PHILOSOPHER IN SPACE AND TIME OF CULTURE (CHRONOTOPE OF MAÎTRE À PENSER) PART II

The paper deals with the research of philosophic way of life as an invariant of the Western culture. The author tries to reveal the answers to the questions: What is the influence of the time and place of life on a thinking person? Is it possible to put a question in such a way?

The second part of the paper give methodological explanation for such putting the questions. Two conceptual strategies of thinking in the contemporary history of philosophy are mentioned – compartmentalism and biographical method. The latter one allows understanding of the philosophizing through research of maître à penser. Such approach made possible cultural studies prospect for a philosopher's life in the context of unique time and space. To designate the uniqueness of time and space, the category of chronotope (M. Bakhtin) was introduced in the paper. Chronotope sets condensed signs in a definite period of time at the result of which a unique image of a thinker is born in a definite cultural space.

Uniqueness of time and space and originality of philosophical quest of a thinker. Analysis of one's philosophizing through the prism of one’s life allows us to compare proved and practical dimensions, and affirm a status of “maître à penser”, if these dimensions are coincided.

The second part of the paper is focused on the time and space of the epoch of Modernity, where public space of the city as a place of activity for a philosopher is inseparably linked to critically directed an self-organized general public. Special attention is focused on life activity of Albert Schweitzer and Hannah Arendt. The author concludes that unlike Antiquity and Middle Ages where we were focused on the images of philosophers, Modernity deals with personalities of philosophers. Schweitzer as well as Arendt personally testify to their life and philosophical practice. The point is that definite life experience according to personal philosophy is purely important moral milestone, transforming the person to worthy exemplary.
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admired him. After they had satisfied their hate by his removal and had carried out their wish for identification with him, the supposed "father" impulse had to assert themselves. This took place in the form of remorse, a sense of guilt was formed which coincided here with the remorse generally felt. The dead now became stronger than the living had been, even as we observe it to-day in the destinies of men” [3, p.166].

Thus, Freud supposed that such structure as the Oedipus complex was already in the primitive mind and insisted on significant meaning of human attachment in it. I am referring to Freud’s hypothesis of "sense of love" and "sense of guilt" as a reaction to the superego of him as a psychoanalytic concept. The moral component is considered to be main function of the Oedipus complex, next to the castration phobia. Later, this discussion will be continued within the issue concerning the origins of human culture, in which the so-called "affective values" play a major role.

The thing is that according to some modern experts the so-called "father complex" has indeed a double face. In other words, the opposite feelings coexist there – profound emotional attachment and hatred with its identical direction to parents. Some scientists have reached the conclusion that the Oedipus complex act not on its natural but on affections basis, expressed in human needs of love or care, the absence of which can lead to negative psychological reaction. In comparison to the castration phobia – that is, to "the fear of losing penis" or refusal of a passive attitude, the school of him as a parent’s love, certainly, is found not to be more effective within internalization of moral norms.

As we find out later, not only the narcissus feels total indifference to the family, society etc. The schizophrenic, as Guattari insisted reasonably, is also essentially beyond the Oedipus complex, thus occupying an absolutely anti-family position. That is why Freud, as we know, couldn’t stand the narcissistic persons and the schizophrenics. Such an attitude of him is quite understandable.

Postmodernist philosophers, such as Guattari, claim that today we should first of all find out what the Oedipus complex means. As is well known, Guattari finally reached the conclusion about its artificial character. However, it seems that, on his point of view, all emotional attachments are considered as fake. Is that why postmodernist philosophers focus their attention on the Schizophrenic Subject?

Certainly, in a famous book of the XX-century, named "Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia" F. Guattari writes that the Oedipus complex is the "shame image" by its nature, and so the first analysis is "or should be, so impersonal that so-called human relation are not involved". Then he proposes interesting but quite debatable exposition of his views and claims that, in spite of dominant experience of communications between parents and their child, the first relationship is neither personal, no biological – a fact which, from his view, "psychoanalysis has not succeeded in grasping".

The post-structuralist criticism the "orthodox psychoanalysis", referring to hypothecical experience of the primary "innocence desiring-production", which ostensibly is only human one. While the psychoanalysis talks about the formation of the human personality, which a priori resists ideology – about temporal aspects, that even an animal cannot be attributed. For even an animal is controlled by something, for example, by instinct.

Meanwhile, it seems to me, this criticism in some sense is quite justified, because it is based on really profound changes in structure of human psyche of the post-industrial era, and consequently on the appearance of new anthropological type – human being, which scarcely feels need of emotional attachments. In any case, it is difficult to deny that current "human being", named by Guattari as "schizoid", is no longer "madman of family". Probably that he has schizoid unconsciousness in the sense of unlimited production of phantasms or, as philosophers claim, desiring-production. Such unconsciousness, as postmodernists note, "always is an orphan", and "it has engendered itself in the identity of nature and man". Hence, here, contrary to "orthodox psychoanalysis", the human desire is not to be reduced to the genital function, and the human unconsciousness should not be regarded as only Oedipal in its content. G. Deleuze, for example, sarcastically remarks that "by placing the distorting mirror of incest before desire (that’s what you wanted, isn’t it?), desire is shamed, stupefied, it is placed in a situation without exit, it is easily persuaded to deny "itself" in the name of the more important interests of civilization" [2, p.118].

