outcomes. Instead, they suggest embracing a more fluid and dynamic approach to production, where the focus is on the process of assembling fragments to create

something new rather than on a predetermined end goal.

In this context, fragments serve as the raw material or components necessary for the formation of something innovative and unexpected. Deleuze and Guattari advocate for a creative process that is not bound by preconceived notions of success or failure, but driven by the continual reshuffling and recombination of fragments to generate new forms and meanings, by encouraging a mindset of experimentation, playfulness, and openness to change. In Deleuze and Guattari's terms, a schizophrenic is moving like a fragmentary entity that is always in the flux. As Deleuze and Guattari state:

It might be said that the schizophrenic passes from one code to the other, that he deliberately scrambles all the codes, by quickly shifting from one to another, according to the questions asked him. He never gives the same explanation from one day to the next, never invokes the same genealogy, never records the same event in the same way (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 15).

In Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy, the schizophrenic is able to be a desire and production shifting force. The fragmentary aspect of the schizophrenic shows that schizophrenic is able to be an anomalous individual that disrupts the daily flow by creating something novel in it.

In our postmodern world, we become fragmented and fluctuating constantly, just like the schizophrenic. In today's society, the emphasis on consumerism and materialism promotes a fragmented sense of self, where individuals define themselves through their possessions and external appearances rather than a cohesive identity. Postmodernism rejects overarching, universal narratives that provide coherence and meaning to human existence, leading to a sense of fragmentation and existential uncertainty. Our postmodern subject functions like the subject Deleuze and Guattari describe:

However, it is a strange subject with no fixed identity, wandering about over the body without organs, but always remaining peripheral to the desiring-machines. It is defined by the share of the product it takes for itself, garnering here, there, and everywhere a reward in the form of a becoming or an avatar, being born of the states that it consumes and being reborn with each new state (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 18).

The subject's fragmentary state proves that one does not have stable identity. Identity production offers multiple ways of identifying oneself with certain features. Therefore, the subject experiences difficulty in prescribing certain features to one's identity. Fragmentation creates pseudo-subjects that are used in capitalist system to exploit their labor power. The fragmentation of the human experience in the postmodern world can be seen as a result of rapid social, cultural, and technological changes that have disrupted traditional structures and ways of understanding the world. These changes leave individuals grappling with multiplicity, complexity, and fluidity in their lives. Just like the schizophrenic, our identity remains fluid:

Although the organ-machines attach themselves to the body without organs, the latter continues to be without organs and does not become an organism in the ordinary sense of the word. It remains fluid and slippery (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 15).

Our identities are fragmented and fractured, fluid and constantly becoming in a continuously changing world. It means that it is harder to produce a stable identity as the person has too many possible choices of how to construct one's identity.

Thus, Deleuze and Guattari relate fragmentation with capitalism and commodities by stating that we construct our identities by given capitalist commodities which do not form a cohesive identity. They also reveal that identity production is something that we are able to "buy" in our postmodern society. Also, by dismantling stable identities, capitalism produces subjects who are more adaptable and willing to fit into fragmented labor markets, gig economies, and

consumer cultures.

## 5. Lyotard: Performativity, Knowledge and Fragmentation

Unlike already mentioned philosophers, Lyotard connects fragmentation with production of knowledge, focusing on intersection between capitalism and fragmentation. According to Lyotard, knowledge is produced in order to be sold and consumed in the exchange of ideas (Lyotard, 1984, p. 4). Knowledge is an epistemological aspect of our society which shows how we form narratives and distribute knowledge in the technological age. Lyotard also focuses on grand metanarratives that totalize stories about history and the goals of the human race that ground and legitimize knowledges and cultural practices.

Lyotard presents a postmodern methodological representation of society as composed of multifarious and fragmented language games. These games strictly control the moves which can be made within them by reference to narratives of legitimation which are deemed appropriate by their respective institutions. The technical and technological changes over the last few decades – as well as the development of capitalism – have caused the production of knowledge to become increasingly influenced by a technological model. The end of metanarratives means that no single overarching theory can pretend to account for everything.

