

UDC: 159.964.2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2020-5-82-06>

WHY THE POSTSTRUCTURALIST REFUTATION OF PSYCHOANALYSIS SHOULD NOT BE TRUSTED

©SAJTARLY, INNA

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv; Associate Professor, Doctor of
Philosophical Sciences (*Kyiv, Ukraine*)

E-mail: inna.saitarly@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8253-4898>

*Національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, вул Володимирівська, 60, Київ
Україна*

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Volodymyrska str., 60, Kyiv, Ukraine

©UTIUZH, IRYNA

Zaporizhzhia State Medical University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)

E-mail: ytyh13@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1152-0151>

*Запорізький державний медичний університет, проспект Маяковського, 24
Запоріжжя. Україна*

Zaporizhzhia State Medical University, 24 Mayakovsky str., Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

Abstract

In this working we consider the most complicated issue of contemporary social explorations, namely an issue of transformations of familial institutes, and essential changes in relation to value of interpersonal attachment, that, according to our profound conviction, is associated, primarily, with socio-economic transformations, taking place in the contemporary civilizations. **The researchtopicality** is due to the lack of sufficient attention to study of those philosophical exploration, which is fundamental in regard to the grasping of postmodern society, and which laid the basis for developing the whole social critical theory as the central paradigm in contemporary philosophy. **The purpose** of the article is to analyzing the methodological connection between the psychoanalysis and some poststructuralist approach, namely between the structuring of unconscious in “orthodox psychoanalysis” and “schizo-analysis”, aimed to underline the dependence of dynamic of philosophical strategies on general dynamic of sociocultural transformations, especially on mental transformations, occurring in mind of postmodern men. **The methodology** of this exploration is founded on descriptive and comparative analyses with the references to fundamental metaphysical treatises within frameworks of development contemporary philosophical tradition. **The novelty** of this article is to with finding correlations between psychoanalysis and schizo-analysis in terms of similarities in their rationale for relative nature of affective values. **As the result**, we concluded that the considered philosophical theory of “designing of mental structures” is conditioned by principles of sociocultural determinism, while the applying a same psychoanalytic approach to the postmodern thinking one can see its dependence on author’s personal experiences, on his “a little dirty secret”.

Keywords: Oedipus complex, psychoanalysis, schizo-analysis, unconscious, postmodernism, libidinal economy.

Introduction. As well-known, the most principal problem of contemporary explorations in philosophy is related to issues of dehumanizing, and to so-called “demise” of basic social institutions, namely, matrimonial ones. It is noteworthy, when considering these issues, a number of postmodern philosophes tend to focus on the problem of the “*transgressions*” and “*disorders*” which, as well-known,

traditionally are the psychoanalytic narratives, if we are putting it in the language of postmodern philosophy.

This topic is clarified and completed by another traditional issue of psychoanalytic philosophy, which is no less important. It is also widespread in the most trends in postmodern philosophy. There is talking about an issue of so-called “designing of Subject” that in “orthodox” psychoanalysis is deeply connected with function of *Oedipus complex*. This connection is the subject matter of philosophical studies not only for Freud, but also for many other outstanding thinkers of 20th century.

This exploration is based on the comparative analysis of psychoanalytic hypotheses and some poststructuralist approaches, primarily, there is talking about the correlation between psychoanalysis and *schizo-analysis*, which are close related to familial problematics.

This article is aimed to clarifying the logic of development of philosophical thinking, in particular, to demonstrating the directly dependence of philosophical social doctrine and anthropology, namely, their views on the family and human feelings on real sociocultural conditions. It is the grasping of this dependence that allow us to realize of relativity of any philosophical theory, even the most convincing.

The analysis of resent publications on the research topic. There are lot of reasonings in this article are grounded on well-known theoretical resources and workings, namely, we are, first of all, referring

to certain ideas and strategies, which was offered by representatives of psychoanalytic thought, and by some postmodernist authors, in particular, Sigmund Freud, Wilhelm Reich, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Jean Baudrillard and other.

