Introduction

This paper analyzes the main reformist ideas of French thinkers of the postmodern era and their influence on the world's philosophical paradigm, as well as compares the philosophical principles of modernism and postmodernism. The author emphasizes that philosophy has emerged in a new image, its purpose and tasks have acquired a deeper meaning in the information society. The study presents the theoretical foundations of the inception and rethinking of the rhizomatic concept of the world and demonstrates the irreversible connection between modernism and postmodernism.

The concept of "postmodernity" excites and attracts researchers in various fields of science. According to Scott Lesh: "everyone has something to say about postmodernity. Everyone has an opinion on this issue and everyone has already become an expert in this field. And even if the very question of "postmodernism" is completely settled, its questions and problems will remain in the center of attention for some time to come" (S. Lesh, Sociology of Postmodernity)

6.1. The concept of postmodernism in French philosophy

The foundation of the postmodern type of philosophizing is known to have been laid by F. Nietzsche and M. Weber. The "founding fathers" of postmodernism also include M. Heidegger, J. Derrida, M. Foucault, and J. Bataille, whose work was characterized by the rejection of classical approaches to understanding the world, society, and man. In the 1970s and 1990s, at the initiative of J.-F. Lyotard, a discussion on the essence of postmodernism unfolded. Noteworthy contributors to this dialogue included M. Blanchot, F. Jameson, D. Camper, R. Rorty, J. Baudrillard, F. Guattari, G.

⁶**Authors:** *Zinchenko Nataliia, Shtepa Oleksii*

Deleuze, V. Descombes, and various other influential figures.

They consider postmodernism as a special mindset that currently dominates all spheres of human life: culture, philosophy, politics, economics, etc. Thinkers seek to adequately understand the current existential situation in which European civilization finds itself after the tragic events symbolized by Auschwitz, Hiroshima, and Chornobyl. Under such crisis conditions, postmodernism offers a non-Eurocentric view of the position of civilization in the world it has created. It intensifies the reconstruction of Eurocentric, totalitarian, social, economic, political, scientific, technical and spiritual structures, the search for new models of planetary coexistence of nations, and its future transformations.

The authors of postmodernism seek to find answers to philosophical problems concerning the prospects for the self-preservation of post-totalitarian sociality and the problems inherited from the modern era. In the context of postmodernism, each of the spheres of human life is viewed as a special discourse, i.e., as a living socio-cultural practice where representatives of various professional, religious, linguistic and other communities meet and interact as equal members. The natural state of this kind of discourse is not consensus (agreement, like-mindedness), but dissensus (agonizing state). For postmodernism, single-mindedness means nothing more than stagnation, lethargy, and the cessation of any development. Therefore, based on such methodological positions, consensus cannot be the ultimate goal of culture, religion, politics, economics, and philosophy.

J. Deleuze and F. Guattari rejected the previous philosophical and cultural traditions, as they believed that culture should be based on a single principle, and knowledge should grow out of a single metaphysical principle, like the Cartesian tree. Philosophers oppose the symbol of the tree to the rhizome. Rhizome becomes a symbol of a new type of culture and, unlike the classical ideas about the hierarchy of the root, trunk, and branches, it records the relationship in the form of heterogeneity, multiplicity, and equality. The very notion of rhizome denies the idea of a center, so the center of postmodern culture is a community that is freed from any authority and hierarchy of values. In this case, a person becomes pluralistic and does not

acknowledge any authority in society.

Postmodernism denies identity, which is replaced by difference and repetition. The modern world is a world of simulacra. Man in the world does not experience God, the identity of the subject, does not experience the identity of the substance. All identities are only simulated, appearing as an optical effect of a deeper game – the game of difference and repetition. We want to realize the difference in itself and in relation to the different to the unequal, independent of the forms of representation that reduce them to the same.

The important methodological significance of the concept of simulacrum is that it asserts the primacy of the individual in relation to the general. It is considered by postmodernism as a system in which the different correlates with the different means of the different itself.

Obviously, granting such a status to the individual, the unique, is a reflection of unlimited individualism, complete liberalism, and fear of restricting individual freedom. Representatives of postmodern philosophy emphasize that any rules and principles that claim to be universal, unchanging, or total domination are unacceptable for such a culture. Thus, the rejection of general principles and ideals by postmodern culture indicates the deepening of secularization processes that lead to the separation of people. This is due to the fact that a person, asserting exclusively his or her individuality, difference from other people, loses the ability to identify with any social community, and thus people become atomic and lonely.

The transition of society from the worldview of modernity to the worldview of postmodernism causes one system of values to be replaced by another, which leads to global changes in people's minds. Postmodernism believes that any individual cannot know the answer to a question in principle, since the truth is extremely complex by nature and therefore cannot be expressed in conceptual terms. That is why something more than reason is needed to explain certain aspects of the extremely complex world. But it should be noted that this does not mean that postmodernism rejects the usefulness of rational thought and science, feelings, traditions, and intuition for understanding the world. But they are needed to search for partial truths, which, although they cannot

figure out all in one scope, can significantly help in the practical life of a person. Thus, from the point of view of postmodernism, what is right for an individual does not exclude the fact that it may be wrong for another. Thus, each individual has the right to his or her own truth and truth and to live in accordance with them.

Postmodern philosophy seeks to reconstruct the basic assumptions of structuralism regarding the role and essence of structure and to prove that the latter is not able to claim priority in the generation of meaning. The generation of meaning becomes possible only in the textual continuum, which is chaotic and decentralized.

In fact, postmodernism can be viewed in theoretical terms as a "globalization" of theoretical thinking. The phenomena that postmodernism generates become the theoretical basis for the construction of the "information society," "technotronic society," "e-college," etc. These concepts, despite all their utopianism, are vigorously opposed not only to contemporary realities, but are also promoted as a logical consequence of the historical development of social relations. Within these "mental constructs" of social reality, a new ideology of world order is being created, in which the leading place is no longer occupied by technocracy (which was opposed by Karl Marx), but by technological primitivism, where the development of neo-modernism and universalism becomes a very convenient basis, without which globalization is impossible – deprivation of everything special in existence makes it possible to create concepts of unified happiness for everyone (common problems, common joy for everyone).

