

## THE PRODUCTION OF SPACE AND THE EXPLOITATION OF ATTENTION: A VIEW FROM/OF POSTSTRUCTURALISM

**Alexander Golikov**

*Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Sociology Department of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4 Svobody Sq., Kharkiv 61022, Ukraine, e-mail: [a.s.golikov@gmail.com](mailto:a.s.golikov@gmail.com) ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>*

**Vladislav Tyaglo**

*MA student School of Sociology V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv 61022, Ukraine, e-mail: [marooceano@gmail.com](mailto:marooceano@gmail.com)*

The article analyzes the possibilities of applying the methodology of poststructuralism in modern sociology, in particular in relation to the problems of space production and the exploitation of attention. The heuristic potential of poststructuralism for sociology is investigated, where the methodology of deconstruction is especially studied. The problem of space production by means of attention exploitation is analyzed in the context of Gilles Deleuze's concepts. It is emphasized that the central Deleuzian concept of difference in correlation with a number of concepts (in particular, representation and repetition) provides important tools for understanding the nature of production and reproduction of space, on the one hand, and the procedurality of attention as an object of exploitation, on the other. Poststructuralist metaphors of systematicity (tree and rhizome) are being rethought from the sociological perspective not as mutually exclusive, but as typologically compatible. Deleuze's distinction between nomadic and structural modes of perception is analyzed. The attention is focused on the phenomenon of a *dividuum* («divided») from the point of view of the production of acts of perception and acts of attention. In addition, an important aspect is the problem of production of chronological as structurally comparable with production of spatial. The preconceptions isolated from the Deleuzian theoretical rhizome are used by the authors in relation to the problems of mass culture in the explications of Gilles Lipovetsky and Paul Virilio. Attention is investigated as a fundamental substratum for the production of space(s) in a society of communicative / cognitive capitalism, which is revealed through examples of problems of visual perception, practices of cultural consumption, language, etc. A conclusion is made about the possibilities and limitations of studying the processes of space production and the role of attention in this process of exploitation in sociology from the standpoint of post-structuralist theory.

*Keywords: space, production, exploitation, attention, poststructuralism, difference, repetition, representation, Deleuze, Virilio, Lipovetsky.*

Sociology of the twenty-first century is facing with more and more epistemological challenges in describing, explaining and analyzing the phenomena and processuality of global capitalism and its communicative nature. In particular, despite the «practical turn» [1; 2; 3] in modern sociology, despite the appeal to the problems of space both from Marxist [4] and Simmelian [5] and synthetic [6] positions, a number of the most important

phenomena of late capitalism of the latter remain in the «blind spot» of mainstream sociology for several decades.

One of these problems is the problem posed by L. Althusser [7], namely, the problem of the production of the manufacturer. And, first of all, before the process of production, it is necessary to reproduce the conditions of production itself, an important component of which is the «reproduction of labor power». In

particular, we are talking about reproduction at the sign-symbolic (and not only at the physical-bodily and physiological-material) level. This (re)production in modern capitalism is carried out primarily communicatively, discursively and symbolically, in which, as we show in our previous study [8], the processes of production of subjectivity through the exploitation of attention play a significant role.

However, modern sociology has not developed tools for defining, operationalizing and researching on the border between objective structures of space and subjective practices of (self)exploitation of attention. At the same time, not only strategies of (self) exploitation of attention, but also tactics of such are becoming more and more relevant. «Surveillance capitalism» is gradually moving from a metaphor to the category of categorically defined categories [9; 10]. «Exploitation of attention» is gaining more and more sociological, political, economic, philosophical recognition as a worthy object of research for a society of communicative / cognitive capitalism (co-co-ca) [11; 12]. However, the overwhelming majority of research in this area is still carried out essentially, from the standpoint of the social factuality of the already existing political-economic-social system, while the problems (both objective and subjective) of the production of this system remain outside the brackets. This explains the relevance of our work.

In light of all above, the *purpose of* our work will be to identify, define and analyze the heuristic potential of the poststructuralist concept in the study of the joint «production of space – exploitation of attention».

The poststructuralist turn in sociology of the second half of the twentieth century is primarily in the fact that sociology began to master, domesticate and apply poststructuralist metaphors, and then categories to redescribe its own object of research. Perhaps, in this sense, the work of M. de Certeau is very indicative, in which he uses such clearly de-essential, relativized and discourse categories to study social phenomena, as «walking rhetoric», «metaphors of place», «body noises» or «pedestrian utterances» [13].

