

The Social Subject in the Context of Modern Concepts of the Other

Modern Öteki Kavramları Bağlamında Toplumsal Özne

VADYM I. PALAHUTA 
National Metallurgical academy of Ukraine

VIACHESLAV BLIKHAR 
Lviv State University of Internal Affairs

MARIANA KASHCHUK 
Lviv State University of Internal Affairs

Received: 03.02.2024 | Accepted: 20.08.2024

Abstract: Purpose. The study is dedicated to the analysis of structuralist and poststructuralist concepts of the Other (Others) as the basis for the formation of social subjectivity and the subject's identity. Theoretical basis. The authors proceed from the assumption that the conceptualization of the Other of traditional philosophical structuralism with his absolutization of the "process without a subject" imposes from the outside, sometimes unacceptable and alien to the subject identity. Scientific novelty. The authors prove the need for further research into multivariate concepts of the Other, which testify to a fairly complex process of subjectivation in the present, which takes place on an uncontrolled, unconscious level. Conclusions. The authors identified directions for further study of the problem of transformation and incorporation of concepts of the Other into modern social structures, which significantly modify the content and role of collective identity in the process of subjectivation of individuals, which becomes a promising topic for future research.

Keywords: Concept(s) of the Other, structuralism, poststructuralism, the "I", individual, subject, identity, (self-)identification.

✉ Vadym I. Palahuta
National Metallurgical academy of Ukraine, Department of Engineering Pedagogy
49600, Dnipro, Ukraine | vipalu@ukr.net

✉ Viacheslav Blikhar & Mariana Kashchuk
Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, Department of Philosophy and Political Science
79007, Lviv, Ukraine | blikharv@gmail.com



Introduction

It is known that in many directions of modern philosophy of the 20th – early 21st centuries (and in social and humanitarian knowledge in general) the study of the problem of the Other and its conceptualization was actively carried out thanks to the construction of various models of subjectivity, primarily, – in existentialism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, philosophy of dialogue, structuralism, poststructuralism, postmodernism. According to the points of view of the French postmodernists, in particular, G. Deleuze, who insisted that the study of the social subject, his “I” is at the bottom of the Other, and J. Derrida, who argued that the modern fragmented man can only be assembled with the help of the Other”, the study of existing concepts of the Other, in particular, in structuralism and post-structuralism, becomes relevant.

The analysis of the latest researches and publications indicates the interest of many scientists of socio-philosophical directions in the position of the subject in the modern neoliberal society. To a large extent, this is due to the emergence of the newest forms of subjectivity, which determine the constant change of concepts of the Other (Others) as conditions of the subject’s identities, which are interconnected with modern identity politics. The current state of Western society and its influence on the reformatting of subjectivity are analyzed by the works of the German philosopher of Korean origin Byung-Chul Han “The Burnout Society” (Byung-Chul, 2015) and “The Agony of Eros” (Byung-Chul, 2017), the British researcher M. Fisher “Capitalist Realism” (Fisher, 2009), the American scientist Sh. Zuboff’s “The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power” (Zuboff, 2019). The latest works of the famous Slovenian philosopher S. Žižek “Hebel in a Wired Brain” (Žižek, 2020) and “Heaven in Disorder” (Žižek, 2022), and Italian philosopher F. Ferrando “Philosophical Posthumanism” (Ferrando, 2019) are dedicated to the significant changes of subjectivity. The works of representatives of the Slovenian school of theoretical psychoanalysis, M. Dolar “Freud and the Political” (Dolar, 2009), his compatriot R. Salecl “Running on the Spot” (Salecl, 2017), Argentinian J. Alemán “Lacan and Capitalist Discourse: Neoliberalism and Ideology” (Alemán, 2023), Brazilian M.R. Kehl “Time and the Dog: Society and Depression” (Kehl, 2018)



and other researchers in the field of studying the human position in modern society, directly relate to the study of processes and social conditions and factors of formation of the subject's identity. However, the problem of whether there is a concept of the Other at all and which concept of the Other fully corresponds to the existing position of the subject in modern society, so far remains insufficiently studied.

Purpose

The research is aimed at finding a valid concept of the Other to understand the state of the modern subject and its identifying characteristics in modern society. Concepts of the Other in the philosophical and anthropological directions of structuralism and poststructuralism were chosen as a research basis for further comparative analysis. The purpose involves the sequential solution of the following tasks: a) to make a comparative analysis of the peculiarities of the concepts of the Other in these areas of philosophy; b) to clarify the position regarding the possibility of distinguishing some universal concept of the Other or determine the dominant concepts of the Other in today's "flowing modernity".

Statement of basic materials

It is no exaggeration to say that in modern theories of subjectivity, the concept of the Other is present as one of the most important foundations. The most influential source of modern concepts of subjectivity is philosophical postmodernism, which is based on the works in this direction of structuralism and poststructuralism. In these directions, with some exceptions, the position of the Other is clearly defined. The concept of the Other as a structure or law, as a prerequisite for the formation of an established collective-individual identity, can be called structuralist, and post-structuralist – as a discursive or changing identity.