The unresolved parts of the general problem to which this article devoted. The topic of Oedipus complex is, primarily, associated with the topic of formation (“designing”) the Moral Subject, and affective values in interpersonal relations. But, if we trace the logic of developing the psychoanalytic thought, we’ll see that starting with Carl Gustav Jung and ending with F. Guattari, within framework of the above paradigms have been essential changes. Apparently, it is not enough to seek an answer to the question of the determinants of these changes, having in mind only social or cultural transformations.

The topicality of the research. The issue of nature of human feelings is the most widespread within framework of philosophical postmodernism, perhaps, due to strongest crisis in this area. The thing is the human feelings, in particular, which were designed by certain cultural tradition, nowadays, have been disappearing like the cultural tradition, which originated them. Put it in Spengler's language, we can say that only passions with their destructive consequences remained.

The “demise” of affection and values of human relations is largely caused by general “spirit” of current social formation, titled by different way, for example, the postmodern

society is very often designated as “consumer”, “postindustrial”, “digital”, “mass society”. It is easy to see that all these characteristics are pointed to its economic ground. It is the philosophical view on this matter that enables us to realize of whole “existential” catastrophe of postmodern civilization and human being, since the problem of decline of affective culture is, mainly, the problem of losing the mental health, rather than the problem of society losing itself. Is not that why it is madness that is turned out to be the main issue of leading trends of contemporary philosophical thinking?

1. The dancing around “Oedipus story”. So, what is, indeed, the Oedipus complex? Is this only the castration phobia and the neurotic phantasm, or anything else? Perhaps, is just construct (myth), which was created by Freud himself. All these questions that are not very simple, will be formulated in a notorious, but very controversial study of J. Deleuz and F. Guattari, titled as “Anti-Oedipus and Schizophrenia”, where they, in particular, note: “We are not saying that Oedipus and castration do not amount to anything. We are oedipalized, we are castrated; psychoanalysis didn't invent these operations, to which it merely lends the new resources and methods of its genius” [2, p.67].

Indeed, the basic component of Oedipus complex is so-called “castration phobia”, which, according to Freud, is identical to father's one, and which provides of arising the moral Subject in the sense of human ability to constrain (control) the

natural strives, namely human instincts.

It is this component that participates in masculinization of individual, but nowadays, which is not seen to be dependent on father's phobia any more, since we cannot talk about “the madman of the family” [2, p. 270], or a paternal coercion to “order” due to the almost widespread “absence” of fathers in modern family, or due to their total dragging into production process. Put it another way, the Oedipus complex is not directly related to father's person any more.

Nevertheless, this minor remark does not mean that pointed above issue is simple. As J. Baudrillard rightly notes, the “phallus standard” still has been taking the dominant position in postindustrial countries, and we can hardly contest the existence of *castration phobia in the sense of male fear of losing dominance, even under postmodern conditions*. There is talking about today's men need in political-economic and social superiority, which is not related to moral superiority, that is, the story about Oedipus complex has completely lost its ethical content and contexts. Thus, *if we can talk about “Oedipus” structure, then only in terms of rigid male identity*. It is this argument that is used by feministic philosophers, but some postmodern thinkers who complicate this problem other assumptions.

However, according to Freud's view, there is another component of Oedipus construct, whose moral function is more significant than

phobia of losing male identity: Freud insisted on more effective role of child's attachment to their parents. *It is this attachment that is mostly subjected of attack from side of postmodernists mostly, rather than the phobia of castration.*

It is noteworthy that throughout the twentieth century, in many modern philosophical studies, the human affective values were being under strong attacks, as never before, in particular, the familial values and ties. There is talking about the argumentations, aimed to prove of absolute relativity of human affection, namely affection between men and women, sometimes, even regarding the doubtfulness of mentioned above affection.