Modern socio-cultural transformations have caused significant changes in the understanding of human existence, accompanied by the search for new ideas and approaches to rethinking methodological paradigms in philosophical discourse. It should be remembered that the groundwork was laid in the past, and the twentieth century burst into human history with a myriad of significant events and reformist ideas. The ideas of French thinkers who tried to explain dramatic social changes and substantiate the relationship between human beings and general progressive processes occupy an authoritative place in world philosophy. The most famous concepts of postmodernism, which are actively developing in Europe, are presented in the works

of French philosophers. We have focused our attention on the works of V. Descombes, G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, M. Foucault, and J. Baudrillard. The era of postmodernism is intended to resolve all contradictions, to explain why the ideas of modernity have led to a number of global catastrophes, bringing humanity to the brink of extinction. It is the rejection of the ideals of modernity that inspires the work of French thinkers of the second half of the nineteenth century, and their concepts appear as legitimate heirs to the modern constructions of previous philosophy. The analysis of recent studies and publications that have been used to address this problem, on which the authors rely. Both Ukrainian and European thinkers are working on this issue. In recent years, French postmodernism has attracted attention for its extravagance of the ontological and epistemological principle of the universe. It should be noted that today Ukrainian philosophical thought does not yet have fundamental studies of the work of French thinkers, but some points have been analyzed in the works of N. Korabliov, V. Liakh, A. Mamalui, O. Sobol, O. Khoma, S. Kutsepal, and V. Okorokov. Considerable attention has been paid to the legacy of French thinkers in Western philosophical discourse, in particular, in the works of J. Coulter, J. Smith, J. Baldwin, C. Wolfe, and others. The aim of the paper is to demonstrate the relevance of the main philosophical concepts of French thinkers of the late nineteenth century, to demonstrate the contradictions and ambiguities of the creative heritage of V. Descombes, G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, M. Foucault and to reveal the dialectical content of the main categories of thinkers in their works.

Discussion of the problem. French philosophy of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries is represented by a large cohort of thinkers. They tried to contrast and analyze the main social trends of Modernity and postmodernity. Their works clearly demonstrate the complexity and simplicity of both transitional moments and the change in the fundamental nature of the subject and object of the ruling philosophical trend. This paper presents an analysis of the works of V. Descombes, D. Deleuze and F. Guattari.

V. Descombes is a French philosopher whose works are authoritative in different parts of the world, and his ideas have both supporters and opponents. His main works

are "Identical and Different" and "Philosophy of Stormy Times". In these works, V. Descombes proves that French philosophy emerges at the moment when Descartes decides to respond in French to M. Montel's "Experiments" with his «Meditations on Method». In his works, V. Descombes explores the world of language and the meaning of discussions, proving that French philosophy of the twenty-first century cannot be identified with either an era or a single philosophical scale. Everything is much simpler; it coincides with historical cyclicality, that is, with the aggregate discourse that prevails in France and is perceived as philosophical. The philosopher aspires to formulate a new task for contemporary philosophy, which has emerged as a result of economic, political, moral, and cultural processes. V. Descombes believes that there is a risk in the process of transition from the judgment "Man speaks about Being", where there is no problem, to the judgment "Being speaks about itself through the discourse that man conducts about Being". In accordance with the above, philosophy is considered to be the discourse of the philosopher, where philosophy stands out to the extent that it is on the other side of absolute knowledge, because the subject of this discourse speaks about something different from itself. French postmodern philosophy is characterized by the presence of lines of articulation and dismemberment, strata and territorialities, and the movement of determination and destratification. As we can see, the dominant feature of the overall world picture of the French society is multiplicity, which becomes substantial, forming different types of social machines. As a result of this mechanism in society, "the machine device is directed at countries that will undoubtedly create a kind of mechanism out of it, or a meaningful integrity or certainty attributed to the subject – but also at the body without organs (corps sans organs), which constantly destroys, forces pure intensities to pass, and attributes to itself subjects who have nothing left but a name as a trace of intensity" (J. Deleuze, F. Guattari, Capitalisme et schizophrénie: L'Anti-Œdipe). J. Deleuze and F. Guattari in their work "Rhizoma", which is a continuation and at the same time the final part of the book "Capitalism and Schizophrenia" (the first volume of which was "Anti-Oedipus"), focus on philosophical changes in the perception and understanding of the subject and the object. Their philosophy rejects the system, program, and password, and attempts to

get rid of market volatility, fashion whims, and the compulsions of academia. Philosophy is able to present its objects not only as reality, but also as responsibility to facts. Emphasis and representation correspond to the same compulsion that is formed from the impulse of thinking. Deleuze and Guattari acted in such a way that philosophy is not perceived as reflection or argumentation, but as invention, as a discipline of category creation. The process of cognition indicates the presence of the consciousness of the subject, and argumentation – on the order of sentences and the presence of referents. They proved that in concepts, the power of thinking is concentrated in one plane, a constellation of complementary motives that can argue for the notion that there is a concept in thinking. The French thinkers of classical philosophy developed a general model of the world representation "in the form of a tree". The main features of this model were: - vertical connection between heaven and earth; - linear uniformity of development; - determinism of ascent; - binary relations "left-right", "high-low".