Thus, considering the Other as a structure, one cannot fail to recall its rather accurate characterization by G. Deleuze, who said that structuralism is inseparable from the new transcendental philosophy, where the subject's *places* of existence rule over what fills them (Deleuze, 2004). By the way, to become the subject means, first of all, to occupy a place in a certain way organized or structured social space. Numerous works of M. Foucault on the study of disciplinary fields and spaces (army, church, educational, medical, correctional institutions) are dedicated to this. This directly



concerns all kinds of organizations and institutions that have a pyramidal structure of power organization. If the model of the Other is purely formally characterized as a structure, then it is necessary to point out its main principle: it “produces” a subject, or an individual is constituted as a subject simultaneously with the interiorization of the originally existing organizational structure. But let’s ask ourselves the question – What is the “nature” of this model of the Other and can it fully comprehend subjective aspirations and requests, solving the dilemma of autonomy and dependence for the subject? Or, the question in a slightly different way, – Will the subject be able to go beyond the boundaries set by this structure, while simultaneously independently forming his subjectivity and identity?

If we consider the model of the Other as a structure or a law, then it can be noted that it comes from the deep prerequisite supported by many famous philosophers and scientists who were and are engaged in the study of social subjectivity. We should mention C. Lévi-Strauss and “early” J. Lacan, the time when he published the work “The Mirror Stage”, as well as the philosophical views of M. Foucault during the period when he wrote “Words and Things” and “The Archeology of Knowledge”, and to some extent – G. Deleuze, the time of his creation of “The Logic of Sense” and “Difference and Repetition”. According to the general point of view of structuralism on man, the subject is the only living creature of its kind in the world, which is constantly in the *symbolic universe*. This symbolic universe is formed with the help of cultural formations – language, myths, rituals, various traditional collective ideas, norms and rules. It acts everywhere, at every moment and at all levels of the subject’s social existence. Speaking about the specificity of the symbolic universe in structuralism, we can say that it is given to the subject not step by step, not gradually and not in approximation, but immediately and in its entirety. It is known that the most important component of the symbolic universe, independent of the type of social system, is primarily language as a structural integrity. By the way, the sign-symbolic structures of the language are not fully understood by the subjects as specific language speakers and they perform a coercive function when used by the subjects. That is, the subject exists at the level of unconscious collective mechanisms of the symbolic universe. In this regard, C. Lévi-Strauss wrote that in our society there is a constant and



continuous situation that originates from the human essence, – firstly, a person possesses the entire set of signifiers, and secondly, he has the power to distribute, to spread this signifier among all things in the world, following the laws of symbolic thinking (Levi-Strauss, 1987).

So, we can say that in this approach, when considering the concept of the Other, attention is focused on the fact that the subject is constituted by the order or structure of the Symbolic as a purely social instance, which directly “imposes” itself on the subject through numerous socio-cultural systems of ready-made meanings, and language is certainly one of the universal systems.

It is accepted among researchers that the approach of the creator of theoretical psychoanalysis J. Lacan also belongs to the conceptualization of the Other as a structure. At first glance, the development of the concept of the Other as a structure was largely determined by studies on the collision between the theory of the subject and theoretical psychoanalysis, carried out by J. Lacan during his “*structural-semiotic*” stage of scientific activity, that is, in the 40s and 50s and the first half of the 60s of the last century. Thus, when applying the structural-semiotic concept of language for the study of subjectivity, J. Lacan used F. de Saussure’s structural concept of language, but at the heart of his concept of *the chain of signifiers*, namely, the position that meaning is not an unambiguous relationship between the signifier and the signified, there is no relationship between a word or name and its referent or concept. Indeed, meaning, according to the Lacan’s point of view, is generated by the movement from one signifier to the second signified, then to the third signified, but already without the signified. As F. Jameson points out, what we generally call the signified – the meaning or conceptual content of the statement – should be considered, rather, as *the visibility of meaning*, the objective mirage of meaning, generated and formed by *the relationship of signifiers among themselves* (Jameson, 2013).

And the most significant (which will significantly affect the development of concepts in the study of the social subject) is the fact that the French thinker introduced two others into the study of subjectivity at once – the big Other and the small other. At the same time, language as a structure is completely “taken over” and is under the power of the language of the big Other (A = Autre). According to J. Lacan, there are two others, at



least two, and they should not be confused with each other – this is the Other with a capital letter (A = Autre) and the other with a small letter (a = autre), which is my own I. The function of language deals with the Other with a capital letter (Lacan, 1991).

But what is characteristic when considering J. Lacan's concept of the subjectivity of *the two others*, that is, the small and the big Other, the opposition of the "small" other to the "big" Other has as its immediate prototype the Freudian opposition of the I-ideal/ideal-I, which differ depending on what place the subject occupies. So, in the first case – the I-ideal as the identity of the subject, and in the second case – the ideal-I – as love and object relations, including, according to S. Freud, the fixation of the narcissistic desire of the subject. It should be noted that both the I-ideal and its opposition – the ideal-I, which is a condition of introjection or a receptacle for ideal external objects, although they are opposed, are closely interrelated and can pass to each other (Freud, 1990).

