

Problem of Human Integrity within the Framework of Technological Society

Sheleketa V.O.

Institute of Economics and Management
Belgorod State Technological University named after V. G.
Shoukhov
Belgorod, Russia
vladshelo@mail.ru

Chizhova E.N.

Institute of Economics and Management
Belgorod State Technological University named after V. G.
Shoukhov
Belgorod, Russia

Dmitrieva I.S.

Department of Economics and Management
Volgograd branch of Plekhanov Russian University of
Economics
Volgograd, Russia

Ivakhnov V.Yu.

Department of Engineering and Economics
Volzhsky Polytechnic Institute (branch) of
Volgograd State Technical University
Volzhsky, Russia

Abstract—The issue under consideration in this article is the problem of psychological theories and concepts reflecting the human's status within the limits of technogenic informational civilization. The purpose of the work is to demonstrate the “unhealthy” in existential and psychological aspects situation in the sphere of subjective reality of a personality, and for this purpose the discourses integration method is used. The usage of the mentioned directions are due to the fact that they are the mainstream ones for comprehending the status of a human in a totally technified world since the middle of the 20th century, as they “grasp” the specifics of the human's status in civilizational context, with the main tokens of the fixed transition to the information society, which is reflected in the general tendency of mental-corporeal existence. The main conclusion of the article is the verification of the schizoid accentuation of a personality as the prevalent tendency of mental-corporeal existence, the manifestations of which are the identity crisis, “cybernetical”, not authentic to the Existence character of most interrelations of human with the society and with the world in general.

Keywords—*manipulativity, technological mentality, machine consciousness, orientation to artificial*

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of determining the human's status within the limits, drawn by the technogenic civilization, was of concern to the representatives of various discourses since the second half of the 20th century. Probably, this is due to the fact that the birth of the new civilization and the discovery of the new status of human became obvious at this particular time. Radicality in the alteration of the anthropological status of human is associated with the cardinal changes both in the psychology (mentality) of human, and in the sphere of their corporality, which could not go unnoticed by the representatives of both psychological and philosophical discourse. A certain interlocking (integration) of discourses was remarkable for that time. It was reflected in the appearance of various branches and spin-outs from fundamental trends which tried to break out of conceptual and categorical

borders, drawn by the “paradigm” within the framework of a certain fundamental philosophical field of that time, - for example, existentialism. So, we will consider the most influential theories which exist, so to say, “at the border” of philosophy and psychology.

II. METHODOLOGY

The main method used in the analysis was the method of pairing discourses.

III. MAIN DIRECTIONS IN THE STUDY OF THIS PROBLEM

A. Synthetic (or syncretic) trends

Among the most typical of such synthetic (or syncretic) trends we can name the existential psychology, existential psychotherapy, humanistic psychoanalysis, schizoanalysis. I. Yalom characterizes the situation with theories about human as the one which appeared due to the fact that the European existential analytical trend was generated, on the one hand, by the desire to use philosophical concepts in the comprehensive, including clinical, study of the personality. On the other hand, it was generated by the not too positive reaction to the Freudian model of human. In the United States, the first indications of the similar trend began in the late 50's, surfaced in the social life and consolidated in the 60's, spread wildly in all spheres at once in 70's [1, p. 11]. In psychology at that time, the positivistic behaviorism on the one hand and Freudian psychoanalysis on the other hand were prevailing. Combining with the popular philosophical statements of existentialism and with the spirit of humanism, having eventually firmed up in Europe, these trends initiated the appearance of existential psychoanalysis. One of the most prominent representatives of it was existential psychology (or rather the psychological existentialism) developed by L. Binswanger.

B. Structuralism

Another influential trend was structuralism. Certainly using the critical pathos and analytical methodology of psychoanalysis, it tried to reduce most of cultural events to certain pre-structures of the mass unconscious and historically developing psychological phenomena of collective consciousness (resulting, for example, in the appearance of institutions like clinics and prisons, according to M. Foucault). However, post-structuralism takes apart the pretensions of analytical methodologies, basing on the same phenomena of consciousness (or, more precisely, of mentality), forming a methodology, basing on the “none of the above” ideology. This contraposition of any structuredness and analyticity at the same time opposes the definitions of clinical psychology, like the “schizophrenia” diagnosis, in their own phenomenological-semantic way interpreting the epistemological network formed in the European scientific consciousness, and even using the schizophrenic perception. This was probably for the better “empathy” and being inspired by the purpose to dismantle the stable gnosiological structures. Such is the schizoanalysis developed by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari.