In their work "Rhizoma", J. Deleuze and F. Guattari distinguish two types of the above-mentioned model of the world – "tree-root" and "system-root," "fibrous root system". "The first model has pivotal roots with peripheral non-dichotomous branching and is characterized by the bifurcation of the One, which obeys the laws of binary logic. The subject plays an important role, and the object is fully subject to the condition of "strong root unity – the unity of the core that supports the secondary roots" (J. Deleuze, F. Guattari, Capitalisme et schizophrénie: L'Anti-Œdipe). Both models contribute to the formation of multiplicity in the same way – by adding new external features of multiplicity that are already evident. Such a tree model appears as a transcendent and hierarchical structure that can develop through binary oppositions. In such a complex system, there is only one unresolved task: the creation of a plurality by separating the one from the many. Such an operation is available only in rhizome, which is an alternative model of non-exclusive and non-traditional world connection proposed by J. Deleuze and F. Guattari. "The rhizome as a hidden stem is radically different from roots and roots. Rhizomes are bulbs and tubers... The rhizome itself has various forms, from its superficial branching extension to its concrete embodiment in bulbs and tubers" (J. Deleuze, F. Guattari, Capitalisme et schizophrénie: L'Anti-Œdipe). That is,

the term rhizome, borrowed from biology, means the root system of a plant that lacks a main process, the result of this structure of the root system is a network of intertwined roots of substance equivalent, which forms a discontinuous surface devoid of depth, which provokes the deprivation of the subject. Analyzing this model, it is clear that it does not have a center, and therefore cannot be demonstrated as a limiting structure.

In the process of analyzing the work "Rhizome", we can identify its main properties: - the principle of connection and heterogeneity, i.e., any point of the rhizome must be connected to any other point, unlike a tree or root that records the order as a whole; - the principle of multiplicity, due to which the multiple is studied as substantial, not related to nature and spiritual reality as an image as a whole; - the principle of insignificant discontinuity or non-parallel evolution. According to this principle, the rhizome can be torn in any place, and as a result, it is rebuilt on another plane; - the principle of cartography and decalcomania. In this case, the rhizome does not obey any structural or generative model, does not recognize the very idea of the genetic axis as a deep structure. According to this principle, decalcomania is a rejection of the residual traces of structural models. A vivid example of decalcomania is schizoanalysis. In this case, it refutes any idea of decalcated fatality, no matter what it is called: whether it is madness, economic, hereditary, or syntagmatic. By analyzing the principles, we can specify the main properties of rhizome. Its main difference is the ability to connect one location point with another at a time when the connection of lines is not necessary. It cannot be reduced to either singular or plural, because it is formed from activated lines. An interesting process is observed, rhizome has neither beginning nor end, there is only a middle from which it appears, grows and has the ability to go beyond. "It forms multidimensional linsaric sets without subject and object, which are concentrated in terms of consistency and from which the One is always subtracted" (Delez Zh., Gvattari F. Kapitalizm i shizofreniya). Taking into account the defined principles and properties of rhizome, it can be argued that there is no longer a division into the field of reality, the field of representation and the field of subjectivity. That is, the formula world→book→author works individually for each component. A book has no continuation in another book, no object in the world, and no subject in the person

of one or more authors. When reviewing the main works of French philosophers, we came to the conclusion that the rhizome is generative, that is, each of its points is connected to any other, while they are not fixed and not connected to a specific topos. In this case, the model of the world in the form of a tree appears as a "copy"; allowing the existence of another one to be copied. It is this model of the world that is sabotaged by the rhizome with the correspondence of a single center and the recognition of the equivalence of pluralistic centers. Since the rhizome is the framework of society, it actively exercises power. Its main function is to supervise the actions of the character, marking the path of his movement with indices and labels, i.e., it is relevant to consider the relationship between rhizome and power, the power of the rhizome.

Another term associated with the legacy of Deleuze and Guattari is schizoanalysis. Schizoanalysis is an attempt to deny any form of ideological enslavement and self-identification on the basis of ideology. A person is left alone in a dangerous and frantic, but still beautiful world, in which "desires," "fluids," and "flows" continue to exist, and death remains an integral part of life. In addition, the project of schizoanalysis refuses to assert the security of the world and human beings in the realm of language and logical representation. The authors of schizoanalysis emphasize the unconscious nature of the actions of both social mechanisms and individual subjects. The unconscious permeates the life of society, resulting in the emergence of destructive forces of desire as "counterinvestment" and "disinvestment" that accumulate between two poles, the macro and micro levels. One is characterized by the subjugation of production and "willing machines" to their own aggregates, which are created under the conditions of a given form of power, and the other is formed by the reverse form and the overthrow of power. Thus, power is the endless variations of the game between the production of desire and the repressive forging that is secondary. Its essence lies in the fact that all possible outcomes of the game are concretely determined by the social production of desire. This process gives rise to a new concept, the "body," a repository of desire machines and collective organs of sociogenesis. In turn, a classification of territorialization and typology of bodies is formed:

1) the body of the earth

2) the body of the despot or the imperial machine

3) the body of capital or the stage of civilization.

Thus, society appears as a regulator of desire impulses, a certain system of rules and axioms. Desire is both the production and the product of this production, the main ruling force.

Thus, from the above, we can draw the following conclusions: the postmodern era is designed to resolve all the contradictions generated by modernity; the binary of modern worldview is replaced by the rhizomaticity of postmodern thinking; the concept of "structure" is replaced by the concept of "rhizome", which is devoid of systematization and hierarchically ordered organization. Postmodernism with its concepts emerges with the advent of a new era, which is determined by global historical changes in the perception of the world, human beings, and society. The existence of different, sometimes opposing points of view on the phenomenon of postclassical philosophy in general and its postmodern component in particular proves that this study has not lost its relevance and also reminds us of the original philosophical problem of the relativity of truth and polemicism and debate as means of philosophizing.