Clarifying this Freudian concept of subjectivity and identity in accordance with J. Lacan's opinion, we can state that the ideal-I establishes a connection with the imagined other with a small letter (a=autre), the I-ideal – with the Other with a capital letter (A =Autre), forming a symbolic instance that gives place or position to the subject and establishes the perspective of observation. This Other, my ideal, can experience for me what I do not experience myself. It acts as a connecting link between all others, as a pillar of their common existence, as an indisputable law. At the same time, it is not his "true" qualities that are important, but only the function assigned to him in the symbolic structure of society. The ideal image of this one and only is important here. Thus, the subject not only speaks in this Other, but only on the basis of the Other can he desire something. Therefore, J. Lacan liked to always repeat the phrase that the desire of the Other is the desire of the subject (Lacan, 2001). And the first object of his desire is to be recognized by "big" Other.

However, the situation is complicated by the fact that desire is not only the subject's desire of this big Other, but also the Other in desire stands in his way, that is, the Other performs the function of an obstacle. This obstacle establishes a distance between the desire and the object, and gives rise to fantasies about the subject behind it, which is the desire of



this big Other. It should be noted here that in speech I do not speak, but the Other speaks “*by me*” or *through me*: this discrepancy between the subject who speaks (that is, I) and the subject who actually speaks for me (the speech of the Other) leads the subject to a series of designations for the previous signifier in relation to the subsequent signifier. It can be presented as a series of micro-acts of subject identification that seem to undermine the legal compliance and guarantee of the Other as a structure from within.

Nevertheless, the figure of the Other is always present in language as its constant background, as a kind of voice emanating from the unconscious subject, that is, he is always present in the subject’s acts of expression. Lacan J. pointed out that all that language strives for in its symbolizing function is to transform the subject to whom it is addressed, establishing his connection with the subject from whom it originates, that is, creating the effect of the signifier (Lacan, 2001). And the forms of representation of the Other, as an exclusively social instance with a capital letter and as an inviolable order, in J. Lacan are the hypostases of the Name of the Father, the Law, the Phallus, which are expressions of the dominant signifier and which set the entire social-symbolic structure. Thus, the Other can be considered as a structure that produces the subject as a certain form (Lacan, 2015). Moreover, the Other is the “place without a place” of the supra-individual, which defines the subject, where the discourse of the Other acts as the discourse of the chain of signifiers, and I got into this discourse (Lacan, 1991).

However, the paradox of this approach lies in the fact that the Other as a symbolic structure is unable to fully define subjectivity, since in addition to the Symbolic and Imaginary register of the human psyche, the subject is primarily determined by a completely different instance of the mental, namely the Real, the study of which J. Lacan was engaged in the final stage of his scientific activity. It is impossible to structure the Real of the subject, it is the residue or growth that cannot be subjected to symbolization and ordering. We are led to this by J. Lacan’s idea of the “late”, in which he himself debunks the subjectivity structured by language, presenting it as a kind of “statistical regularity”. U. Eco drew attention to this when he noted that this Other is nothing more than a pure subject of the modern



strategy of the game, and as such he is quite accessible to the calculation of probabilities, if only a real subject, calculating his own conjuncture, will not take into account any deviations that are called subjective in the usual sense, that is, psychological, but he will only have to fit himself into a certain combinatorics that is subject to exhaustion (Eco, 2013). But if the law of probability (the game of primary differences) is introduced here, it naturally cancels the legal compliance of any structure.

If we agree with this criticism of J. Lacan's theory of subjectivity as precisely structuralist, and which is based on the concept of the Other, then it really contradicts the main explanatory principle of structuralism and its mechanism of producing subjectivity through a ready-made system of rules and norms that determine the stability and the firmness of the structure as *a symbolic universe*. Indeed, if it is followed, then no further structuring is possible and this is where J. Lacan's so-called structuralism ends, and the subject himself, his "I" only triggers the social-symbolic mechanism of the structure, but nothing more. The Other as a structure is presented as a shared beingness possible for the subject, that is subject to the logic of the Symbolic. But the symbolic structures themselves are probabilistic in nature, which suggests a real possibility of the subject to bypass or not "fit" into the structuring of the Other. Moreover, if we follow the logic of U. Eco, the effectiveness of socio-symbolic structures, including language structures, is no longer perceived as an inevitable and self-sufficient beginning for the subject.

A well-known modern representative of theoretical psychoanalysis M. Dolar notes that there is an abyss between Lacan and other representatives of the generation of structuralists, since they classified themselves as the anti-Hegelian and anti-Cartesian camp; to some extent J. Lacan saw himself as an heir to these traditions (Dolar, 1993).