In this regard, it is enough to refer to such words from "Anti-Oedipus ...", which describe the postmodern era as a whole, rather than the separate author's perspective. We have in mind the place, where Deleuz and Guattari note that despite of schizoid nature of postmodern man, he still has been giving his orders to the world. "He doesn't care for the ladies. He is brave, too, but decorated like crazy", and «in man's game of chance, the death instinct, the silent instinct is still decidedly well placed, perhaps next to egoism» [2, p. 335].

Indeed, it is hard to contest that majority of human communities is subjugated to the super power of "male alliances", which unavoidably generate of phallogentric *paranoia* in the form both "Oedipus complex" and devaluation of all feminine. One can even say, it is this *paranoia* that hunts all societies even more then

capitalism itself. We have in mind the prominent statement of these authors about that "in a sense, capitalism has haunted all forms of society, but it haunts them as their terrifying nightmare..." [2, p. 140]. Supposedly, it is this phenomenon that predetermining of the core of *homosexual libido per se*. But, why is this old psychoanalytic story about Oedipus is turned out to be not enough?

Wilhelm Reich was the first who made a great contribution into criticism of familial institutions, where the power in history traditionally belonged to "phallogentric paranoiac". His ideas are of a particular interest, especially *in regard to his contribution to elaboration of the theoretical background for development of "libidinal economy"*. But, despite of some similarity his ideas with ideas "Anti-Oedipus", his views on human nature, particularity, on male nature differ from mentioned above authors. Let us dwell on these ideas in more detail.

In his well-known study, titled "The mass Psychology of Fascism" Reich states that an authoritarian family forms the relevant worldview, which is expressed in a love for power and deep contempt for natural instincts.

In fact, until recently in most societies dominated the patriarchal and ascetic-clerical mores that, according to him, generated only mystical conception of life, with "its negation of sexual needs" [4, p 125]. All this, in its core expressed of

totally hatred for life. It is hatred toward life with a strong desire for violence that is to the main marker of fascist person – orgiastic imponent individual, who constantly feels himself to be repressed and unsatisfied, trying to substitute for his displeasure with pleasure in power and material success, including the sadistic libido.

That is the reason Reich was inclined to a negative attitude to patriarchal family and church, since according to him, it is primarily these institutes that play a leading role in “designing the destructive Subject”. In other words, the basis of designing the “fascist’s unconscious” does occur under conditions the authoritarian upbringing, *manifested in a love for dominate*, which tend to be ersatz for unhappiness in love relationship. But, how much is this vision relevant to nowadays and what does homosexuality have to do with it?

2. Idea of innate male homosexuality in philosophy, and what does it really mean? From Reich’s perspective, *fascist libido* is equally perversion, as has been pointed above, based on hatred for natural existence and, that is why fascist tends to destructivity. Moreover, the fascist individual does express of the high level of natural alienation. Fascist’s libido, for example, is generated at a time, when the violence is to the solely source for gratification, and its actions remain unpunished.

An example of human perversion is also *homosexuality*, that one can very often to be met in fascist’s individual. Reich is convinced that the

main reason for emergence of *homosexuality*, is to the ascetic virtues and “false” sense of guilt, which is caused by these virtues.

Thus, following this logic, it turns out that the same reason laid the basis of such various consequences, namely, according to Reich, the patriarchal-authoritarians and ascetic imperatives leads to the passive homosexuality, to the sadism with its super-natural cruelty, and special tenderness attitude to the woman, for example, in the form of romantic standard. For instance, in his notorious working, titled as “The mass Psychology of Fascism” Wilhelm Reich writes: “where is that the youth is to seek the energy to subdue his genital titillations? In faith in Jesus! As a matter of fact, he does derive an enormous power against his sexuality from his faith in Jesus. What is the basis of its mechanism? The mystical experience puts him in a stage of vegetative excitation, which never culminates in natural orgiastic gratification. The youth’s sexual drive develops in a passive homosexual direction. In terms of the drive’s energy, passive homosexuality is the most effective counterpart of natural masculine sexuality, for it replaces activity and aggression by passivity and masochistic attitude, that is to say, by precisely those attitudes that determine the mass basic of patriarchal authoritarian mysticism in the human structure [4, p.163].