Not only postmodern philosophes, but also many other thinkers insist that human desire has social nature in the meaning of its dependence on the organized system of public relations, which exists, as Guattari points out quite reasonably, from the very beginning of emergence of social production and reproduction. According to meta-anthropology offered by the post-structuralists, a person in current time is neither spiritual, nor social in terms of his complete indifference to person relationships. Here is how Guattari writes about this indifference: "We would seem that certain subjects have such a viscous libido or on the contrary such a liquid one that nothing succeeds in “taking hold”" [2, p.85]. These sentenced the whole humankind, which has not any high values anymore. Hence, the issue of sublimation, that is, – of the culture with its topic of affective values are closed here.

In other words, one can agree with authors mentioned above that the anthropological type, which has arisen recently, is rather a "desire machine". "Cynicism has said, or claimed to have said, everything there is to say about love: that it is a large scale (at bottom, love is in the organs; at bottom, love is a matter of economic determinations, money") [2, p.292].

Unfortunately, such a point of view concerning relationships in postmodern society belongs to many postmodern philosophers. Even J. Baudrillard, whose attitude to the "body without organs" concept was quite skeptical, also, in spite of his doctrine about postmodern society belongs to many postmodern philosophers. As postmodernists write, "the body without organs" is a major attributive characteristic of schizophrenic that is opposite to paranoid Oedipus, gendering “from the stasis of libidinal energy—that actualizes Oedipus and engages desire in this requisite impasse, organized by the repressive society” [2, p.163].

To Guattari’s view, institution of family is indeed a delegated agent of this psychic repression, insofar as it ensures the psycho- logical reproduction of economic system of a society. Meanwhile, the postmodern culture that is correlated to postindustrial society, tends to the dissolution of close relations, attachments, and stable family, at the same time, it is characterized by the powerful economic pressure that has never existed before. The thing is not only about the schizoid unconsciousness, but also about the cult of desiring-production. It is so due to functioning of repressive production system as a whole because of Oedipus actualization. Above the sexual libido that is a primary structure of psychic, have being built such desire, which by its nature is economic or political one. This mainly refers to desire of money and power that doesn’t need sublimation. This is the way to generate a paranioac-fascist, which invests the formation of central political economic system, “over invests it by making it the final eternal cause for all the other social forms of history.”

According to logic of “schizoanalysis” libido originally to designate the specific energy of desiring-machines that is not aggressive, but it is anti-social. Schizoid is absolutely indifferent to any social order. Thus, such subject demonstrates his true attitude, when he completely rejects the family and the whole field of social relations and "retreat into his shelf". To hell with mother, father, family and affections! Yet the paradox of schizophrenia lies in the
fact that it is the product of capitalism, hence such social order, as Guattari claims, provide “familialism” and at the same time, schizophrenia is the bound of capitalism, its limit.

Postmodernists emphasize that identity of capitalism and schizophrenia belongs to almost all subjects of current production process in the meaning that each of them is fascinated by “desiring production”: “Monetary flows are perfectly schizophrenic realities, but they exist and function only within the immanent axiomatic that exercises and repels this reality. The language of a banker, a general, an industrialist, a middle or high-level manager, or a government minister is a perfectly schizophrenic language, but that functions only statisitically within the flattening axiomatic of connections that puts it in the service of the capitalist order” [2, p.246].

The reader can get ambivalent impression concerning a theory that was mentioned above. Nevertheless, the postmodernists insist that every society is totalitarian, even capitalist one, in which elites are always intending to get an absolute power in relation to social lower classes. Their aim to annihilate any desire that is not corresponding to the interests of régime, or it has not been sanctioned by the whole society. For realization of this aim, elite uses different means – from blooded shows to ideological approaches, for example, religion or mass media. In a word, any state in its essence is “despotic”. That is why State has been forming such a public consciousness that reflects the interests of ruling class, and that is why F. Nietzsche once said his famous phrases: “churches, armies, states – which of all these dogs wants to die?”. “It could be that, spiritual or temporal, tyrannical or democratic, capitalist or socialist, there has never been but a single State, the State – as dog, that speaks with flaming roars" [2, p.132]. On the other hand, the postmodernist “schizoid alternative” is somewhat troublesome, because it is not only madness or, as was said above, “the limit of capitalism”, but also a dread negation of culture in all its meanings.