Thus, the Other is a subject of the unconscious, which constantly participates in the processes of subjectivation of the "I" at the symbolic level, but the consciousness of the subject itself cannot recognize this, which indicates the appearance of an "alien core" inside the subjectivity itself, therefore the psychoanalytic subject is compared to the very gap in the inner dimension of subjectivity. M. Dolar notes that without an integral relationship with the Other, subjectivity has no meaning, emphasizing that



there is no such thing as individuality for psychoanalysis, it can only be understood as a network of relations with the social Other (the Other as a designation of a social instance), as a node of social connections; therefore, the subject initially had sociality (Dolar, 2009). So, collective identity is more primary than individual identity, being its basis.

Thus, it can be argued that the concept of *the subject of the unconscious* as the big Other of J. Lacan significantly modernized the concept of the Ideal as the identity of S. Freud and outlined further perspectives for the conceptualization of the Other. This concept of the Other set the vector of subjectivity research in the societies of the 21st century. It can be defined taking into account the meaning of the Big Other as a *matrix* concept for modern concepts of the Other, in particular the concepts of poststructuralism and postmodernism.

The concepts of the Other in poststructuralism look fundamentally different. If the principles of poststructuralism are to be characterized at all, then the emphasis of research is transferred from the systems of ready-made meanings of the structure of the methodology of structuralism to the processes of their establishment, with inherent moments of shift, rupture or failure. Characterizing poststructuralism as a direction of thought based on the search for the invariant of the subjective-psychic invariant, on accentuating the significance of anthropological constants in the picture of reality, the outstanding Ukrainian thinker M. Popovych wrote: “The post-structuralist analysis expresses an attempt to combine the idea of structure and evolution. At the same time, the problem of fundamental worldview structures, *their rootedness in the laws of the human psyche*, acutely arises” (Popovych, 1997, p. 45).

The modern researcher R. Salecl characterizes the situation of change in the paradigm of subjectivity, which has arisen, by an important issue regarding the solution of the problem of the representation of the subject (who loses his monolithicity and continuously changes and creates his identity) as a certain integrity, and not as an actualization of the problem of description of a sublime object (which the subject himself is unable to grasp) in the subject (*the Big Other, Law, Rules, Norms, etc.*) (Salecl, 2000). Thus, the tendency to replace the concept of the Other as an established structure with the concepts of the Others as the basis of identities that are



constantly formed in the discursive practices of the subject, can be seen here.

Therefore, the focus of consideration of poststructuralism falls on *astructural, non-deterministic elements of subjectivity* that do not fit into the classical paradigm of the subject: the Real, which is not subject to symbolization, which was explored by J. Lacan in the late period of his scientific activity; the unconscious aspirations to escape from the influence of power structures (J. Butler, R. Barthes, M. Pêcheux, G. Deleuze and F. Guattari); “open” structures (U. Eco); the phenomenon of corporeality as a non-structural characteristic of subject being (J.-L. Nancy) and many others.

However, eliminating or canceling the transcendent, essential basis of human being and replacing it with a completely poststructuralist immanence like the “pure” singularity, multiplicity and transversality of G. Deleuze and F. Guattari represent a significant problem, due to the fact that there is always some unreduced “ontological residue”. In other words, it is impossible to cancel the ontology of the subject, which appears, however, under the conditions of the modern establishment of the subject as poly-subjectivity, that is, in a completely different way than it was established by the classical theory of subjectivity and structuralism as a “process without a subject”, which in principle cancels subjectivity as such.

Based on this understanding of subjectivity by the leading representatives of poststructuralism, who directly studied the problem of the Other, we see that most of them consider the model of the Other as the identity of the subject (J. Derrida, S. Žižek, R. Salecl, J. Kristeva, E. Laclau, C. Mouffe, J. Butler, V. Connolly, R. Braidotti). Not having the opportunity within the framework of this study to analyze in detail all the diversity of aspects and their nuances related to the poststructuralist problematic of the Other as the basis of the procedural identity carried out in the processes of discursive identification, we will only point out the principles of this approach and the difficulties that arise during its use.

Thus, post-structuralism, considering the model of the Other as a sub-basis of identity, radically rejects the interpretation that “fastens” the subject to the “real” place or position he occupies in social space, that is, the subject’s identity is not considered in the context of a certain place in



society, the subject exists in constant becoming and without place (in at-
 oposity) (J. Derrida, G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, S. Žižek, R. Salecl).

Therefore, as if nowhere, but also everywhere there is an entity of the
 Other, according to J. Derrida's apt remark. In this regard, it should be
 noted that the synchrony of the subject's places and positions in society
 must always be correlated with the diachrony of discourses as a whole se-
 ries of his statements or pure facts of speech. This creates a special kind of
 relationality of places and positions in the space of discourse, but there is
 always the Other as the addressee, that is, the one who anticipates the
 counter-question from the subject as the addressee – "Who says this?"