Furthermore, how convincing is Reich’s thesis of substituting the genital pleasure for mental one? We can get the impression that according to Reich the human *satisfaction with*

life is reduced to only “coitus” and nothing more. His instinctual emasculation of human being is similar to madness.

Meanwhile, Reich also offered the idea, which would be supported by Herbert Marcuse, in particular, he stated that due to direct integration of human individuals into the production system, they redirect their biological energy into social field, transforms the structure of their *libido* essentially, maintaining in such way the whole system of political and economic relations, that is, the system of social suppression. *If we take in account that the any society is based on power and property relations, then human being unavoidably is doomed to perversion in terms of love for power and domination, since there is no social system, which is free from relations of coercing and suppression.*

But, how much is true the thesis about the *substitution* (ersatz) of genital satisfaction for mental one? Do they not coexist in man? The human being is the complex psychical and social “entity” with very complex structure of pleasure. It is more reasonable to suppose that in the case of super-excessed (malignant) aggression there is talking about the psychical compensation, that is, about mental function of pleasure, rather than about substitution for sexual displeasure. This perspective, for example, was grounded by E. Fromm.

Reasoning about the nature of fascist *libido*, homosexuality and family in “Anti-Oedipus and Schizophrenia” Guattari and Deleuze state, first of all, that all these issues are related to each other. If, for

example, Freud believed in dependence of *homosexuality* on male Narcissism, designated by post-modernists as a “phalli-(logos)-centrism”, then according to later postmodern reflections the secret of *homosexuality* is rooted in male nature as such. In any society we can find of the *eternal male solidarity* that, apparently, causes of **mentioned** prime Narcissism.

Furthermore, these authors assure that so-called *homosexuality* can be divided into two forms, namely into primary and secondary (Oedipal or social) *homosexuality*, that is, the phenomenon of *homosexuality* is considered here in terms of its dual genesis and types. They are referring to this divergence suggest of existence *Non-Oedipus version of homosexuality* that they designate as a primary one. So that, “all men are homosexuals” [2, p.185], therefore, we cannot say about any love for woman and child. Therefore, according to Guattari and Deleuze, all of this is “social myth”, which is aimed *to impose on the man a family* as a unite of reproduction and consumption, consequently, to involve him much more in established production order.

In view of the above, we would like to elucidate if there is any sense of such differentiation. Put it another way, not whether this theory is an effect of author’s phantasm?

3. Schizoid as a symbol of the social death humanity. Thus, the psychoanalytical doctrine is, primarily, subjected to profound rethinking in the works of poststructuralists, namely in

mentioned above writings, titled as “*Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*”.

In this outspoken work, Guattarian and Deleuze constantly emphasize the existence of another sexuality, which does not limit personal relations, that is, not related to “Oedipus complex”. The thing is existence of so-called “*schizoid libido*” that, according to them, today intensively spread over all body of social formation. That is why, a fundamental concept of mentioned above treatise is the *Schizoid Subject*, which, on the one side, expresses of emergence of a new anthropological type, on the other, similar to the concept of “necrophile”, offered by Fromm, can be understood as a quite metaphysical concept.

As was noted in a previous publication, “postmodernists emphasize that identity of capitalism and schizophrenia belongs to almost all subjects of current production process in this 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 exorcises 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 statistically within the flattening axiomatic of connections that puts it in the service of the capitalist order” [5, p.47].

If Reich, for instance, regarded that *existential drama* of human being is due to “lack” of happiness in love relationship, caused by rigorous

ascetic ideals, since according to him, “the basic religious idea of all patriarchal religions is the negation of sexual needs” [4, p.222], then postmodernist theory, offered in “*Anti-Oedipus*”, fully reject any whimpering about not being loved or understood. This is generally “anal” perspective on human relations, which also reduced here to the “copulation organs”. In other words, there is here no need for attachment any more. The fundamental concept of this philosophy is “the body without organs”. Despite on assurances of authors about their fighting against fascism, we can see here the most dehumanized and inhumanity story, then we have ever met.