IV. MAIN IDEAS COMPREHENDED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORKS OF THE ABOVE-MENTIONED TRENDS

A human in civilizational context became the main subject matter of the analysis, with all the signs of the fixed transition to information society. At this, a general tendency is identified which can be summed up as reflecting in such categories as “manipulativity”, “technological mentality”, “machine consciousness”, “orientation to artificial”.

Let us consider the main ideas comprehended within the frameworks of the above-mentioned trends.

A. E. Fromm as a representative of the psychological trend

E. Fromm, a representative of the psychological trend, characterized the main feature of the human’s attitude towards the reality in the second half of the 20th century as the necrophilic mindset, while the biophilia is defined as preferring live to artificial. “This general orientation to everything artificial, to the secondary, human-made reality, renouncing everything natural as second-rate” [2, p. 540] is definitely the feature of technological civilization. The general consequence of such a mindset is that even the natural needs of people are subject of this repressive mechanism. Thus, sex turns into a set of techniques, joy is replaced with excitation or satisfaction as the reflection, in a way, of mechanistic parameters of the body. What is the most alarming is that “what people earlier called love and tenderness, they nowadays mostly give to the technology (machines, instruments, apparatuses)” [2, pp. 540-541]. And, finally, “the world turns into a set of artifacts: a human as a whole (from artificial nutrition to transplanted organs) becomes a part of a giant mechanism which he seems to control, but by which he is also controlled at the same time. A human has no other plans or vital aims, apart from those which are prescribed by the logics of technological progress. He strives to create robots and considers this one of the greatest achievements of the technologic mind. Many specialists say that it is possible to make a robot which would be virtually no

different from a human”. [2, p. 540]. These words were written by Fromm in the beginning of the second half of the 20th century, and nowadays we can see the antropomorphic-looking androids which operating system in its processing speed is the closest to the neurosystem of the human brain. But the most important existential-anthropological characteristics of this situation is not the very fact of the phenomenally quick scientific and technological process, but what Fromm expressed in the following phrase: “Such achievement could hardly surprise us more than the fact that nowadays a human is often undistinguishable from a robot” (ibidem). Here Fromm the most generally determined his guesses about the total mechanization of all the aspects of human life which in their essence are the favoring of the dead matter. These conclusions by Fromm may be considered by someone as too radical and the extreme position of anti-technicism. However, in a way, it is true that “nowadays the symbols of dead stuff are not the malodorous corpses and not excrement – but the shining clear machines and apparatuses,” - and people are plagued not by the attraction to stinking toilets (which is mentioned by Fromm in the context of his description of necrophilia symptoms), but by the passion to shining automatic structures made of aluminium, steel and glass (ibidem).

In this regard, apart from the subject of psychosexual deviation considered within the context of contraposition of necrophilia and biophilia, Fromm argued the possibility of defining the above-mentioned characteristics of the present-day interaction of human and technology as a psychopathological symptom. Thus, he introduced a concept of cybernetic personality with such characterological features as non-distinction between living and nonliving matter, lack of affection (love) to other people, using language not for communication, but for manipulation, and the prevailing interest not in people, but in machines and mechanisms [2, pp. 546-547]. These are rather diluted traits of schizophrenia which nevertheless reproduce all its elements.

Depicting this problem even more prominently, Fromm suggested the categorical link: “mechanical – non-living – anal,” underlining that at considering the character of an extremely estranged, cybernetic human, by no means should we overlook the schizoid or schizophrenic features of such a human [2, pp. 543]. The first that catches the eye is definitely the splitting of personality, the disagreement of senses, mind and will (this split nature was the basis for naming the disease; E. Bleuler just used the Greek words “schizo” – “to cleave, to tear” and “phren” – “psychics, soul”). Describing the “cybernetic personality”, Fromm gave the examples of such splitting: for example, the indifference of a bomber pilot who knows that by pushing a button he kills hundreds of thousands of people [2, p. 535].