So, at first glance, poststructuralism seems to open up the possibility
 of understanding aspects of the relationship of the subjective "I" with the
 Other, which goes beyond the limits defined by the structural concept of
 the Other. But it, as far as can be judged from the analysis of poststructur-
 alist sources, remains unused due to the fact that "I" itself is no longer per-
 ceived as the main instance that fully characterizes the subject. The idea
 of subjectivity in poststructuralism is significantly reviewed – here there is
 no longer an authentic, self-sufficient "I", but a subject emerges as a mul-
 tiplicity or poly-subjectivity. Explaining the radical change of the post-
 structuralist (postmodernist) position in the interpretation of the con-
 scious "I", J. Lacan emphasizes that one should never lose sight of the fol-
 lowing: *my* I is not an I at all, not a delusion in the sense of a partial truth,
 as presented by *classical doctrine*, in particular, the Cartesian concept of the
 subject. This is something completely different – it is a special object, pre-
 sent within the experience of this subject. It is, literally so: *my* "I" is an
 object that performs a certain function, which we will call here an imaginal
 function (Lacan, 1991). Therefore, "I" and the subject are completely dif-
 ferent instances in the poststructuralist approach, and its significance lies,
 first of all, in the fact that it tries to restore *the ontological status* in the study
 of subjectivity, lost by many traditional approaches.

Thus, the consistent understanding of the concept of the Other by
 this approach leads to the fact that the question of the relationship be-
 tween the "I" and the Other is *transformed* into the question of the rela-
 tionship between the subjective and the social (collective, intersubjective,
 Symbolic) both in the subject itself and beyond its physical boundaries, as



a result of the fact that the border of subjective and social, internal and external, conscious and unconscious is constantly moving, that is, it is relational, fluid and dynamic in nature and moves in the direction of the absorption of the “I” by the external collective identity. Moreover, collective identity is interconnected with culture and historical memory, which exist as a semantic triad, which constantly changes its conceptual meanings under mutual influence, which indicates the constant mutual development of those phenomena that they denote, and which are investigated by one of the authors of the article (Palahuta, 2023).

The paradox is that the call and influence of the Other does not disappear, because the imaginary properties of the “I” lose their self-sufficient character and they no longer determine the essence of the subject; and the very structural model of the Other as a basis for establishing subjectivity loses its real contours and “disperses”. However, the Other is still thought of in poststructuralism as a structure, be it imaginary or virtual, which forms the basis of *the identification matrix* of subjectivity. Here the ontology emerges, not so much of the Other, as a multitude of Others (the Voice of the Other), not tied to a specific place, but rather scattered in the fields and spaces of the subject’s discursive practices. Thus, if we are guided by this principle position of poststructuralism in the interpretation of the model of the Other, then its leitmotif may well be expressed by a successful, in our opinion, characterization of J. Authier-Revuz, who noticed that the Other is fundamentally present *structurally within* the subject, in his discourse (Authier-Revuz, 2019). Thus, the model of the Other is even more virtualized and multiplied, but it does not become less real for the subject. At the same time, the study of the possibilities of discourse, which constructs not only one Other, but many Others, and through them the poly-subjectivity of the subject as such, comes to the fore.

Analyzing the Levi-Strauss’s method of bricolage as a universal indicator of discourse, J. Derrida characterizes the actions of a subject who uses bricolage in discourse as follows: a bricoleur is any discourse, it is one who uses the means that are around him from the very beginning; these tools were not intended for their particular purpose or the particular operation to which their trial and error method tries to adapt them; when it is necessary, their changes, various attempts are possible, even under conditions



of heterogeneity of their origin and form (Derrida, 2001). Here there is no longer a fundamental difference between bricolage and bricoleur, that is, discourse and subject – they mutually define each other.

Therefore, to “naturalize”, to endow the Other with some representative image, and what is more, to attribute to him some “exclusive” desires, needs, aspirations are practically doomed to failure. The subject receives from the Other a place in the space of discourse, not knowing why he has this place, according to S. Žižek. Thus, S. Žižek, like J. Lacan, believes that the Other (the big Other), constituting the I (the small other), refuses the subject even to discuss the choice of the Other; S. Žižek emphasizes the subject’s ignorance of the reason for his stay in the symbolic structure and provides the subject’s only answer to the Other’s question “*What do you want?*”: “Why am I who I was obliged to be?”, “Why am I one, who I am according to the voice of the Other with a capital letter?” (Žižek, 2009).

Moreover, the essence of the Other is complete silence. Therefore, the most important circumstance in the attempt to somehow explain the unimaginable Other is that the discourse of the subject takes place in a state of simultaneous *absence-presence of the Other*, as J. Lacan emphasized; real, true Others are ones about which we know nothing. They are on the other side of the language wall – where I can never reach them (Žižek, 2009).