Schizoid “body without organs” generally reject any person and attachments. Furthermore, referring to their descriptions of postmodern subject, we can suggest that here it is not saying about human being at all, or about deeply sick human being, who is absolutely antisocial. Like other people he feels some emotions, but these emotions, as authors write, is quite “material”, directed only to things and flows.

Underlining “the universal fact that marriage is not an alliance between a man and a woman, but an alliance between two families,” “a transaction between men concerning women,” [2, p.185], “*schizo-analysis*” is aimed to manifest that so-called human relations cannot be involved into unconscious. Despite of dominant experience of communications between parents and their child (Deleuz and Guattari had to recognized this fact, which was

evidenced by Carl Gustav Jung), postmodernists were convinced that all this is only “investment of the capitalist field to apply all the social images to the simulacra of the restricted family, with the result that , wherever one turns, one no longer finds anything but father-mother – *this Oedipal filth that sticks to our skin*” [2, p,267]. For example, in their treatise Deleuz and Guattarinote: “But in effect, Oedipus begins in the mind of the father. And the beginning is not absolute: it is only constituted starting from investments of the social historical field that are affected by the father. And if it passes over to the son, this is not by virtue of a familial heredity, but by virtue of a much more complex relationship that depends on the communication of the unconscious” (178).

That is why, they, in general, focused on the relativity of human affection and declared that society itself imposes the love for the parents, whereas in nature a child *libido* can be directed to absolutely impersonal objects. In other words, the prime individual unconscious is neither spiritual, nor familial in terms of its almost complete indifference to person relationships, that is, it is absolutely schizoid one.

Thus, instead of the fascist paranoiac, these thinkers propose us the Schizoid subject, who, in fact, is not able to create of any sociality due to his complete indifference. It looks like as a fully delirium. In this connection, it is worth to remind that Deleuz and Guattari fully review of very concept of “*libidinal economy*”. According to them, the notion of

“*desiring-production*”, which laid the basis of libidinal economy, and the notion of “*libidinal labor*” is not the same. Referring to this divergence, their expression about that the desire knows only theft and gift, and nothing more, become quite clear.

The libidinal economy, that is, the production is to the “desiring” in terms of its dependence on human passion and pleasure, which have nothing to do with the pleasure of work. All of that feed solely on the love for financial flows (profits). There is pleasure for labor in established system of production relations is impossible in principle. That is why, if there is any sense to claim about postmodern myth, this is, first of all, “the myth of zombies – mortified schizoids, good for work, brought back to reason” [2, p. 335].

In regard to the above, these authors emphasize, that, in fact, “the fundamental notions of the *economy of desire* – *work* and *investment* – keep their importance, but are subordinated to the forms of an *expressive unconscious* and no longer to the formations of the *productive unconscious*” [2, p.55]. The particularity of *libidinal production* is to with that it namely characterizes of the nature of unconscious, which, according to authors, has a collective, that is, a genetic ground. If this is characterized as the production of phantasms, then these phantasms have solely collective origin.

Conclusion. 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”. Today, we have the society, which is fully disappearing into relations of production and consumption, even at the level of familial values and relations. Contemporary postindustrial phase of civilizing process opened and gained for itself a very comfortable and, that is most importantly, a very profitable resource of exploitations, namely the recourse of human desires and passions, even the most

dangerous, mean and destructive. It looks like a vampire who stuck to the body of contemporary man with only one purpose – to suck everything out of him – until his death. But here, as Baudrillard wittily noted, there is a terrible dialectical connection between the resource and its “bloodsucker”. After all, the life of a vampire does dependent on the life of his victim, that is, everything can be resolved in a general mortal synthesis.