6.2. M. Foucault on power.

In this case, it is feasible to refer to the research of M. Foucault. Michel Foucault is a talented and extraordinary French philosopher of the twentieth century. French philosophy is known for the progressive ideas of this thinker. The active work of Foucault can be divided into two periods – structuralist and poststructuralist. It is the second period that coincides with the time of the philosopher's active civic position, regarding the challenges of modernity and the definition of the problem of the philosophical subject. M. Foucault was socially active and he was a reformer in the political environment. In his lectures, the philosopher emphasized: "Do not use thought to give political practice the value of truth" (Michel Foucault, Politics philosophy

culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). Michel Foucault was always at the epicenter of historical events not only in France but also abroad. In 1979, the thinker supported the Islamic Revolution in Iran on the side of the Protestants. He saw the actions of the Protestants as a "people's breakthrough to freedom," followed the chronology of events and published his opinions in the "Liberation" newspaper. It should be noted that "Liberation" is the youngest French national newspaper. Foucault always sought to learn about the unknown, to discover new things, and because of his skepticism, he was not dogmatic. His lectures were regularly attended by prominent politicians, and his conclusions on historical landmark events were noted and recorded on tape. At one of his lectures, the thinker emphasized the problem of "power" and "knowledge". His research is concentrated in various fields, but our attention is drawn to the ideas of rhizomatic power. From the point of view of M. Foucault, the subject of power is represented by the terms of conflict and power or force, and the concept of subject has two meanings:

1) a person who is subordinated to another through control and dependence;

2) a person who is connected to his or her own identity through self-consciousness or knowledge of oneself, which enslaves and makes one subordinate.

M. Foucault is the author of the concept of "political technology of power". The basis of this category is the body and its role in power relations. Power relations can do anything, it is enough to recall the centuries of torture and ill-treatment, which were considered the norm in the sovereign-subordinate relationship. Power relations can have a direct impact on the body, stigmatize it, cause it to suffer, and demand obedience. Power is a certain strategy, as it is active rather than possessive; it is a set of strategic positions of the sovereign, who determines and approves the conditions of existence of the subordinates. A common definition of power states that power is the domination of one over others, which highlights another function of power related to discipline and supervision of society's members. As noted above, power is immediately directed at the body, which is the target of power, and its methods allow for controlling the body's operations, ensuring the constant enslavement of its forces, and giving it the property of submissive utility. The human body falls into the hands of mechanized

power, which dismembers and shapes it differently, and the so-called "political anatomy" or, as it is also called, "mechanics of power" is born: it determines the ways of influencing people's bodies so that they do not only what is required of them, but also act as the authorities need, using socio-political mechanisms. That is, a new mechanism is born – the mechanism of "obedience" (M. Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.). Thanks to this mechanism, four properties of an individual are formed:

- chamber, as a result of spatial distribution

- organic, coding of activity;

- genetic, accumulation of masses;

- combinatorial, through the combination of forces.

M. Foucault's understanding of power is one of the origins of Bentham's concept of panopticon, which is based on a closed and divided observable space. According to this concept, each individual is assigned a prominent place, full control of movements, and detailed registration of events. Therefore, power is indivisible in accordance with a holistic hierarchical structure, and the main attribute of power is supervision and punishment. Power permeates the social body, forming an endless hierarchical plane of subordination, as power is visible and at the same time unattainable for total control and verification. In this case, like the atoms of Democritus, there is a movement of anonymous individuals, forming a society to the extent that they are able to control each other, influencing the fates and actions of others. One of the main points in M. Foucault's concept of power is the assertion of the need to criticize the "logic of power and rule". The French philosopher identified the following features of power

- dispersion

- discreteness

- contradictory nature

- omnipresence;

- mandatory nature.

The understanding of power is that it manifests itself as "the power of scientific discourses over human consciousness," since the knowledge gained by science is

relative, therefore it is questionable, and this knowledge is imposed on people in the form of "unquestioned authority" that forces people to think in standard categories. Considering the genealogy of power in his work "The History of Sexuality", M. Foucault argues that: "Power is omnipresent; but not because it has the privilege of grouping everything under its irresistible unity, but because it is reproduced at every moment, at every point, or, more precisely, in every relation from one point to another. Power can be found everywhere, and not because it comes from everywhere. And "this" power, in all its constant, repetitive, inert, self-reproducing characteristics, is nothing more than the consequence of the totality that appears through all these moving interactions, the clutch that is formed from them all and, in turn, tries to fix them. It is necessary, of course, to be a nominalist: power is not an institution or a structure, it is not a kind of power that certain individuals are gifted with; it is only the name we give to a complex strategic situation in a given society" (M. Foucault, The History of Sexuality). From the point of view of M. Foucault, power can be neither a substance nor an entity that determines an external force; power is a complex network and at the same time a mobile strategy, a set of unstable actions. Thus, power is organically distributed throughout the infinity of the rhizome, among all the elements, and therefore it is legitimate to speak of the pacoptic nature of the rhizome, since one can see the interdependence, control and accountability of the elements, the interdependence of connotative relations. Rhizomatic circumstances are caused by the limitlessness of power, which has no clear boundaries in a certain space, is endowed with fragmentary power potential, in this case, there are conditions for preventing the discussion for power. At the level of fantasy, we can assume the end of the rhizomatic situation, but in the holistic sense, it will be a complete end, as it is perceived as a curtailment of connotative connections, ways of combining elements to the initial denotation that started the process. However, it should be remembered that the primary has the potential for reverse actualization, and therefore the end result is nothing more than a "story about the end," meaning that there will be a continuation of the story.

The work of M. Foucault "The History of Madness" clearly analyzes and demonstrates the interconnection of these categories. We should not forget that it was

in the 1960s that existentialism and phenomenology dominated in France, and Foucault was influenced by the philosophical views of M. Heidegger and E. Husserl. In search of truth, Foucault analyzes the works of Nietzsche and Hegel. Their ideas contributed to the formation of the theme of the genesis of a modern European. Nietzsche's idea of the genealogy of morality, where morality is a historical form of the subject's experience, was completely rethought by M. Foucault. He argued that as a result of the clash and modification of different types of freedom, it leads to power. Freedom and power are the driving force of genealogies, and these categories are reflected in the concept of "power – knowledge" in Foucault's works. The theme of power in Foucault's works was influenced by the ideas of Marxism. The scholar was even a member of the Communist Party for three years. His experience of working with authoritarianism contributed to his interest in the role of power relations in the process of forming different types of knowledge in relation to power.