The postmodern condition is composed of fragmented language games attached to incommensurable forms of life. For Lyotard, language is composed of a multiplicity of phrase regimes which cannot be translated into each other. In Lyotard's postmodern philosophy, the fragmentation of language games also means the social subject fragments and seems to dissolve. The subject cannot be seen as a master of language games, a unifying power, but is rather a node at which different incommensurable language games intersect.

Lyotard points out that the power is in the hands of the ones who control the knowledge distribution and have access to it. Knowledge can be related to fragmentation as the society loses its form as a whole entity. Instead, it becomes fragmented and fractured because the distribution of the knowledge becomes divided as well. The society lost its form as a united structure. Lyotard also highlights the importance of performativity. The true goal of the system, the reason it programs itself like a computer, is the optimization of the global relationship between input and output — in other words, performativity (Lyotard, 1984, p. 13).

Performativity involves the performance of identities or roles by characters in our capitalist system, while fragmentation refers to the disintegration or breaking apart of these identities or narratives. In our techno-capitalist society, performativity highlights how identity performances are influenced by and contribute to the fragmented nature of knowledge dissemination. Fragmentation can create layers of meaning, reveal hidden complexities, or challenge traditional storytelling structures, impacting performativity and how it is understood. Lyotard emphasizes analyzing performativity as it becomes a crucial aspect of a society that seeks profit and commercializes knowledge.

Fragmentation functions as a power that is able to determine in what kind of form the knowledge is distributed. The fragmentary form of knowledge creates gaps and inconsistencies. Such form is dispersed and not united, therefore, it is harder to find commonalities and reach the uniting consensus in fragmentary form of knowledge distribution.

Even though a system can function by reducing complexity, fragmentation of knowledge form creates a wide diversity in the society. Such fragmentation of knowledge can be a tool to gain more power for certain people. For example, people can create individualistic movements or groups that focus on very specific points of view, specific values and knowledge in order to create a closed group that has its own knowledge and virtues. However, the process of knowledge fragmentation is not useful for the structure of the society as it creates division and multiple smaller groups of people who can compete for power.

Fragmentation of knowledge in functions is a way to hold the power over divided society that loses its coherence and wholeness. Such society also loses its consistency and has multiple ways of the knowledge distribution in society. Performativity of knowledge in the society creates closed tiny group societies that hold specific views which prevents identification with the society as a whole. We experience the decline of grand narratives that offer a unified way of seeing the world. As Baudrillard said, the postmodern society is without the community (Baudrillard, 1995, p. 15). To quote Lyotard:

This breaking up of the grand narratives leads to what some authors analyze in terms of the dissolution of the social bond and the disintegration of social aggregates into a mass of individual atoms thrown into the absurdity of Brownian motion. It seems that nothing of the kind is happening: this point of view is haunted by the paradisiacal representation of a lost "organic" society (Lyotard, 1984, p. 15).

The set of pragmatic rules that constitutes the social bond is transmitted through the grand narratives (Lyotard, 1984, p. 21). However, if grand narratives dissipate, the links that hold the societal order and relation also weaken. As Lyotard argues, the society loses its wholeness and connection, and as a result becomes fragmented and divided. Lyotard's analysis of how the fragmentation of knowledge and grand narratives leads to the atomization of society and the individual, but also creates new forms of power and control. Society becomes controlled by the processes of fragmentation, atomization and isolation.

The self, which is complex and mobile, is an active agent in the changing relations of the society which becomes alone as it has never been before. The self becomes atomized in fragmented society and unable to form relations to others. To quote Lyotard:

The atoms are placed at the crossroads of pragmatic relationships, but they are also displaced by the messages that traverse them, in perpetual motion (Lyotard, 1984, p. 16).

Atomization may highlight the reduction of complex ideas, identities, or systems into their fundamental elements or components. This reduction can sometimes overlook nuances, connections, or broader contexts present in the original whole.