Спис використаних джерел

1. Baudrillard Jean “The consumer society”. – English translation copyright, Sage Publications 1998, Introduction George Ritzer 1998, *Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society*, Nottingham Trent University
2. Deleuze, G. Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
3. Freud, S. (1919). *Totem and Taboo. Resemblances Between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. New York University; London: *GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED*. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/41214>
4. Reich Wilhelm “The mass Psychology of Fascism”/ <https://archive.org/details/wilhelm-reich-the-mass-psychology-of-fascism/page/n195/mode/2up>
5. Sajtarly I.A. Few notes on fundamental approaches in the postmodern theories of culture. *Культурологія. Українські культурологічні студії*, 1 (2). *КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка*, 2018. 45-48
6. Jameson F. (1990). *Postmodernism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: *Duke Univ. Press*. 438.
7. Jameson F. (1998). *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern 1983-1998*. London ; New York : *Verso*. 206.
8. Фрейд З. (1901). Психопатология обыденной жизни// Психология бессознательного. М. : *Просвещение*. 202-309
9. Лакан Ж. (2002). *Образования бессознательного. (Семинары: Книга V (1957/1958))*. М. : Гнозис. 608 с.
10. Лакан Ж. (2006). *Этика психоанализа. (Семинары: Книга VII (1959-60))*. М.: Гнозис, *Логос*. 416.
11. Батлер Дж. (2002). *Психика власти: теории субъекции*. Харьков : *ХЦГИ*; СПб. : *Алетейя*. 168.

REFERENCES

1. Baudrillard Jean “The consumer society”. – English translation copyright, Sage Publications 1998, Introduction George Ritzer 1998, *Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society*, Nottingham Trent University
2. Deleuze, G. Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
3. Freud, S. (1919). *Totem and Taboo. Resemblances Between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. New York University; London : *GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED*. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/41214>
4. Reich Wilhelm “The mass Psychology of Fascism”/ <https://archive.org/details/wilhelm-reich-the-mass-psychology-of-fascism/page/n195/mode/2up>
5. Sajtarly I. A. (2018). few notes on fundamental approaches in the postmodern theories of culture. *Культурологія. Українські культурологічні студії*, 1 (2). *КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка*. 45-48

6. Jameson F. Postmodernism (1990). Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Durham : *Duke Univ. Press*. 438.
7. Jameson F. (1998). The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern 1983-1998. London ; New York : *Verso*. 206.
8. Freyd Z. (1989). Psihopatologiya obyidennoy zhizni // *Psihologiya bessoznatelnogo*. M. : *Prosveschenie*. 202-309
9. Lakan Zh. (2002). Obrazovaniya bessoznatelnogo. (Seminaryi : Kniga V (1957/1958). M. : *Gnozis*. 608.
10. Lakan Zh. (2006). Etika psihoanaliza.(Seminaryi: Kniga VII (1959-60)). M. : *Gnozis, Logos*. 416.
11. Batler Dzh. (2002). Psihika vlasti: teorii sub'ektsii. Harkov : *HTsGI; SPb. : Aleteya*. 2002.168 s.

САЙТАРЛИ, ІННА АНАТОЛІЇВНА – доктор філософських наук, професор кафедри філософії гуманітарних наук Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна)

E-mail: inna.saitarly@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8253-4898>

УТЮЖ, ІРИНА ГЕННАДІЇВНА – доктор філософських наук, професор, завідувач кафедри суспільних дисциплін Запорізького державного медичного університету (Запоріжжя, Україна)

E-mail: utyh13@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1152-0151>

ЧОМУ ПОСТСТРУКТУРАЛІСТСЬКОМУ СПРОСТУВАННЮ ПСИХОАНАЛІЗУ НЕ СЛІД ДОВІРЯТИ?