Foucault was deeply interested in the relationship between power and knowledge not only in the political sphere, but also in various social spheres of society: the relationship between doctor and patient, teacher and student, parents and children. In a conversation with a journalist in 1977, Michel Foucault, analyzing his scientific work, said: "...the real difficulty for me was to solve a question that is now a question for the whole world, namely the question of power" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). He argued that the concept of "power" had gone through a thorny path to formulate the basic problems. For the prominent philosopher, in 1955, the time comes when the concept of "excessive power" is misunderstood. This concept is identified with the period of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and fascism in Germany. Some scholars, studying the above political systems, explained and argued from an economic perspective. However, Foucault notes that the termination of their existence does not end the existence of the concept of "excessive power", and therefore such a process requires a deep analysis of political and social processes. Foucault writes: "...we have not had any concepts and historical tools that would allow us to properly grasp the complexity of the issue of power, since the nineteenth century, which bequeathed us these tools, perceived this problem only

through various economic schemes" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). However, in this context, the philosopher argues for the Marxist system of power, which unofficially existed until the middle of the 20th century, and speaks of the existence of other types of power that are not officially recognized. M. Foucault argues that his work is aimed at the problems of power and this work is not just a momentary one, this issue is the leitmotif of his activity and the problem is solved and analyzed in different ways. During a lecture held at the French-Japanese Kansai Institute in Kyoto, Foucault said: "My studies address the technicians and technologists of power. They are centered on the research of how power rules and enforces itself" (M. Foucault, The Will to Truth). The philosopher notes that power is a complex phenomenon and to understand this mysterious thing, which is both visible and invisible, present and hidden, invested everywhere, it takes a long time to carry out a deep historical analysis. Foucault sees the problem of the failure of the existence of a general concept of power. This problem is the identification of the phenomenon of power with the interpretation of state power and its institutions (army, judiciary). In this case, the theory of the state could not claim to cover the phenomenon of power in its entirety. The study of different types of social institutions is also limited in this aspect. Power, and most importantly, its essence and mechanisms of exercise, elude us and are not available for research. In this case, a monolithic study of power and political institutions is impossible. Foucault says that people live with glasses on and are not aware of the power process, which is implemented through social institutions and institutions that seem to have nothing to do with each other. For example, educational institutions, penitentiary institutions, medical organizations, each has its own specifics of influence and uses its own methods and technologies of exercising power. In addition, power penetrates into social life much deeper than it seems. The above-mentioned institutions and agencies are the foundation of social life, and the principles of their activity have been formed over the centuries and are constant values. Foucault does not equate power with political power. In fact, the philosopher said: "relations of power exist (this is something we know in spite of everything, but we do not always draw conclusions from it) and pass through many other things. After

all, power relations exist between men and women, between those who know and those who don't, between parents and children, within families. There are thousands and thousands of different power relations in society" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). Indeed, social relations of different nature (industrial, family, marriage, etc.) are closely intertwined and have both a determining and a conditional role. It is inappropriate to say, for example, that power relations between men and women, between the sick and the healthy, between the educated and the uneducated are based on the position of state power, but do not depend on each other; rather, on the contrary, state power relies on them. Foucault writes in his works that an individual is in a plane where there is a "whole bundle of power relations" that help him or her to realize themselves. In this regard, Foucault argues, it is pointless to try to change state power by changing the state government and some social institutions through which state power is implemented. First of all, the system of micro-power needs to be changed, because power is omnipotent, because it produces and reproduces itself anywhere: "Power is everywhere, not because it covers everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (M. Foucault, The Will to Truth). Power, especially state power, is usually associated with violence and assessed as a negative phenomenon, but Foucault objects, saying that this statement is not true. State power cannot generate violence, in which case it would be vulnerable and weak, but it is authoritative and strong, thanks to the methodology at the level of micro-power systems. One of the key issues for Foucault is "power relations", "power relations are relations of force, confrontations" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). That is, power relations clearly define two sides, two poles: the pole of striving and the pole of confrontation, or the pole of resistance, that is, the force of opposition. Power relations, accordingly, are in constant dynamics and tension. The thinker emphasizes that "relations of power are relations of force, confrontations, and therefore they are always reversible. And there is no power relationship that would triumph in its entirety and whose dominance would be irreversible" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). This is due to the fact that there is an internal dissonance in power

relations, but it is even more evident at the level of micro-power and absorbs society. In this regard, there is a divergence of types of power and their struggle. "Every struggle," Foucault writes, "revolves around a specific center of power, one of those countless small centers, which may be a small boss, a private citizen in a municipal house, a prison warden, a judge, a union worker, the editor-in-chief of a magazine" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984).

Analyzing the above-mentioned positions of M. Foucault concerning power, we can agree on the phenomenality of this category. The philosopher is right, state or political power is only one form of the phenomenon of power. There may be non-political, but authoritative and effective forms of power in society. In practice, we observe how the state authorities use the army, law enforcement agencies, and other institutions to implement their actions. However, in specific historical conditions, they can acquire relative independence. Foucault's statement that power is concentrated in all socio-cultural institutions without exception, in the author's opinion, is not true. The thinker tries to prove at all costs that power exists not only in socio-cultural institutions but is contained in itself. The author's position explains the phenomenon of power in the uniqueness of its forms and principles of existence in both social and state-political life.

6.3. Rreformer of postmodernism

Familiarity with French philosophy is impossible without the guru of postmodernism, Jean Baudrillard. J. Baudrillard is a well-known and popular French philosopher, sociologist, and cultural critic who is considered one of the theorists of postmodern philosophy. He studied in Sorbonne, and is a philologist by training, so a significant place in his work belongs to literary and critical essays and translations. He lectured at universities in Europe, the USA, and Australia. The philosophical methodology of J. Baudrillard is defined as "hypercriticism", "radical thinking", "total supercritical criticism". The palette of recognition of the philosopher's philosophical

ideas is varied – from absolute admiration and recognition as a "postmodern guru", "consumer society theorist" to being declared a "philosophical marginal". J. Baudrillard is the author of the concepts popular in Western philosophy: hyperreality, simulation, simulacrum, which reveal the virtual nature of contemporary reality. The thinker pays considerable attention to mass communication and information, defining their role in shaping the world picture and public opinion. It should be noted that Baudrillard's ideas in the context of French philosophy seem original, but unexpected. This was facilitated by one case when the competition committee refused to give Baudrillard a teaching position because of disagreement with his analysis of Nietzsche's works, and he stopped reading his books, having calmly survived the intellectual "fashion" for Nietzsche. The philosopher actively studied the works of J. Bataille, M. Moss, A. Artaud, P. Klossowski.