However, the difficulty of applying poststructuralist vocabulary into

sociological grammar lies in the fact that the poststructuralist episteme is highly hermetic and needs «direct penetration» into it, as J. Derrida pointed out, «subjecting the discourse to all sorts of distortions or contractions... by deconstruction to its deepest basis» [14]. Society and the social, understood as discourse, lose their proximity, immediacy, presence, cease to be «naively real» and «obviously unproblematic». In place of the study of social «contents», in the language of G. Simmel, we turn first of all to the study of «forms», and not even so much the forms themselves, as the relations between them. «The mere presence» (presence), as J. Derrida notices, should be changed back and ceased to be reduced to just accounting horizons of potentially present. Here, the most trivial step is a requirement formulated generalized as: «A deconstruction of presence must pass through the deconstruction of consciousness». It is precisely this structuralist-constructivist deconstruction-without-deconstruction that P. Bourdieu implements in his project of reflexive sociology [15]. Thus, in poststructuralist methodology, the requirement to take into account the double construction of reality turns out to be implicated by (epistemo)logic itself.

This requirement is reinforced by the poststructuralists' awareness that «ordinary language is completely incapable of expressing some forms of modern thinking» [14]. R. Barthes writes this about when he says that language becomes alienated, uncontrollable and objective in relation to the user of language [16]. Indeed, insofar as language is a structure (but not reduced to (discursive) practice of the language), to the extent we have to look at the objectivity of language in looking for response to a question about the order and its possibility.

And, so, the study of rhetorical and discursive orders should answer the fundamental remark: «Rather than destroy, one should also understand how a certain ensemble was constructed, to reconstruct it for this» [17]. The study of genesis through Heidegger's hacking of order turns out to be an important guarantee for the epistemological transformation of any order into a grammatical order: after all, only in this case «despite the appearance, deconstruction is neither analysis nor

criticism» [17], only in this case «dismantling some structure is not a regression to a simple element, some indiscriminate source» [17]. It is the grammatical nature of structures (and not their mechanicalness, organicity, physicality, biologicality, etc.) that requires a specific deconstruction procedure – which is not a method, cannot be reduced to and cannot be transformed into a method, not analysis, not criticism, «nothing», by definition J. Derrida.

An example of this procedural «nothing» is the exploration of the cinematic space by David Weberman [18]. He subordinates the narration in the film to the four (hypo)theses he formulated about the differences between reality and simulation in dialogue with the texts of Plato, R. Descartes, J. Baudrillard, G. Debord and other authors. Deconstruction implies, in particular, recontextualization: each thesis is accompanied by a quotation or description of a scene from the film, thereby revealing several contradictions associated with the «Matrix»:

– in the outside, which consists in the fact that the film addresses postmodernist problems, refers to the work of J. Baudrillard, but remains essentially an old-fashioned Hollywood motion picture, where good fights against evil, and only theme of movie is borrowed from postmodernism for greater urgency;

– on the inside, consisting in the fact that the traitor Cypher (born Reagan, by the way) actually made the right choice when he chose a simulation of reality. The «goodies» Neo and Trinity choose a desert of reality as opposed to simulation, which is described in the film as not free: thus, the paradox is that Neo chooses the red pill, but the blue one sends to a much «better» world.

It is this deconstruction methodology that we apply to the construction of space with the tools of poststructuralism. So, the basis of any space is differentiation: «Each consists of differences and communicates with others through differences of differences» [19]. Moreover this differentiation, as well as the differentiation of the text suggests «... the repetition, but repetition, implying difference between the two words» [19]. Structures exist precisely as structures of repetition, structures of space function due to the space of reproduction and reproduction of the space of reproduction. On the level of

the structures of thinking, this process is mirrored with full form: «...thinking thinks through the differences...» [19]. Space, being differentiated, makes it possible to establish not only the differences between the different, but also the difference between the identical: both the identity of the different and the identity of the identical. Each of these acts of (de)equivalence (and we have demonstrated that any knowledge operation is an operation of (de)equivalence [20]) requires ongoing work on (re)production of (de)equivalence. As we prove [8], this work exists as non-material labor, in the process of which not only the direct product of this labor is produced (in this case, the space of differences of the different and the identity of the identical, the differences of the identical and the identity of the different), but also the subject of differentiation and identification itself.