But, at the same time, according to J. Lacan, we are still *free to treat the Other as we like*, including respecting him as an object, that is, assuming in advance that he himself does not know what he is saying. When we use language, our relation to the Other constantly hovers within this ambiguity. In other words, discourse is designed both to root us in the Other and to prevent us in principle from understanding him (Lacan, 1991). Thus, discourse as a micro-social level has a specific property of simultaneous discovery and concealment of the Other or an illusory representation of the Other (which in itself is nonsense), without whom its further explanation at the macro level of the social and its various variations at this level are difficult.

Another obvious difficulty in understanding the Other in discourse is that discourse always involves the constant appropriation and representation of those who speak for the Other. Therefore, discourse, as a special



type of social communicative practices, is connected with various forms of (sometimes very hidden) struggle for dominance, for the right to speak on behalf of the symbolic Other.

In the situation of replacing the Other with the subject, there is actually neither a subject nor the Other, but there is an *unpredictable* poly-subjectivity in this approach that absorbs the symbolic Other. Analytically, within the framework of this approach, two different options are possible.

The first variant reduces the interaction of the subject and the Other to the mutual confirmation of identities in the discourse space. The only Other that such an identity can meet is the Other who is with the subject in a relationship of mutual constitution, which is unlikely, because there is no conflict in their interaction. The second variant of this approach extends the sphere of “interflow” of identities beyond the framework of their interaction, relying on the dialectic of Self and Alien, where the Other is not outside the identity, but inside it. Here the Other as a fundamentally Alien is opposed to the subject. This option is most vividly presented by J. Kristeva in her work “Strangers to Ourselves” (Kristeva, 1991), where the philosopher substantiates the thesis that the Other is an unconsciously rejected aspect of my “I” (where the Other resides within us). This provision is actively used by the supporters of the considered variant to confirm the ability of the subject’s identity to open up to the Other.

Indeed, since identity is constituted from the outside, it must itself to a certain extent be this external and other, that is, on the one hand – other, but at the same time – not different (a paradox that is very difficult to comprehend and even more so to conceptualize). The well-known modern socio-political philosopher C. Mouffe gives a detailed analysis of this paradoxical situation: “Since identity always depends on the absent otherness, it is always repeated and distorted by this otherness. Therefore, an identity cannot belong to just one person, and no one can belong to just one identity. We will go further and claim not only that there are no “natural” or “original” identities, since any identity emerges from *a continuous process*, but also that *the process itself* must be seen as the process of constant hybridization and nomadization. In fact, identity is the result of many interactions taking place *in a space without clearly defined boundaries*” (Mouffe, 1994, p.109-110). Therefore, the contradiction of this approach to the topic of



the Other, at first glance, can be seen in the fact that in order to confirm the effectiveness of this concept, it would be necessary to follow the path of least resistance and insist on depriving the Other of *his own identity*.

At the same time, C. Mouffe actually pointed out all the problematic aspects of considering the Other as an external identity, schematically marked the ways to solve them. So, first of all, identity can exist only as a difference, as a differentiation, as a boundary between the I as a subject and the non-I (and as such belong to both spaces – internal and external). Identity as the similarity of the subject to the Other is constituted outside the position of the subject and bears traces of the Other's own exceptions. Overcoming this contradiction is achieved only through the subject's "acquisition" of multiple identities, which must be constituted by acts of self-identification. But then it is necessary to abandon the interpretation of identity as a single, imposed concept of the Other for all subjects. Here, an opportunity opens up to present identity not as the only one of its kind, but as a set of performative acts of staging and performing self-identifying discursive acts on the part of the subject. What is important for us here is that the performativity of identity can introduce into the performative discursive practices of the subject a new source of action, a new life actor capable of going beyond his own identity and "sliding" from one identity to another within acts of self-identification.

It should be added that in poststructuralism, self-understanding acquires many identities, which are established in statements at the moment of the meeting of the subject and the Other. Here, discourse can to a certain extent be considered as a unity of continuous processuality and discreteness of speech acts, which exist on the common border of interaction of subjects. But this is a moving and changing border. In this aspect, the analyzed approach to the Other as an identity relies to some extent on the concept of nomadic subjectivity proposed by G. Deleuze and F. Guattari. Thus, developing the position of nomadic identity of his teacher G. Deleuze, R. Braidotti deepens the idea of the plurality of the Other, modifying the concept of nomadic subjectivity (Braidotti, 1994).

In some respects, we find a similar interpretation, in particular, in modern gender studies. For gender theorists, this point is important as a justification for the ability to reject the proposed gender identity and form



one's own (not male at all, not female at all), in particular, it is presented in the concept of queer subjectivity (as a position of constant formation) of J. Butler (Butler, 2005). Thus, in this work Butler's Other is considered as allegedly knowing everything about the subject from the very beginning and thereby justifying his presence in his actions. This implies the adaptation of the subject during their performance to this "knowledge" of the Other. At the same time, J. Butler's subject during the implementation of the act of "self-report", that is, self-interpretation, creates numerous opportunities for self-transformation and the constitution of a new subjectivity (Butler, 2005, p.130-131).