Baudrillard gained popularity after publishing his work "Simulacra and Simulation" (1981), which is devoted to the analysis of totalitarian society and preaches a society of contemplation, an alternative to the popular panopticon of Michel Foucault at that time. A detailed analysis of the simulation system, proving the impossibility of the social, the study of revolution and terrorism are the topics that are most in demand for explanation in the modern world, which is why Baudrillard's philosophy is popular and relevant.

The end of the last and the beginning of the current century are marked by constant experiments in the field of artificial reality and various means of its formation and modeling (especially in this sense, we note the creation and distribution of interactive computer games, where communication with the game character itself becomes possible and necessary), as well as the replacement real things and relations to their analogs – simulacra, devoid of ontical-ontological characteristics, led to changes in the models and methods of communication, which now takes place within the simulative sphere, the functioning of which is guided by the laws of "cold seduction". We live in a world similar to the original – things in it are duplicated according to their own script, but this is a world of simulacra, ersatz.

The concept of "simulacrum" dates back to the works of ancient philosophers to

denote a certain likeness, a copy of reality that is the result of imitation of this reality. In the theory of ancient aesthetics, simulacrum was synonymous with the concept of "artistic image," and Lucretius translated with the word simulacrum what Epicurus called eicon, i.e., a cognitive image. The semantic load of this concept changes dramatically in the period of modernity, which is characterized by the obsessive dominance of a significant number of fakes, imitations of reality, especially in architecture. The Enlightenment and Romanticism only intensified the change in the concept of "simulacrum" in the direction of replacing reality with its simulative copies. The most successful time for the triumph of the simulacrum was the second half of the last century and the beginning of the twenty-first century. S. Zenkin in the introduction to Baudrillard's book "Symbolic Exchange and Death" notes: The notion of simulacrum ("appearance", "likeness") is a very old one; it has existed in European philosophy since antiquity, and it was usually included in the theological scheme of representation formulated by Plato: there is an ideal model-original (eidos), in relation to which true or false likenesses are possible. True copy-cats are characterized by their similarity to the model, and false simulacra by their difference (from the model and from each other), but common to both is their correlation, positive or negative, with the transcendental model. It is in this vein that the simulacrum is viewed by representatives of postmodern philosophy, who refuse to refer in favor of interpretation, declaring the simulacrum ("an exact copy, the original of which never existed," according to P. Klossowski) as a specific means of communication, a modern model of communication based on the fact that interlocutors must reconstruct the connotative meanings of each other's statements, thereby realizing the "openness of existence", identifying the identity of the model and the similarity of the copy. According to P.Klossowski, if concepts and conceptual language imply what J.Bataille defines as "closed existence", then the openness realized in the processes of communication is the openness of existence or the achievement of the integrity of existences... can be developed only as simulacra of concepts. The important methodological significance of the concept of simulacrum is that it asserts the primacy of the individual in relation to the general. It is considered by postmodernism as "a

system in which the different correlates with the different means of the different itself" (M. Foucault, Politics philosophy culture interviews and other writings 1977-1984). J. Bataille introduces the dichotomy of "openness of existence" – "closed existence", which results in the emergence of "conceptual language". Traditionally, a concept is declared to be a carrier of constant meaning, knowledge about an individual subject, while the actualization of the meaning of a simulacrum is carried out only in communicative procedures, i.e., a simulacrum is a vector phenomenon directed in the process of communication from the addressee to the addressee. Thus, a simulacrum is endowed with meaning only when its individual associative and connotative aspects are actualized, deciphered by the addressee and create a single image in his or her mind. By uttering the word "simulacrum," a person actually frees up both their associative fields and the possible connotative meanings of what he says, getting rid of themselves as a subject addressing other subjects in order to leave only the content of experience" (Klossowski), open to any configuration. This experience, captured by the simulacrum, can be interpreted by the Other (who is in a relationship of "complicity" with me) not through my (expressive and suggestive) or his (hermeneutical) efforts, but only through the self-movement of associative fields and connotative meanings. In other words, we can say that simulacrum is a term of postmodern philosophy that, in its ontological projection, fixes the way of realizing eventuality, which is realized in the act of semiosis and has no other form of being than perceptual and symbolic; in its epistemological projection, it is used to denote an extra-conceptual means of fixing transgressive experience. The Novel Philosophical Dictionary states: "The term 'simulacrum' was introduced into the postmodernist vocabulary by Bataille, and interpreted by Klossowski, Baudrillard, and others. In the context of the general rejection of the idea of reference, postmodernism radicalizes the interpretation of the simulacrum: postmodernist philosophy sets up a thought space where "the identity of the model and the likeness of the copy will be a delusion" (Deleuze). A simulacrum in this context is defined as an exact copy whose original never existed (Jamieson). The merit of Baudrillard is that he endowed this concept with transparency and made it visual. As Dyakov notes: "Baudrillard is often misunderstood – either in the sense that

the simulacrum hides a certain "true" reality from us (i.e., in the Platonic spirit), or by claiming that Baudrillard declared reality non-existent (i.e., in the spirit of some primitive pop-Berkeleyanism), both of which are wrong" (Jean Baudrillard, The System of Objects). The beginning of Baudrillard's own interpretation of the simulacrum is the work "The System of Things," where he concludes that there is no sphere of existence free from simulation, and the main subject of simulation is "naturalness," whose connotations are freedom and responsibility. At the same time, the principle of reality in relation to any thing is bracketed, all things turn out to be models, and there are no more models (Jean Baudrillard, The System of Objects). In the work "The System of Things", the scientist still admits the existence of "non-empty" signs, i.e. those that refer to a certain reality, later he is convinced that there are only "empty" signs that refer not to reality but to each other. In "Passwords", the author argues that all things are capable of slipping into the realm of the sign, and the sign is a constant erasure of the thing. The concept of simulacra is further developed by J. Baudrillard in his works "Toward a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign", "Transparency of Evil", "Simulacra and Simulation", etc.