Moreover, the nature of the acts of this labor differs depending on the content of this act. Thus, the establishment of various differences is an act of branding, it is the most common and known method of operation of attention (see, e.g., as in the context of space modern scholars [21] describe branding). The establishment of the identity of the identical as a result of the exploitation of attention is an act of recognition and identification. And this act plays a crucial role in the (re) production of the structures of cognitive capitalism (attention capitalism; surveillance capitalism): after all, it is on such an act that the very technique of authorization and, accordingly, monetization is built. Establishing the identity of the different is an act of integration, in which the different finds, in the language of N. Luhmann, a «loose joint» [22] for the production of systems for the joint and common exploitation of attention (such, for example, «cohabitation» of different brands, the connection of different techniques and practices of attraction, retention, exploitation and monetization of attention, etc.). Finally, the establishment of the difference between the identical is the act of out-differentiation [23, p. 125] of a functional (sub)system within a spatial system, during which space isolates its regions, identical in one dimension (for example, halls of a museum or a factory workshops), but different – in another (halls of different eras; workshops of different stages of production).

In this light, the metaphorizations of systemicity proposed in poststructuralism look completely different. The opposition of tree systems as «hierarchical systems» and rhizomes as «antigenealogy» [24] turns into a mutually non-exclusive. Insofar as «the logic of a tree consists in tracing anything that is already given to us ready-made..., the tree articulates and hierarchizes tracings, tracings are like the leaves of a tree» [24]. The logic of a tree is the logic of the act of establishing identity. Each new leaf of the tree is identical to another, and their multiplication turns out to be the multiplication of the identical. The space of a school or university, factory or museum with their classrooms, workshops and halls turns out to be a tree-like organization of identity. In contrast to this, in opposition to a traced identity, «a rhizome deals with a map that must be produced, constructed, always disassembled, connected, revised, modified – in multiple inputs and outputs ...» [24] – and, unlike the traditional museum or exhibition gallery (the very metaphor of the gallery space is tree-like with a dominant «gallery» trunk), appeals to the procedure of difference. Contemporary art-spaces are rhizomes not only in the sense of a- and dis-hierarchy, but also in the sense of the cartographic nature of these spaces.

It is characteristic that this logic is also reproduced for the distinction between a modern city (industrial, fabricated conveyor belt, typical, with identical and selfsame Builders' streets) and postmodern urban space (patchwork, scrappy, heterogeneous and heterologous, fireworking and oscillating). However, this does not mean that any of these logics differ from the other in the essential process of exploiting attention in the production of spaces. Only the techniques differ.

Thus, the technique of space production implies multiple, competitive, formally emancipatory exploitation of attention, because «any point of the rhizome can – and should be – attached to any other point of it. This is very different from a tree or a root that fixes a certain point and a certain order» [24]. The struggle for methods and algorithms, trajectories and substrates for connecting points is becoming one of the central strategies in the production of space in communicative / cognitive capitalism. The exploitation of attention begins with the

struggle for this exploitation, which only sharpens and exacerbates the instruments of exploitation, makes it more shameless and manifested, painful and – paradoxically – reified, attributed to the things themselves and their logic. This reification is reinforced by the ego-centering of the constructed space. The consumer is illuded as the center of the constructed space. This does not close him in the Matrix – this closes the consumers in a multitude of small matrices, each of which is intended for the corresponding consumer (that is only confirmed and illustrated by the power of Big Data). The vision voiced by Deleuze comes true: «The plateau is always in the middle – neither at the beginning nor at the end. The rhizome consists of a plateau» [24]. And formal freedom only strengthens the illusory reality: «Each plateau can be read from any place and be in conjunction with any other place» [24]. Thanks to this illusory liberation and illusory subjectivation (for more details see [8]), the consumer himself turns into a producer, a considerable part of the production process (including the production of space) is «shifted» onto his shoulders and his activity. A slogan like «Now shop X is closer to you», in addition to a purely spatial connotation, is fundamentally plateauized: «you» acts as the very plateau that something «approached» enters in collaboration with, and space is represented as purely ego-centered.