Here, another important question arises, namely the question about, so to say, the mental provision of such a worldview and such a deep mental set. And here the gnosiological modality of such a personal, to a large extent, orientation is showing through. In this regard, Fromm said: “cybernetic personality is guided only by rational categories, and such a person can be called monocerebral [i.e., using only one side of his nervous system and brain, - the one which is connected with logical thinking. – V. Sh.] – a person of one

thought (or of “one dimension”). His whole attitude to the surrounding world (and to himself) is of purely rational-cognitive character: he wants to know how things appeared, how they are organized, how they function and how to manage them. Such interest was stimulated to a great extent by the scientific development. Science is the essence of the modern progress; it is the basis of the technological reclamation of the world and of providing the mass consumption” [2, pp. 543-544]. Here Fromm discovered the rational character of technologically-oriented personality’s mind or a “cybernetical human”. This fact itself is not something new. It is sort of obvious that only the rational cognition due to its specifics can provide the scientific thinking and is also the condition of scientific and technological progress, due to its being “geared” towards the manipulative nature of analytical thinking. All the elements of analytical thinking are interchangeable within the framework of a system of statements and definitions working in a mutually-agreeable way like gear-wheels of a certain mechanism-metasytem where each system is a concept which can be figuratively depicted, for example, as a Rubik’s cube or a clockwork mechanism, etc.

However, along with psychological characteristics, this also involves something deeper and more philosophical, namely, certain pathology of thinking, lameness of the general cogitative and worldview orientation. The hypertrophy of the rational element is naturally the lack of an emotional and sensuous component. And the latter, resulting from the antecedent, cannot fail to cause anxiety and to draw attention, because it is as deep as total, it is the universal character of such a world-outlook with which most of the population of the modern industrial-rational world are infected. Fromm was worried about the fact that such “monocerebral” mindset can be observed to be possessed not only by representatives of science, but by the greater part of the population – clerks, merchants, engineers, doctors, managers, and it is especially characteristic for workers of culture and representatives of the creative community. Further Fromm declared, totally in the spirit of existential philosophy, but not the humanistic psychoanalysis, to the school of which he is referred: “All of them see the world as a set of things which should be understood for the purpose of their useful application” [2, p. 544].

At this point of reasoning we should, in our opinion, concentrate closely. On the one hand, in order to understand the alternative of such a position in the world, and its handicaps, as we think, are obvious. On the other hand, in order to consider the manipulative-narcissistic character of technological civilization. This has now become a generality, not only due to philosophers-existentialists who have been acutely posing this question since the beginning of the 20th century, connecting the fundamental features of the existence of human and the world in general with the rational existence of machine (or “world as machine”).

B. *Structuralism and post-structuralism*

Structuralism and post-structuralism (including the one presented by M. Foucault) postulated as the initial point of such a worldview the forming of medical surveillance as the reflection of the anti-humanistic normative-mechanistic societal order and the order of “disciplinary” practices. In other

words, they postulated the formation of government as a special mechanism, autonomously existing and working under its own principles, which, once wound up, functions then by itself. Its action zone includes the rulers themselves. To demonstrate this phenomenon of the absoluteness of disciplinary practices power, Foucault gave an extraordinary example of taking the English king George under psychiatric arrest [3]. Foucault associated this with the appearance of clinic. At the same time, if we look at the period of these events, this was the first “scientific revolution” going hand in hand with the rise of industry and large-scale industrial production. Exposing the texts by Foucault to historical-cultural analysis, we can conclude what was the starting point for the chain of events. However, in our opinion, we should not raise here the question of determination and genesis in compliance with the popular presumption and historical-genetic approach: what was the source of what – science was the source of industry, or industry was the source of science. Anyway, there is the fact of disciplinary practices appearance which is considered in the discursive analysis. The latter sets a goal to demonstrate “how utterances – these specific events within speech practice – can conjugate and do conjugate with the events of nonverbal character: technical, economic, social, political, etc.” [4, p. 64].