In several of his works, Baudrillard defines a certain order of simulacra. In this case, we will focus on the version that the thinker proposes in his work "Simulacra and Simulation." Hence, he defines: "Simulacra are natural, naturalistic, based on image, imitation, and fake. They are harmonious, optimistic, aimed at depicting nature in the image that was intended by God; - industrial simulacra, aimed at increasing productivity, based on energy, power, machinery of various kinds, as well as the entire production system - this is "the Promethean desire for monumentalization and continuous expansion, for the release of unlimited energy"; - simulacra of simulation based on information, model, cybernetic game - total efficiency, hyperreality, desire for total control" (Jean Baudrillard «Simulacres et simulation»). Each of the orders of simulacra correlates with a certain kind of imaginary: for the first order, it is the imaginary of utopia, for the second – science fiction, and for the third – an implosive model. "In the first-order simulacrum, the distinction is never canceled: it always assumes the possibility of a dispute between simulacrum and reality (their play reaches

a special subtlety in illusionist painting, but in general, all art lives thanks to the gap between them). In a second-order simulacrum, the problem is simplified by absorbing appearances – or, if you will, by eliminating reality; in any case, it creates a reality without image, without echo, without reflection, without appearance; this is what labor is, what the machine is, what the whole system of industrial production is, since it is fundamentally opposed to theatrical illusion" (Jean Baudrillard L'échange symbolique et la mort). The transition from one order of simulacra to another characterizes the distance established between the real and the imaginary – it is maximal in utopia, where "the sphere of the transcendent, a radically different world emerges", and is significantly reduced in science fiction, because "the latter is only a disproportionate, but qualitatively indistinguishable projection of the real world of production" (Jean Baudrillard «Simulacres et simulation»). "Ridded of all concepts as containing the intention to identify its meaning with reality, language abolishes "itself together with identities", while the subject, "uttering" the experience, "at the very moment he utters it, gets rid of himself as a subject addressing other subjects" (Klossowski). In this context, sense-making appears as the self-organization of experience freed from the subject and expressed in a simulacrum, and in this case, the place of a stable (referentially guaranteed) meaning is taken by a multitude of connotative meanings, formed on the basis of cooperation of momentary associations. Thus, the simulacrum as a form of fixation of unfixable states opens up the "event horizon", on one side of which is the deadening and rigid certainty of the supposedly objective and immanent meaning of the event, and on the other side is blindness resulting from... the implosion of meaning. However, the distance between the real and the imaginary is completely absorbed in the implosive era of models. "Models are no longer transcendence or projection. They are no longer the imaginary in relation to the real, they are the anticipation of the real and, therefore, leave no room for any kind of fantastic anticipation – they are immanent, so they leave no room for any kind of imaginary transcendence. The field that opens up is the field of simulation in the cybernetic sense, that is, the field of comprehensive manipulation of models (scenarios, staging of simulated situations, etc.), but then nothing distinguishes this action from the

management and the very action of the real: fantasy no longer exists" (Jean Baudrillard «Simulacres et simulation»). According to Baudrillard, one of the main characteristics of the present is the "metaphysical beauty of the destroyed abstraction", since the latter is no longer an abstraction of a map, copy, mirror, or concept. Abstraction is identical to simulation. Therefore, the next concept is simulation, which J. Baudrillard defines as "the generation of models of reality without underlying causes: hyperreality" (Jean Baudrillard «Simulacres et simulation»). The latest philosophical dictionary offers the following definition of simulation- simulation is a concept of postmodern philosophy that captures the phenomenon of total semiotization of existence up to the acquisition by the sign sphere of the status of the only and self-sufficient reality. In the process of simulation, the real coincides with the models of simulation, the distinction between simulation and the real, between essence and phenomenon disappears, "the remnants of the real have become the desert of the real itself." The real loses its property of being rational and remains only operational, and with it the whole metaphysics disappears, the imaginary equidimensionality is denied, and genetic miniaturization becomes the only dimension of simulation. If rationality used to be a prerequisite for obtaining the status of reality, now it makes no sense, because the real is no longer measured by any authority. "In fact, it is no longer real, because no imaginary covers it with its shell. It is the hyperreal, produced as a result of the radiant synthesis of combinatorial models in hyperspace without atmosphere" (Jean Baudrillard, Simulacres et simulation). The traditional dichotomy of "real-imaginary" is being destroyed, and a new symbiosis of "hyperreal-imaginary" is being formed instead, the only thing that remains as a legacy is "the orbital circulation of models and the simulated generation of differences." It is not without reason that the post-nonclassical type of philosophizing, which includes postmodern philosophy, is commonly called the "philosophy of difference," where the concept of "difference" acquires the status of a paradigm, is defined as an "authentic philosophical principle" (J. Deleuze), and all identities are only simulated due to the optical effect of the game of distinction and repetition. According to Baudrillard, it is no longer possible to leave reality and create something unreal, because now the process will proceed in the opposite direction and will consist in creating situations

"with a shift in the image, models built on simulation, in inventive attempts to give them the colors of the real, the banal, the experienced." The simulation cannot be overcome, no one can penetrate its boundaries, it is "matte, it has no external manifestation," the mirror has been lost, and with it the opportunity to look "on the other side of the mirror." The drama of the situation is that the quality of the reality we get is really higher, but unfortunately, it is the reality of someone else. The quality of the actual human, that which is not mediated by technology, is inferior, secondary, alienated. Thus, our civilization "seems to live". Where there is a lack of reality, informational and semantic surrogates appear, and not so much the primary meaning of an action as its ritual load is reproduced. "Considering modernity as an era of total simulation, Baudrillard interprets a wide range of social phenomena in this way, demonstrating their simulation character in modern conditions: if power acts as a simulation of power, then resistance to it cannot but be equally simulative; information does not produce meaning, but "plays" it, replacing communication with a simulation of communication ("devours communication") – simulation, thus, is located on the other side of the true and the false, on the other side of the equivalent, on the other side of the rational differences on which everything social functions. J. Baudrillard is convinced that simulation has always been the immanent essence of everything that has happened in the world, and now the time has come for its explicit appearance, so simulation will be present in the world until its end.