It should be noted that modern conceptualizations of the Other, in particular, the works of Mark Fisher "Capitalist Realism" (Fisher, 2009), the works of the German scientist Byung-Chul Han "The Burnout Society" (Byung-Chul, 2015) and "The Agony of Eros" (Byung-Chul, 2017), American scientist Shoshana Zuboff (Zuboff, 2019), not to mention the works of researchers of modern theoretical psychoanalysis, namely M. Dolar (Dolar, 2009), R. Salecl (2017), M.R. Kehl (Kehl, 2018), S. Žižek (Žižek, 2020), J. Alemán (2023) significantly expanded the horizons of using the concept of the Other in socio-philosophical research.

But the positions of modern researchers fundamentally differ. Thus, according to the British researcher M. Fisher, in modern society the big Other is exclusively a *collective* fiction. Continuing to remain a symbolic structure for any social subject and for society as a whole, he can easily be replaced by surrogate collective copies, so the Other is profaned (Fisher, 2009). This leads to a gap between the collective Other, who does not know what the modern subject knows and feels, and this gap still allows the subject to exist in the modern social reality. But when this gap becomes obvious, the unity of the social system is destroyed and the symbolic big Other practically loses its meaning for the subject, which threatens serious cataclysms for society. The German philosopher Byung-Chul Han holds a slightly different point of view. Thus, generally agreeing with M. Fisher's assessment of the disappearance of the Other as a gradual immanent in society, who develops in a way that is imperceptible to many subjects, the scientist explains the total narcissization of modern individuals (Byung-Chul, 2017). According to this concept of the Other, the narcissistic



subject is incapable of hearing the big Other in his otherness and recognizing his otherness. This process makes any encounter with the big Other impossible, which has a detrimental effect on his identity.

The famous American scientist Sh. Zuboff believes that in the modern society of surveillance capitalism, the collective big Other has transformed into transnational corporations Google, Facebook and other powerful information systems that allow not only unprecedented control and modification of the behavior of subjects, but also to set their wishes (Zuboff, 2019). This is a kind of new behaviorism, which the founder of behaviorism, B. Skinner, never even dreamed of. It allows the great Other to create the most powerful source of power, to almost totally control the behavior of the modern subject. A similar point of view is held by S. Žižek, who believes that the power of the digital machine is the last embodiment of the big Other as a kind of Lacan's "subject, probably knowing", which already acts as a subjectless field of knowledge (Žižek, 2020). The digital big Other invades all activity and life, including secret thoughts and desires, completely publicly exposing and undressing the subject.

The latest conceptualizations of the Other testify to a fairly complex modern process of subjectivation, which mostly takes place on an uncontrolled, unconscious level, but has a new direction, such as, on the one hand, *the ideological (or digital) formation of the collective Other*, which significantly affects the formation of the collective identity of the modern subject, and on the other hand, on the contrary, the disappearance of the big Other, which becomes a dramatic event for the modern subject, which is signaled by modern psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic research, in particular the latest developments of R. Salecl (Salecl, 2017), M. R. Kehl (Kehl, 2018), J. Alemán (Alemán, 2023).

Originality

The authors proved the need to use the opportunity not to accept false and externally imposed identities proposed by a certain, usually, power structure of the Other. Emphasis should now be placed on the fact that the Symbolic in the discourse is no longer structured around the function of the Father's name, the ideological signifier, the Law, the Phallus, etc. That is, it is not centered in an unambiguous and "rigid" way, but is a series of graphic and constantly emerging and disappearing differences that



never reduce to a single meaning. The impetus for such concepts of the Other was outlined by J. Lacan's concept of the big Other. This position opens up perspectives for the plurality of ways of construction and representation of identity as many context-determined and trans-contextual formations produced by the subject himself through acts of self-identification.

The conceptualization of the Other in poststructuralism revealed the undeniable fact that identity has a "flowing" or continuously changing character, that is, it is expressed through the processes of self-identification, which implies the presence of a special space of discourse for the meeting of *fundamentally different* subject and the Other. If this indispensable condition is neglected, then the Other, who violates the order of meanings in the constitution of subjectivity, turns out to be a kind of "blind spot" for the subject. The generated mechanisms of subjectivity are interconnected with the micro-levels of the social, where discourses are carried out, in which the symbolic Other or Others are constantly represented and appropriated. At these micro-levels of the social, subjectivity is generated.

Conclusions

As evidenced by the comparative analysis of models of the Other (Others) in structuralism and poststructuralism, the model of the Other (Others) is a necessary condition for the study of the social subject and his identity. An important component in both models of the Other are the very principles of their construction. Important differences in these methodological approaches regarding the problem of the Other(s) were noted. Thus, the model of the Other of traditional philosophical structuralism with its absolutization of the "process without a subject" *imposes from the outside*, sometimes unacceptable and alien to the subject identity. A characteristic example of the use of this model of the Other is M. Foucault's dispositifs of power or L. Althusser's interpellation, which is involved in the construction of ideological identity.