In the context of identifying the peculiarities of discourse, is quite appropriate, in our opinion, to use the basic theoretical-methodological precondition of “knowledge archeology” by Foucault. This is an idea about the knowledge archives which are the systems of utterances acting in their various aspects both as “words” and as “things”; Foucault called them “archives”. “An archive is included within the discursive formation, as it is a set of speech practices which contain utterances...”. An archive, according to the definition given by Foucault, neither connects the events to rigidly determined linear sequences, nor leaves them up to chance. It is neither a language determining the regularities of possible phrases, nor a passive body of text in which ready phrases are gathered. It is neither a generally accessible library, nor a forgotten storeroom. An archive, in the opinion of Foucault, corresponds to the level of historical consciousness, to the level of discursive practice. It is a set of objectified preconditions of historical objects existence and knowledge about them. It is impossible to completely describe an archive of a certain era, especially the present-day one, as such description requires an absolutely external position, which is not possible if a researcher is within that system of the rules which he or she describes” [4, p. 70]. The matter is that the consciousness of people of a certain era is guided by certain theoretical-methodological mindsets. In this case, there is a *technical-manipulative* mindset for the rational control over the reality. It is natural to assume that this mindset is limited with a single modality of consciousness and psychics. The epistemological configurations in which Foucault was interested are not the formalized scientific knowledge. It is the level of knowledge in which the criteria of modern science do not act; it is the “lowest” level of knowledge, lower, as they say, than the “positivity threshold” of knowledge.

“If science is eventually the “distillation” of the direct experience to the status of generality and objectivity, the archeological knowledge of Foucault imprinted in the dynamic forms of speech practices is the ground on which the first stages

of this objectification can be researched. The multiplicity of discursive practices is the ground on which science is founded, substantiating anew in the forms of theoretical consciousness the modalities of the experience which is initial, but which already can be structured and rationally organized” [4, p. 73]. Foucault divided the phenomenological layers and the phenomenological experience of consciousness [collective subject].

C. *The existentialist trend in psychology and psychotherapy*

The mechanistic approach to the existence which consists of spiritual and corporal phenomena is in general characteristic for a person of technological civilization. However, this approach, in the opinion of representatives of the existentialist trend in psychology and psychotherapy, is the source of the majority of psychological abnormalities, including serious destructive alterations. Existential psychoanalysis is the trend which has grown by the “linking”, integration of the psychological and philosophical discourses and, in our opinion, has provided a rather effective methodology. To solve these problems of the modern society and the individual problems of a certain person, existential psychoanalysis has the method of listening and nurturing the ontological essence of one’s own, individual existence. Surely, in this terminology the spirit of existential phenomenology is perceived, due to using the categories of classical existentialism. At the same time, the ontological, ontocentric approach to the psychological existence of a person allows solving the problem of multiplicity and partial character, the limitation of methodologies applicability. It also makes “authenticity” the criterion of psychological health as the reflection of the “ontological transparence” of psychological states of a person for himself or herself. In spite of the repercussions of psychoanalytic methodology the basics of which were founded by S. Freud, the existential analysis is especially relevant in the context of considering the estranged and schizoid existence of a person of the technocentric civilization. Indeed, what can be more transparent and clear, self-evident and doubtless, than accordance with the very “essence of existence”.

As the original philosophical premises, or, so to say, the ideology of this method, especially in the context of our research, the following words by M. Heidegger can be taken: “One thing is only to use the earth, and another one is to receive the blessing of the earth and to find oneself within the law of this beginning approval, to keep this mystery of Existence and to guard the integrity of Possibility” [5]. Such “dwelling near” the existence, guarding or “care” was accepted by existential psychologists as an opposition to the destructive pole of human and civilization disruption of spiritual and corporal integrity, when body is understood as a tool (as well as consciousness). The overturn in such a worldview, for which K. Dürckheim as the most prominent representative of existential phenomenology advocated, consists in the transition from understanding the body as a tool to understanding *the body which is myself* [6].

V. V. Letunovsky noted here that this point made by Dürckheim is compliant with the understanding of psychopathia developed by R. Lang. The alienation of a person

from his or her body, the perception of the body as a tool was considered by him as a component of schizophrenic process [7]. Indeed, in the projective drawings by schizophrenic patients, the living body parts are often combined with the mechanic ones: fans, wheels etc. This indicates such mechanistic orientation of world view that contributes to the splitting of a person’s integrity, its alienation within certain elements which are obviously associated with the application-oriented modes of corporality from the unity of spiritual and corporal existence of a human.

Alexithymia has been often considered, especially from the psychoanalytic point of view, as one of the factors of somatoform disorders as the disruption of balance between the corporal and spiritual spectra of a human existence. Alexithymia is understood as the inability to adequately percept emotions and verbally express them. However, as one of the possible characteristics of alexithymia is also certain, oriented to reality style of thinking, the reduced ability for daydreaming and the poor imagination are mentioned.