When analyzing Baudrillard's theoretical heritage, one often encounters the concept of "consumption", which is interpreted by the author without reference to material practice, not determined by any material or visual content of images or messages, only the way in which all this is organized into a sign substance matters. "Consumption, to the extent that this word has any meaning at all, is the activity of systematic manipulation of signs" (Jean Baudrillard, The System of Objects). The reason for this state of affairs is that in modern conditions, production is turning into a semiotic sphere, since the produced goods are articulated not in the context of their consumer or exchange value, but in terms of sign value. In addition to J. Baudrillard, S. Lesch, Z. Bauman, G. Vattimo, B. Smart, and others have paid attention to this

aspect. For example, F. Jameson points to the phenomenon of semiotization of movie stars like Marilyn Monroe, who have already been transformed into commodities and turned into their own images. The subject-object relation, which was dominant in the era of classical philosophy, loses all meaning and dissolves in a whirlpool of discursive codes. "Baudrillard postulates a kind of victory of the speculative image of reality over reality as such ("The Evil Demon of Images"): The image "imposes on reality its immanent ephemeral logic, this amoral logic on the other side of good and evil, truth and falsehood, the logic of destroying its own referent, the logic of absorbing meaning"; it "acts as a conduit not for knowledge and good intentions, but rather for the blurring and destruction of meaning (of event, history, memory, and so on), which is why modern culture loses its vivid sense of life, its real sense of reality. All this is replaced by the simulation of reality, on the one hand, and the simulation of its experience ("cool" realization of pleasure), on the other. The world society in general and Ukrainian society in particular are acquiring new features and characteristics, new life standards generated by the demands of the times. Due to the blurring of the boundaries between economy, politics and society, a new struggle for power and confrontation with the authorities is beginning. The needs and values of society, forms and mechanisms of participation of countries and citizens in the global civilization process are also changing. Today's world has given humanity not only significant technological advances and state-of-the-art technologies, but has also changed the very social space of human existence, transforming it into the infosphere, turning information into a driving force for development and endowing it with the ability to assess a person's attitude to reality. Thanks to the unifying activity of information, a person receives a certain set of general concepts that replace, and sometimes even supplant, the real content. The replacement of industrial production with a postmodern society of services and postmodern activity, economic reorientation from global concepts to diversification strategies, structural changes in communication through new technologies, new scientific interest in non-dominant processes, to structures of self-organization, to chaos and fractal dimension, philosophical parting with strict rationalism and scientism and transition to a multiplicity of competing paradigms – all

these are processes that demonstrate important shifts compared to the position of modernity. The information society of the twenty-first century is characterized by a postmodern type of worldview based on fragmentation, variability, plurality, and decentralization, so it is possible to describe and analyze social reality only with the help of a non-classical methodology, using a non-classical model of representation, taking into account the stimulating transformations of the modern heterogeneous society. The dominance of the classical model of representation ended with the Modern era, and the non-classical model is now becoming relevant, according to which the primary attention is paid to the incompleteness of being, the contradictions of true knowledge, and the transformation of the simulacrum into reality. For Baudrillard, the simulacrum functions as a new interpretation of time, represents a new temporality that is characteristic of a situation where time is no longer characterized by linearity but begins to transform, to curl into loops, to gather in folds, to offer people already used and discarded copies instead of real things. This is an attribute of this state of affairs, which is devoid of not only the real, but also the material in general. In his work "Symbolic Exchange and Death," Baudrillard emphasizes that modern man exists "in a mode of referendum," since there is no longer any reference. Any thing, any sign, any message appears to a person in a question-answer projection. This allows the thinker to conclude that the modern communication system has lost the complex syntactic structure of language in order to use the binary-signal system "question-answer". Therefore, we live in a system of continuous testing, and the test and referendum are ideal forms of simulation, because the answer is always suggested by the question itself, modeled even when the question is asked. The simulacrum is declared a degraded copy, becomes a representation of something that does not exist, turns into a sign without a referent. There is no longer a semantic correspondence between sign and referent, because, having become a self-sufficient sign, the simulacrum no longer needs to be referred to a referent. Perhaps it is these maxims of Baudrillard's that make him a philosopher of the "Internet generation" to whom the virtual hypertrophied constructions of the thinker are understandable and close.

Summary and conclusions.

The change of millennia prompts the philosophical discussion to search for new paradigms of philosophizing that meet the demands of modernity. Much attention is paid to the social component of philosophical knowledge, which is determined by the idea of communication, that is, the interaction of people as the basis of social reality and the original source of philosophy. Postmodern philosophy is dominated by the pluralism of values, the development of such categories as justice, responsibility, and legitimacy, since we live in a time of constant risk. Proponents of postmodernism argue that modernization is not modernism in the generally accepted sense of the term. It represents the process of renewal of all spheres of social existence, which does not always have the character of a stable theoretical and ideological position, rather it is characterized by relativism, which seeks to improve anything that comes to the attention of skeptical criticism. The modern process of modernization is directly related to the philosophical situation of postmodernism. The reality indicates that modernization embraces postmodernism itself, promotes the denial of truth and seeks to establish polyvariance. In the theoretical aspect, postmodernism can be considered as globalization in the field of theoretical thinking. The phenomena generated by postmodernism become the theoretical basis for building an information society.