Indeed, the postmodern culture, not accidently named as “aesthetic”, doesn’t bring limits to anything. Moreover, the traditional cultural analysis considered (which indeed could be defined) as a repressive one, compulsive and “blooded”, today is completely dead. In the conditions of postmodern culture with its “desiring-production”, “desiring consumption” and finally, with its cult of “transgression”, the social relations are considered to be so weak that it generates a lot of social, moral and psychic troubles.

Probably, the "Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia" should be seen as a serious provocation. Its task is to reconstruct a production system in the conditions of industrial capitalism and anthropologic type that is correlated to it. Obviously, this book reflects a burning hatred of people, family, and society, where human relations are replaced by "flows", "environments" and "objects".

At first sight, it seems that the authors of this project do not see special difference between the functional field of culture and the capitalist economy because, from their perspective, the culture and capitalism are based on repression. The negative analysis of culture prevails here. However, postmodern philosophers also insist that capitalist system of production has substituted the cultural code for axiomatic of abstract quantity in mode of money. It means that the capital destroys the cultural code as such, assigning it only an archaic, folkloric function, etc.

Results. One can agree partly that between the functional field of culture and the capitalist economy lost its true meaning that is direct cause of subordinating the economical life or the law, but in case of capitalism, the repression of the culture is meant to be the forcing to normal conduct or the law, but in case of capitalism, the thing is about its forcing to production and then – to consumption. In this connection, as J. Baudrillard reasonable noted, in the conditions of post-industrial economics, the labor should not be considered as a symbol of compulsion anymore, but rather – as value that signifies the "gift", or "ack". Moreover, in the system of post-industrial economic the productive labor lost its true meaning that is direct cause of substituting the immaterial production for the material one.

Today we observe not only the lack of labor in its different senses, but also the lack of culture in its ability to regulate the relationships. Is the human society without law functioning, that postmodern thinkers hated so much, possible anyway? Indeed, the constant attribute of "Western" civilization is permanent evolution of production area, and postmodern philosophy is an immediate reflection of the finale stage, named “post-industrial society”. One can get an impression that traditional problem of so-called "civilizational approach" is ignored here. In other words, problem of the primary of existential values, that is – cultural one, or determining role of the economic “basis” in many postmodern investigations is replaced by the problem of dissolution of any cultural tradition, defined as “decoding”. Postmodern philosophers emphasized that the structural matrix of the post-industrial civilization is different because it is dominated not by social, but by political economy institutions, that reflect the interests of global capitalism, its cruel struggle for productive resources and domination in world markets. All the rest is at the mercy of an all-powerful and indestructible simulacrum, therefore, a continuously broadcast lie, produced in the virtual space, as long as it is interesting. This led, of course, to the nonstop production that finally was extrapolated on unconsciousness, where reality was replaced by the simulacrum. Henceforth the immediate component of the unconscious is a "mechanisms", which is correlated to simulacrum, but desiring production is directly corresponded to production of desire – anyone, even most vile, disgusting, low and inhumane.

Discussion. Thus, the "economy or culture" dilemma, which is inherent to philosophy of the XX century, is turning today into an indistinguishable union, where the economy occupies the dominant position. It became obvious that the existence of society in its whole is impossible beyond culture. The aim of culture is to restrict the capitalism by adjusting social life, including the production area.
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Несколько заметок о фундаментальных подходах в постмодернистских теориях культуры

Эта статья посвящена сложнейшему проблеме в постмодернистской философии культуры, в рамках которой сложилось двусмысленное понимание проблемы культурного обеспечения в постиндустриальном обществе. С одной стороны, постмодернисты подчёркивают трансформацию культуры, как таковой, с точки зрения культуры, основанной на репрессии и насильственной, а с другой – они отвергают существующую систему ценностей, поскольку считают её декадентской по отношению к человеку и его обществу. Из этой философии можно сделать вывод, что в истоки "шизоидного субъекта", в противоположность постмодернистским доктринам мы, по большому счету, достигли предела культуры, и не капитализма.
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Постановка проблеми. Теза, що вирахує у широкому формулюванні актуальність і вказує на проблему, що виявляється та розглядається у межах даного матеріалу, визначається ознаками, чим чи не є становлення щільної системи управления, яка є необхідним для подальшого розвитку на підставі наявного існуючого процесу. Вона полягає в твердженнях, що на теперішній етап пізнавальної і практичної діяльності людина знаходить своєї або постійно відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходить безпосередньо та відкривається безпосередньо відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходить безпосередньо та відкривається безпосередньо відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходить безпосередньо та відкривається безпосередньо відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходить безпосередньо та відкривається безпосередньо відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходить безпосередньо та відкривається безпосередньо відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виходити в інші форми відкривається в новій формі і з постійними настільки відкритими, але не досягненої. Вони також подаються у новій формі і постійними на стійкою і перевіреною, не без перспективи, що в результаті виход