If an individual has difficulty in recognizing and naming his or her emotions, this, according to that theory, increases the probability that the physical equivalents of emotions, though perceived, can be incorrectly accessed, obtaining the meaning associated with the disease [8].

The poverty of technocratic thinking and the technically-oriented worldview position is not difficult to recognize as something obvious, due to the very way of performing such thinking and, in general, positioning oneself in the existence (*Dasein*) as the main existential category. The “essential definition of a human as understanding the Existence implies at the same time that [theoretically] the detachable characteristics of a person cannot be the available [*vorhanden*] “features” which “are manifested” so-and-so. Rather the essential structure of a person is determined as his or her modes of existence, and nothing else [9]. The anxiety appears as the inability to adapt to the constantly changing Existence.

The main *Dasein*-analytical criterion of a mental disease is the stage in which the freedom of *Dasein* is subdued by the power of something else.

- For a neurotic, such subjection is partial. Though his or her existence-in-the-world is under the control of one or several categories, he or she constantly struggles for the ability to adhere to his or her own self-identification.
- This struggle takes the forms of the *Dasein* which renounces some of his or her capabilities in order to protect the world view, constructed strictly under the influence of one dominating meaning-context, from destruction, and thus to protect his or her sameness from the same threat.

- However, as renouncing the potentials of existence means the beginning of dissolving (flattening, narrowing, or emptying) of the sameness, all the made efforts result in self-denial, and a neurotic discovers that he or she is trapped.
- The attempts to solve the problem result in the aggravation of it. A psychotic goes further and completely subjugates himself or herself to something else. The price which he or she pays for reducing the anxiety is the loss of his or her self-identification. In case of psychosis, the *Dasein* is fully subjugated to only one certain worldview.

In all these cases, the *Dasein* is not able any more to *freely* let the world be, but rather capitulates to one certain world view, is suppressed by it and becomes obsessed with it. A special term for denoting this state of capitulation is *thrownness*.

According to L. Binswanger [10], any psychopathology is a way of reacting or a [stagnant, solidified] structure which results in the contraction, flattening of the world and the ways of positioning oneself.

Binswanger said the following: if anything that makes possible the existence and experience, which is *existentially a priori*, is “narrowed” and “diminished”, it means that the existence is *guided* by only one or several categories. Only one topic (in extreme cases) dominates in the meaning-matrix within which the phenomena emerge and correlate with the *Dasein*, in which the sameness and the worldview are structured [10, p. 104]. So, it means the extreme schematism and programmed one-sidedness of reacting. The multiplicity of possibilities is the fundamental characteristics of the existence-in-the-world. And a person limits his or her reactions with the stiffened forms of reacting. As for where such form of reacting comes from – one of its mechanisms is, according to the correct reasoning of the founders of psychoanalysis, the consequence of traumatic experience which once caused an effect, suppressing the psychics, and probably formed one typical way of reacting to the typical (or sometimes only to some of them) situations. This is *non-openness* to new opportunities offered by the existence. And, - this thought is a generality nowadays, - the more we think about it, the more fixed such way of reaction becomes. This is probably due to the fact that a human's psychics is such a precise recorder that any impression stays in the psychics virtually forever, being imprinted like a sort of pattern and becoming, according to Binswanger, an existential *priori*. In this case, it becomes an existential *priori* of continuity. Anything that is “discontinuous” and changeable poses a potential threat for a mentally ill person. The existential psychoanalysis points at the freedom in the *Dasein* through which the *Dasein* structures its worldview and its sameness. *It is this freedom that is lost in a mental illness.*

Thus, “if the category of continuity is used for characterizing an existential *priori* of a mentally ill person, it indicates a feebly struggling freedom (neurosis) or the freedom as a transcendental condition of existence, which is not performed (psychosis)” [10, pp. 109-110].

V. TECHNOCRATIC CIVILIZATION AND “INFORMATION SOCIETY” AS SCHIZOID

So, the paradox of self-chosen unfreedom, subjugation to the world of one's structuring is just what, according to Binswanger, gives the most substantial characteristics to the dynamics of the neurotic anxiety vicious circle. Solving this paradox by the total subjugation and loss of freedom is a characteristic of a psychotic.