A significant role in this production of the space of communicative capitalism is played by the absolute secondary and post-Benjamin copyability: «No row has an advantage over the others, none of them has the identity of the sample or the likeness of a copy» [19]. This not only «equalizes» acts of production, makes the space a «flat» and «predictable», «uniform» and «one-dimensional», but also eliminates the objective subjectivity and subjective objectivity: «The multitude has no subject, no object, there are only definitions, quantities, measurements, that can grow only when the multitude changes its nature» [24]. In such a space the bearer and the operator of attention being equalized, they constantly invert their roles, exchange positions (by the way, «infecting» each other with their dispositions). Space ceases to be manifestly asymmetric, implicitly retaining its political economic and political asymmetry; ceases to be explicitly heterogeneous, while retaining

its social and hierarchical heterogeneity implicitly. Attention in such a space ceases to be a product of subjective choice and act, and the process of exploitation is represented only in «quantities and dimensions», in completely Lukacsian way [25] being alienated and objectified.

So, the precondition for the exploitation of attention (for) poststructuralism is the conceptualization of difference as «the state of definition as one-sided difference» [19]. «Difference in itself» is the possibility of creation, it is dialectically freed from identity and identified with it, it is itself able to find this identity later, it exists together with repetition, since differences appear in repetition. That repetition (e.g. repetition of/in perception and attention) is an act of (re)production of differences, because «repeat – means to behave in relation to the unit or special, deprived of similar or equivalent» [19]. The repetition does not have a copy, it is not a production of the same, it is a production of difference in the fight against representation. Representation as a doubling of reality is opposed to an endless multiplication of reality in repetition and difference. The represented space is not multiplied and not realized, does not repeat and does not differ: «The final representation is the representation of the form, including matter, but secondary matter, permeated by extremes. ...It represents difference, mediating it, subordinating it to identity as a genus and providing such subordination with the analogy of the gentes themselves, the logical opposition of definitions, as well as the similarity of their own material contents» [19]. Equal and secondary turns out to be synonyms for Deleuze and representation becomes a production of the same and the secondary. Concepts, syntax, semantics are interchangeable in the representation, since they are similar, governed by a common prescription. There is no such prescription in repetition and the difference based on it. It is on the basis of this dialectic that the poststructuralist will investigate the phenomenality of the exclusive and the conveyor, the processuality of hand-made and craft, the ontology of forgery and the original, the praxeology of closed and open spaces, and the axiology of public and intimate.

Deleuze's distinction between nomadic and structural modes of perception adjoins

the same problematics: «...nomadic, not sedentary distribution, where each system of singularities communicates and resonates with others...» [26]. And although J. Deleuze first of all puts emancipatory and anti-hegemonic pathos into this distinction (for example, opposing nomadic thinking to «state, limiting philosophy»), directing it against representation and equipping it with difference and repetition, it also allows a completely different view of the production of space. The nomadic as moving is implicitly metaphorically connected with the spatial, but it is not limited to this dimension: it turns out that nomadic thinking, perception and practice can serve a structural order. The exploitation of attention by nomadic means, in particular, turns each consumer into a singularity, which communicates and resonates in a pseudo-free, but marketing-structured way with other singularities, which are always-already connected to the consumption plateau and the space production plateau. Such nomadic consumers – a functional and comfortable substrate for fabricating dividuum («divided»), fragmented into acts of perception, interests, quanta of attention, acts of immaterial labor, divided reactively or proactively, objectively and authoritatively structured, systematically limited actions following the «proposals» and «feeds» of capitalism. It is the dividuum (associated with all structural elements of the rhizome and being the main character of the capitalism) that is associated with the functions and acts of distinction, repetition and representation. We will not use here Deleuzian schizoanalysis, since it is not necessary for Raum-Analysis of the space of communicative / cognitive capitalism. But in the (post)Deleuzean analysis of space we also find out-of-space heuristics.

Thus, the exploitation of attention turns out to be relevant for the study of the production of the chronological: «The actual present is considered not as a future subject of memory, but as something that is reflected, thus forming a memory of the past present» [19]. In this light everything is relevant, that is happening *now*, learned empirically and formed from the virtual, and – in contrary – the virtual «is not subject to the global character of real objects. It is not only in origin, but in essence – a patch, a fragment, a shell. It lacks identity» [19]. It is

what happened before the actual, and what, as it seems, should happen after. The virtual influences the development of the actual, the actual is implicated by the virtual, they permeate everything around, where intensity is formed between the virtual and the actual. This turns out to be significant for both chrono- and -topos production, in commercial or political spaces and times, «orders of worth» and «économie de la grandeur», fields of journalism and fields of literature.

In modern variations of post-structuralist sociology, the preconceptions outlined by us are applied and operationalized in more detail for specific social phenomena and processes. Thus, the French sociologists and philosophers Paul Virilio and Gilles Lipovetsky, who study mass culture and its spatial-visual representations, are indicative in this sense. It is through their example that one can see specific methodological and research implications of the above, seemingly purely philosophical provisions.