Thus, the orientation of our society now favors a multiplicity of finite meta-arguments. Right now, we experience the demand for unity, simplicity and communicability in a world that lacks all these features.

## **6. Debord: The Society of the Fragment**

Unlike previously analyzed philosophers, Guy Debord describes our postmodern society as the society of spectacle in which everything is made to be a representation. In societies where modern conditions of production prevail, life is presented as an immense accumulation of spectacles (Debord, 1992, p. 24). Debord focuses on investigating the manifestation of fragmentation in our society relating it to spectacle and play. However, just like Lyotard, Debord mentions the relation between society, identity, fragmentation and capitalism.

Firstly, Guy Debord argues that capitalism and its economic impact on society were an important milestone which not only created the society of the spectacle but also increased the ongoing fragmentation of the world. The economical and capitalistic aspects of our world started to dominate our society and the way we form our identities. The society of the spectacle becomes invested in illusions and illusionary aspects of the world which could be compared to virtuality.

Guy Debord does not talk about fragmentation explicitly, but it is a prevailing topic in his work. He points out that our world is becoming more fragmented because it is losing the unity, wholeness and structure. Since capitalism creates the society of the spectacle by intro-



ducing various marketing strategies that impact the postmodern proletariat, it also encourages fragmentation as we become more and more immersed by diverse images and fragmented information channels. In this regard, Debord is similar to Deleuze, Guattari and Lyotard because they also focus on the relation of capitalism and identity formation via commodities. Guy Debord especially points out the fragmentary nature of the images because they flow like separate fragments in our postmodern world:

Fragmented views of reality regroup themselves into a new unity as a separate pseudo-world that can only be looked at. The specialization of images of the world has culminated in a world of autonomized images where even the deceivers are deceived. The spectacle is a concrete inversion of life, an autonomous movement of the non-living (Debord, 1992, p. 2).

The society of the spectacle is produced by fragmentation and loss of the unity which is produced by various representations that we can look at. These images become autonomized and atomized pieces in the spectacle and mass media. Guy Debord points out that when the real world is transformed into images, they become beings-figments providing hypnotic behavior while also pointing out that the world can no longer be directly grasped and it is disintegrated (Debord, 1992, p. 6).

The spectacle is born out of world's loss of unity and becomes the product of fragmentation in the world. The spectacle becomes the fragmenting element in the society which creates diverse and multilayered meanings that do not produce any kind of unity or wholeness, but instead produce chaos. As Baudrillard states:

What we experience is the implosion of fragmented meanings that do not produce any coherence but instead create wider gaps in meaning production and signification. The spectacle itself is separated and isolated from everything else. It is fragmentary in its nature because it presents itself from a different perspective every time it produces something. Mass media and its production don't produce any wholeness and do not seek to create any kind of rigid and defined structures of meaning. Mass media is like a chaos of prevailing marketing and various information pieces that do not form any coherent structure. Instead, mass media creates division. Every information for people now is given in the form of the fragments.

The already dubious satisfaction alleged to be obtained from the consumption of the whole is thus constantly being disappointed, because the actual consumer can directly access only a succession of fragments of this commodity heaven. These fragments invariably lack the quality attributed to the whole (Debord, 1992, p. 27).

This also brings the questions of the commodity and fragments. Fragmentary information which is distributed via mass media gives us only a glimpse of certain information that we want to seek. What is produced is fragmentary lines of knowledge. Fragmentation also impacts isolation and loss of touch with our reality:

In a society where no one can any longer be recognized by others, each individual becomes incapable of recognizing his own reality (Debord, 1992, p. 116).

Atomization creates isolation and loss of understanding of one's reality. We are so immersed in our closed tiny worlds inflated by images and representations that it gets harder to absorb and analyze the existing environment and current way of living. Instead of offering cohesive or meaningful narratives, media overwhelms individuals with unrelated images, advertisements, and soundbites which do not allow to form a comprehensive understanding of the world. In today's world, we experience isolated individuals and atomized and manipulated masses:

Incessant circulation of choices, readings, references, marks, decoding. Here cultural objects, as elsewhere the objects of consumption, have no other end than to maintain you in a state of mass integration, of transistorized flux, of a magnetized molecule (Baudrillard, 1995, p. 24).