The concept of the Other in poststructuralism is significantly different from the structuralist one, which allows us to consider subjectivity as multiple subjectivity in a different way. Thus, if we consider the individual from the standpoint of multiple subjectivity, it is possible to further expand the application of this approach, which emphasizes the virtual social



fields and places (everywhere and nowhere) of the imageless Other. The Other or Others are presented here as a kind of constant present-absent companions-partners or competitors of the subject. Along with this, as a perspective for further research of the problem of the Other, the question remains – What transformations are taking place now with the concept of the Other, when the subject believed in the prospects of “free” and limitless construction of his identity? And is it even necessary to assign him any “place” in modern society?

The use of various variations of the concept of the Other to study the rather complex process of subjectivation, which takes place mainly at the uncontrolled, unconscious level of the individual’s existence, is relevant for our time. In our opinion, the conceptualization of the Other is a fairly promising direction of research of the modern social subject, the methodological toolkit for which was provided by the J. Lacan’s concept of the Other and the subject of the unconscious.

References

- Alemán, J., & Runnels, D. (2024). *Lacan and capitalist discourse: Neoliberalism and ideology* (1 Edition). Routledge.
- Authier-Revuz, J. (2020). *La représentation du discours autre: Principes pour une description*. De Gruyter.
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic subjects: Embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. Columbia University Press.
- Derrida, J., & Bass, A. (2010). *Writing and difference* (Transferred to digital print. 2006, repr). Routledge.
- Dolar, M. (2009). Freud and the Political. *Theory & Event*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1353/tae.0.0085>
- Eco, Umberto. (2011). *La estructura ausente*. Debolsillo.
- Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* Zero Books.
- Freud, S. (2007). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic.
- Han, B.-C. (2015). *The burnout society* (E. Butler, Пер.). Stanford Briefs, an imprint of Stanford University Press.
- Han, B.-C. (2017). *The agony of eros*. MIT Press.



- Jameson, F. (2005). *Postmodernism, or, The cultural logic of late capitalism* (11. printing in paperback). Duke Univ. Press.
- Kehl, M. R. (2019). *Time and the Dog: Society and Depression*. Verso.
- Lacan, J. (1991). *The seminar of Jacques Lacan. book 1: Freud's papers on technique 1953-1954 / translated with notes by John Forrester* (J. Forrester, Пер.; First publishes as paperback). W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lacan, J. (2020). *Écrits: A selection*. Routledge.
- Lacan, J., & Fink, B. (2013). *On the names-of-the-Father*. Polity.
- Lacan, J., & Lacan, J. (1991). *The ego in Freud's theory and in the technique of psychoanalysis, 1954-1955*. W.W. Norton.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (2013). *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss* (о вид.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315005102>
- Palahuta, V. (2023). Actualization of the Study of Identity Problems in The Modern World. *Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education Herald. Series: Philosophy, Pedagogy, Vol. 1 No. 1 (2023), 13-18*. <https://doi.org/10.54891/2786-7005-2023-1-2>
- Popovich, M. V. (1997). *Ratsional'nist' i vymiry liūds'kobo buttiā*. Vyd-vo Sfera.
- Salecl, R. (2000). *(Per)Versionen of Love and Hate* (1. publ). Verso.
- Salecl, R. (2017). *Tek na mestu* (Prva izdaja). Mladinska knjiga Založba.
- Žižek, S. (1989). *The sublime object of ideology*. Verso.
- Žižek, S. (2021). *Heaven in disorder* (1st printing). OR Books.
- Žižek, S. (2022). *Hegel in a wired brain*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Zuboff, S. (2020). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power* (First trade paperback edition). PublicAffairs.

Öz: Amaç Bu çalışma, sosyal öznenliğin ve öznenin kimliğinin oluşumunun temeli olarak Öteki'nin (Diğerleri) yapısalıcı ve postyapısalıcı kavramlarının analizine adanmıştır. Teorik temel. Yazarlar, “öznesiz süreç” mutlakaştırmasıyla geleneksel felsefi yapısalcılığın Öteki kavramsallaştırmasının, özne kimliğine dışarıdan,



bazen kabul edilemez ve yabancı bir şekilde dayattığı varsayımından hareket etmektedir. Bilimsel yenilik. Yazarlar, kontrolsüz ve bilinçdışı bir düzeyde gerçekleşen oldukça karmaşık bir özneleşme sürecine tanıklık eden çok değişkenli Öteki kavramları üzerine daha fazla araştırma yapılması gerektiğini kanıtlamaktadır. Sonuçlar. Yazarlar, bireylerin özneleşme sürecinde kolektif kimliğin içeriğini ve rolünü önemli ölçüde değiştiren ve gelecekteki araştırmalar için umut verici bir konu haline gelen Öteki kavramlarının modern sosyal yapılara dönüşümü ve dahil edilmesi sorununa ilişkin daha fazla çalışma için yönler belirlemiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öteki kavram(lar)ı, yapısalcılık, postyapısalcılık, “ben”, birey, özne, kimlik, (öz)kimlik.