How all the above-mentioned statements are connected with technocratic civilization and “information society”? Not only through everything schematically-petrified and extremely rationalized which initially manifested in the industrial production, replacing the warm and alive individual handicraft with the stereotyped industry. And later, through the phenomena of “general worldview mindsets”, “general scientific world picture”, and nowadays, to a greater extent, in the stereotypes broadcast through mass media, and in the education which has become a *system* of forming the templates of world perception and “mindsets” of thinking.

A. *The schizoanalysis by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari*

This was considered in the schizoanalysis developed by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari. Here is the beginning of “AntiOEdipus”: “Machines are everywhere, and it is not a metaphor: machines of machines, with all their links and connections. Machine-organ is connected to machine-source: one emits a flow which is broken by another. A breast is a machine producing milk, and a mouth is a machine connected to it” [11]. The representatives of schizoanalysis speak not only about a human-machine as a project of the Enlightenment era, but, listing the examples of machinery, Guattari argued: “Among them, as I have said, there are technological machines, but also linguistic machines... urbanistic machines, mega-machines of cities, there are even aesthetic machines” [12, pp. 7]. In general, as it is known, the pathos and the originality of positivism consist in the opposite to the classical for clinical psychology paternalistic practice of stigmatization which uses the category of “deviance” for schizophrenia and other psychological and psychical deviations. On the contrary, schizoanalysis reveals the opportunities for, in fact, a healthier schizophrenic positioning of a person in the world, as such a schizoid state is, in a manner of speaking, a condition of freedom from societal norms, economic coercion and other “ills” of capitalism and of the modern society. However, it is equally necessary to mention schizoanalysis as a fruit of post-structuralism, with its known “complexity of language” and fuzziness, the unstructured and figurative narration. The main idea, as we can catch from these texts by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, consists in the fact that the machine-like thinking, behavior, positioning oneself in the existence is something ineradicable and conditioned by the very form of a human and his or her mind existence in the world. The machine of machine and the production of production as a vicious perpetuity of reality in which all of us are included, are described by schizoanalytics as to a certain extent a “psychosis or schizophrenia of the existence itself”. “The production, the product, the equivalence of the product and the production... This equivalence forms the third term in the linear series — an

enormous undifferentiated object. At a certain point everything stops and stands still (and then would start again). In a way, it would be better if nothing worked, nothing functioned” [12, p. 10]. This is a phrase by Deleuze and Guattari, and in the end of this phrase, we note not only the despair of the authors, but also as if of the world itself which has let involve it into this endless self-genesis, essentially senseless. At the same time, here the already known theoretical-methodological premise of schizoanalysis about removing the necessity of the rational discourse is showing through. This is not something new, by the way, in the history of philosophy. Let us recall, for example, the academic philosophy of life by Bergson and Dilthey. The total machinery manifests itself in the fact that even the processes of nature are associated with machines – “photosynthesis machine”, “celestial machines”, and all this is linked in a totally machine-like and mechanism-like way with the human activity which makes a mega-machine: “human and nature are not as two terms, opposed to each other or even held with the same relation causation, understanding or expression (cause—effect, subject—object, etc.), but as a one-and-only essential reality of a producer and a product. Production, as a process, crosses the borders of all the ideal categories and forms a cycle which correlates with the wish as an immanent principle” [12, p. 8]. This is the reality of a schizophrenic, where the global undifferentiatedness of mental processes, having no purpose, but existing by themselves, can be completely equated with the described world of production. The conclusion is peremptory: “schizophrenia is a universe of producing and reproducing wishing machines, with the primary universal production as the “essential reality of human and nature” [12, p. 9]. In the cognitive-epistemological context, it means the analysis of the structural formations which due to their belonging to the manipulative worldview matrix of the modern civilization, predetermine all the processes which take place in the human-dimension reality [13].

B. The phenomenon of multiple identity

In this regard, all the pretensions of the technological optimism associated today with the technocratic tendencies can be certainly diagnosed within the framework of the competence of philosophical discourse, and not the clinical psychiatric one, as schizoid. A schizoid in the accentuation theory appears (unlike a clinically diagnosed schizophrenic) as a person with a *latent* attraction to splitting certain sides of his or her personality and their subsequent autonomation. There are plenty of proofs for that in the modern world. One of the most widespread of them is the multiple subjectiveness. It manifests itself in the fact that a person can live the lives of several (two and more) personalities in the Internet and social networks, while this diffuseness spreads and embraces all the sides of his or her existence. The most evident consequence of this is the formation of multiple personalities which are autonomized and freely split from the integrity of spiritual-corporal existence. The corporal representation can also be freely transformed or obtain new dimensions [14]. The phenomenon of multiple identity is closely associated with what can be called a latent self-identity crisis. For its sake the constant attempts are made to obtain a socially approved appearance, - by the constant demonstration of their personal life (posting photos, updating statuses, etc.) – the process of creating a persona, as the

representatives of analytical psychology and Marxism would understand this process [15].