Capitalism dismantles traditional social bonds, shared values and unified structures, replacing them with commodified relations. The individual becomes reduced to a consumer, which marks the rise of isolation rather than solidarity. Thus, capitalism breaks unified experiences and replaces them into consumable fragments that fulfill some sort of desires.

Thus, Guy Debord focuses on fragmentation and the society. His goal was to investigate the relation between fragmentation, capitalism and identity formation. He comes to similar conclusions to Lyotard by stating that we are formed as subjects by capitalist society. He also revealed the fragmentary state of the spectacle because it shows itself every time from a different, non-identical perspective, thus reminding the definition of fragment in German Romanticism. Fragmentation is also experienced in the social media which represents only fragmented narratives that do not constitute a unitary grand narrative.

## 7. Conclusions

In Derrida's concept of deconstruction, fragmentation functions as a gap in meaning in which the transformation of meaning occurs. Fragmentation disrupts logocentric thought and enhances pluralism and multiplicity which can rewrite the boundaries of hierarchies. The fragments become the border states of identity formation which means that fragmentation forms an identity instead of destroying it. Just like in Derrida's deconstruction, in Deleuze and Guattari's book "Thousand Plateaus" fragmentation creates a transitional identity and functions as a border area that also helps to establish a nomadic identity. In Derrida and Deleuze and Guattari's "Thousand Plateaus" fragmentation plays a meaning forming role in which it is able to constitute an identity and subjectivity by difference.

In Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy, fragmentation is also an important concept related to capitalism. Capitalism thrives thanks to fragmentation and deterritorialization that becomes the way we prescribe meaning to ourselves as well as form our identity. Fragmentation of meaning also produces multiplicity of meaning which means that it gets harder to choose and attach oneself to certain meaning.

In Lyotard's philosophy, fragmentation can be related to the production of knowledge in the postmodern world. As the channels of knowledge production become fractured, the knowledge becomes fragmentation and temporary in its form. The mode of performativity in postmodern world changes and becomes more dispersed and fractured, which impacts the way we understand ourselves. The fragmentation of knowledge and lack of grand narratives creates small groups that hold certain beliefs and values and thus create a fractured society full of small inner groups without a united community, isolated and divided.

In a similar way to Lyotard, Debord talks about identity, capitalism, society and fragmentation. The society of the spectacle functions like a fragment, because we are entertained by various fragmented images that do not form any kind of coherent idea. The society of the spectacle produces atomization of meaning and knowledge. The mass media produces overproduction of meaning which creates fragmentation, lack of connection and understanding.

Overall, fragmentation plays a key role in meaning production in all analyzed poststructuralist philosophers. In Derrida's and Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy, fragmentation is able to constitute meaning in the gaps between meaning and it manifests in the form of a difference which is able to produce meaning. While in Lyotard and Debord, fragmentation is more related to capitalist production and signification of meaning in our society which shows the plurality of meaning and fragmentation of grand-narrative and discourse.

## References

- Baudrillard, J. (1995). *Simulacra and simulation*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9904>
- Braidotti, R. (2013). Nomadic ethics. *Deleuze Studies*, 7(3), 342–359. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3366/dls.2013.0116>
- Debord, G. (1992). *The society of the spectacle*. Berkeley, Canada.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gairaud, R. H. (2005). Deconstructing totalitarianism: Fragmenting the whole in narratives. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica*, 31(2), 9–21. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15517/rfl.v31i2.4421>
- Hill, L. (2012). *Maurice blanchot and fragmentary writing: A change of epoch*. Continuum.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/1772278>
- Mojsilović, M., & Milenković, V. (2018). The concept of fragmentation: Between form and formless. *Architecture and Civil Engineering*, 16(3), 517–528. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2298/FUACE181130026M>