Thus, when defining the objectification of an image, P. Virilio speaks of distinguishing between «paper or celluloid base-surface», «space of material reference» and «exposure time, which allows or forbids seeing» [27]. This post-structuralist internal composition of the image leads P. Virilio to the problematic of the production of the seeing act itself: «The act of seeing turns out to be an act before the act; it is a kind of pre-action» [27]. The act of perception is not a passive action of reflection or reception, but an active act of (self)exploitation of efforts to intensively (re)producing the above-described composition at all its levels. It turns out that seeing the space of material reference or keeping within the exposure time is a disciplined action that requires massive (self)learning, tight (self) control, and a detailed and differentiated apparatus of violence and power.

This leads to the naturalization and subjectivation of things no longer as artifacts of space, not as a concentrates of relations, not as materializations of the relations, but as things: «I no longer see the poster on the wall. The poster itself is presented to me from the wall, its image itself looks at me. This inversion of perception, this catchiness of advertising photography makes itself felt everywhere – on street pedestals, in newspapers and magazines; not a single image of them is complete without «suggestiveness», which is the very meaning

of advertising» [27]. Here, no distinction is made, representation is made here, where flashiness, (self)positioning, view, imagery, suggestiveness – all this is obsessively and objectified represented in an imperious way, appropriating the spectator's attention quanta in favor of the «spatial capitalists», and the consumer, as we noticed above, is turning into a producer. Even the sanctions acquire communicative nature, and there P. Virilio becomes similar to J. Baudrillard: «Penalty acquires primarily advertising nature: it is a punishment by a desire and lust» [27]. Thus, punishment acquires not only the power of sanction, but also the power of seduction, motivation, pushing, initiation. The space is homogenized, representation takes the place of differences: «The war of images and sounds replaces the war of objects and things, and in order to win a new war, it is enough to be always in sight» [27]. These representations are seductive precisely because of their fundamental accessibility, consumability, attainability: «Everything that I see is, in principle, achievable for me (at least for my sight), is present on the «I can» card...» [27]. Here subjectivity turns into subjectivity of obedience and obedience of subjectivity.

It is especially important here that subjectivity is replaced by personalization, or, more precisely, subjectivity is *represented by* personalization, and the controllability and subservience of this subjectivity is ensured and guaranteed by the anisotropy of transparency (which we wrote about in [8] and [28]) due to hyperproduction of a quantitatively defined reality. In this case – the reality of diversity, the reality of the proposals, the reality of the possible and the actual: «The systematic process of personalization, the work of which, in essence, is to increase and diversify the proposals, to do more so that everyone could make new decisions; substitute violent uniformity by free choice, homogeneity – by diversity, the severity of morals – by fulfillment of desires» [29, p. 36]. In such a space, the «reference point», body, subjectivity, singularity turn out to be illusory, produced purely discursively, but in practice, «...one's own body, personal balance, free time are influenced by the majority, the individual constantly has to choose, take the initiative, be aware, criticize the quality of products, be listened to and examined, keep himself young, puzzle over

the simplest problems: what car to buy, what movie to watch, where to go on vacation, what book to read...» [29]. Space is produced in an exclusively illusory way in the process of non-reflective and «lightning-fast absorption» of television news, medical, technical and artistic programs, different genres of music, culinary, tourist or psychological advices, intimate confessions, films – everything that «along with an abundance of goods are they are an integral part of the consumer society» [29]. All this hyper-produced reality does not oppose information and pleasure, but juxtapose and collate them, along with prosumerism, creating also the phenomenon of infotainment. Such hyperreal production and hyperproduced reality creates the illusion of rejection of «uniform structures» and the appearance of «personalized systems based on need, choice, communication, information, decentralization, participation» [29]. However, in the space of society, this leads dialectically to homogenization, flattening and simplification space, to smoothing folds, as J. Deleuze and F. Guattari would describe, to dissolve differences. So, J. Lipovetsky cites a quite Boltanski-Thévenotian example: «Advertising refused ... from the solemn word; the more refined the teacher's speech, the worse he is listened to. When using humorous methods, the quality of the product is emphasized all the more clearly when it appears against the background of striking improbability» [29]. A quarter of solemnity and a quarter of pathos, a quarter of elevation and a quarter of majesty in a city of inspiration or a city of authority are destroyed by the iron core of the market bulldozer, exploiting attention to smooth space during its production. «The process of

personalization sterilizes the vocabulary», says Gilles Lipovetsky, and this sterilization, dialectically combined with hyperrealization, produces the enclosed space of a whitewashed, nameless metro station entirely under Merovingen's control.