VI. CONCLUSION

As follows from the above-mentioned, the theoretical concepts of the second half of the 20th century, existing at the boundary of philosophical and psychological discourses, demonstrate an existential situation which is characterized with the splitting of various sides of the psychological-corporal existence of a human. This integrity crisis originates from the initial sources of manipulative-technological positioning oneself in the world, which results in the self-identity crisis (which L. Binswanger defined in the categories of non-authenticity to the Existence). The consequence of such person’s positioning in the world is a schizoid accentuation of the personality, the manifestation of which is the identity crisis. The form of the latter is, for example, the obsessive need to constantly construct one’s *persona* as the expression of socially approved personality, while such a personality can, in its turn, split into several ones, which is a characteristics of a schizoid state). All in all, the machine-like thinking, having appeared on the cusp of the eras, nowadays predetermines the mainstream tendency of the oversized-schematic, “cybernetical”, and, consequently, non-flexible – non-authentic to the Existence – character of the most interrelations of a human with the society and the world in general.

Acknowledgements

The article was implemented in accordance with the program of the “Strategic development of the BSTU named after V.G. Shukhov for 2017-2021”.

References

- [1] I.Yalom I., “Existential psychotherapy,” Transl. from English, Moscow: Class, 1999, p. 11.
- [2] E. Fromm, “Anatomy of human destructiveness,” Moscow: AST, 2018.
- [3] M. Foucault, “Psychiatric power: a course of lectures given at the Collège de France in the 1973-1974 academic year,” Transl. from French, St Petersburg: Science, 2007.
- [4] N. S. Avtomomova, “Philosophical problem structural analysis in the humanities (Critical essay concepts’ French structuralism),” Moscow: Nauka, 1976.
- [5] M. Heidegger, “Overcoming of Metaphysics,” Moscow, 1993, p. 191.
- [6] K. Dürckheim, “Our Two-Fold Origin,” St Petersburg: Impax, 1992.
- [7] V. V. Letunovsky, “Working with the body in existential therapy. Ontocentric approach,” in “Psychology of corporality between soul and body,” V. P. Zinchenko and T. S. Levi, Eds. Moscow: AST, 2005, p. 562.
- [8] M. Pere and U. Bauman, Eds. “Clinical psychology and psychotherapy,” Transl. from German, St Petersburg: Piter, 2012, p. 697.
- [9] M. Boss, „Psychoanalyse und Daseinsanalytik,“ Bern, 1957, pp. 62-63.
- [10] L. Binswanger, “Genesis-in-World Favorites articles,” Mu: Juventa, St. Petersburg: Lenato, 1999.
- [11] G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, “AntiOedipus,” Paris: Minuit, 1972. Russian translation: G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, “Capitalism and schizophrenia. AntiOedipus,” Abbreviated summary translation by M. Ryklin, Moscow: INION AN USSR, 1990. G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, “Mille plateaux,” Paris: Minuit, 1990.
- [12] G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, “Anti-Oedipus Capitalism and Schizophrenia,” Yekaterinburg: U-Factoria, 2007.

- [13] V. O. Sheleketa, V. V. Kortunov, Y. B. Pribytkov and Z. V. Stolyarova, "Formation of political and legal youth culture in modern Russia," *Man in India*, vol. 97(6), pp. 151-158, January 2017.
- [14] V. O. Sheleketa and S. V. Batzanova, "Corporeality in Context of Problem of Human Identity: Body of Protest as Form of Individual Social Representation," *The International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences" (CILDIAH-2018)*, SHS Web of Conferences, vol. 50, Volgograd, April 23-28, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001164CILDIAH-2018>
- [15] I. Jacob and S. Timofeev, "Marx as an effective discoursologist of the twentieth century: linguistic and cognitive mechanisms of "smart" discourse setting," *Bulletin of BSTU named after V. G. Shukhov*, No. 1, pp. 270-275, 2015.