В статті ми розглядаємо найбільш складну проблему сучасних соціальних досліджень, а саме проблему трансформації сімейних інститутів, а також суттєві зміни у ставленні цінності міжособистісної прихильності, що, на наше глибоке переконання, пов'язане, в першу чергу, з соціально-економічними перетвореннями, що відбуваються в сучасних цивілізаціях. Актуальність дослідження обумовлена недостатньою увагою до вивчення тих філософських досліджень, які є фундаментальними для розуміння постмодерністського суспільства і заклали основу для розвитку всієї соціальної критичної теорії як центральної парадигми в сучасній філософії. **Метою статті** є аналіз методологічного зв'язку між психоаналізом та постструктуралістським підходом, а саме між структуруванням несвідомого в «ортодоксальному психоаналізі» і «шизоаналізі», з метою підкреслити залежність динаміки філософських стратегій від загальної динаміки соціокультурних трансформацій, особливо ментальних трансформацій, що відбуваються в свідомості людини постмодерну. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на описовому і порівняльному аналізі з посиланнями на фундаментальні метафізичні трактати в рамках розвитку сучасної філософської традиції. **Новизна** даної статті полягає у виявленні кореляцій між психоаналізом та шизоаналізом з точки зору подібності в їх обґрунтуванні відносної природи афективних цінностей. В результаті ми прийшли до висновку, що розглянута філософська теорія «конструювання ментальних структур» обумовлена принципами соціокультурного детермінізму, але застосовуючи той же психоаналітичний підхід до постмодерністського мислення, можна побачити його залежність від особистого досвіду автора, від його «маленького брудного секрету».

Ключові слова: Едипів комплекс, психоаналіз, шизоаналіз, несвідоме, постмодернізм, лібідінальна економіка.

САЙТАРЛИ, ІННА АНАТОЛІЇВНА – доктор філософських наук, професор кафедри філософії гуманітарних наук Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна)

E-mail: inna.saitarly@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8253-4898>

УТЮЖ, ІРИНА ГЕННАДІЇВНА – доктор філософських наук, професор, зав. кафедрою суспільних дисциплін Запорізького державного медичного університету

E-mail: utyh13@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1152-0151>

ПОЧЕМУ ПОСТСТРУКТУРАЛИСТСКОМУ ОПРОВЕРЖЕНИЮ ПСИХОАНАЛИЗА НЕ СЛЕДУЕТ ДОВЕРЯТЬ?

Аннотация

В данной работе мы рассматриваем наиболее сложную проблему современных социальных исследований, а именно проблему трансформаций семейных институтов, а также существенные изменения в отношении ценности межличностной привязанности, что, по нашему глубокому убеждению, связано, в первую очередь, с социально-экономическими преобразованиями, происходящими в современных цивилизациях. **Актуальность** исследования обусловлена недостаточным вниманием к изучению тех философских изысканий, которые являются фундаментальными для понимания постмодернистского общества и заложили основу для развития всей социальной критической теории как центральной парадигмы в современной философии. **Целью** статьи является анализ методологической связи между психоанализом и некоторым постструктуралистским подходом, а именно между структурированием бессознательного в «ортодоксальном психоанализе» и «шизоанализом», с целью подчеркнуть зависимость динамики философских стратегий от общей динамики социокультурных трансформаций, особенно ментальных трансформаций, происходящих в сознании человека постмодерна. **Методология** исследования основана на описательном и сравнительном анализе со ссылками на фундаментальные метафизические трактаты в рамках развития современной философской традиции. **Новизна** данной статьи заключается в обнаружении корреляций между психоанализом и шизоанализом с точки зрения сходства в их обоснованиях относительной природы аффективных ценностей. **В результате** мы пришли к выводу, что рассматриваемая философская теория «конструирования ментальных структур» обусловлена принципами социокультурного детерминизма, но применяя тот же психоаналитический подход к постмодернистскому мышлению, можно увидеть его зависимость от личного опыта автора, от его «маленького грязного секрета».

Ключевые слова: Эдипов комплекс, психоанализ, шизоанализ, бессознательное, постмодернизм, либидиозная экономика.

Received date 05. 11.2020

Accepted date 10.11.2020

Published date 17.11.2020