Thus, poststructuralism, which we studied using the example of Gilles Deleuze's methodology and applied explications performed by Gilles Lipovetsky and Paul Virilio, provides us with a rich arsenal of research of hidden (for traditional political economy, positivist, structural-functionalist and other sociological paradigmatics) problems. Of course, our research is a rather sketchy and exploratory one, we did not touch on many aspects of poststructuralism in its classical versions (R. Barthes, J. Kristeva), historical and sociological (M. Foucault, J. Baudrillard, M. Maffesoli) sections. However, our research made it possible to reveal that a poststructuralist approach makes it possible to identify, on the one hand, stable recurring patterns of structural (re)production of the society of late (cognitive / communicative) capitalism; on the other hand – to preserve its logic of exploitation and alienation; on the third hand – to make important distinctions, defined primarily structurally (rhizomatic – tree-like; difference / repetition – representation; dividual - individual, etc.). All this allows in the future to deploy a complex multidimensional toolkit for research and operationalization of space production processes through the exploitation of attention, specific mechanisms and methods of exploitation of attention, empirical artifacts of space production and much more, reconceptualizing capitalism itself as simultaneously attention capitalism and capitalism space.

#### Список літератури

1. Гофман И. Анализ фреймов: эссе об организации повседневного опыта / пер. с англ. Москва: Институт социологии РАН, 2004. С. 3-12.
2. Вальденфельс Б. Повседневность как плавильный тигль рациональности. Москва: Прогресс, 1991. 480 с.
3. Волков В. В., Хархордин О. В. Теория практик. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, 2008. 298 с.
4. Лефевр А. Производство пространства. Москва: Strelka Press, 2015. 432 с.
5. Филиппов А. Ф. Социология пространства. Санкт-Петербург: Владимир Даль, 2008. 285 с.
6. Бурдьё П. Социальное пространство: поля и практики. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя; Москва: Институт экспериментальной социологии, 2005. 576 с.
7. Альтюссер Л. Идеология и идеологические аппараты государства (заметки для исследования). Неприкосновенный запас. 2011. № 3 (77). С. 159-175.
8. Golikov A., Tyaglo V. Immaterial Labor as a Phenomenon and Concept: Status in a World Of Insecurity and Research Possibilities. SOCIOПРОСТІР. 2021. № 10. С. 7-20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2470-2020-10-01>
9. Zuboff Sh. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs, 2019. 704 p.
10. Wills J. Tug of War: Surveillance Capitalism, Military Contracting, and the Rise of the Security State. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2017. 518 p. DOI: [10.1017/eso.2019.75](https://doi.org/10.1017/eso.2019.75)
11. Hill D. W. The Pathology of Communicative Capitalism. Palgrave. Macmillan UK. 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137394781>

12. Bueno C. C. The Attention Economy: Labour, Time and Power in Cognitive Capitalism. Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017. 210 p.
13. Серто М. де. Изобретение повседневности. 1. Искусство делать. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, 2013. 330 с.
14. Деррида Ж. О грамматологии Москва: Ad Marginem, 2000. 512 с.
15. Бурдые П. Опыт рефлексивной социологии. В: Теоретическая социология: Антология: В 2 ч. Часть 2. Москва: КД «Университет», 2002. 424 с. с. 160-185.
16. Барт Р. Литература и метаязык. Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика. Москва, 1994. С. 131-132.
17. Деррида Ж.. Письмо к японскому другу // Вопросы Философии. 1992. № 4. с. 53-57.
18. Веберман Д. Симуляция в «Матрице» и эпоха пост-модерна. В: Матрица как философия. Екатеринбург: У-Фактория, 2007. 384 с.
19. Делёз Ж. Различие и повторение. Санкт-Петербург : Петрополис, 1998. 384 с.
20. Голиков О. С. Фабрикация порядку. Знания в конституванні соціального. Харків: ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2018. 592 с.
21. Ильин И. Феномен бренда как предмет социально-пространственной интерпретации. Саарбрюкен: LAP, 2016. 272 с.
22. Филиппов А. Ф. Теория систем. Аутопойезис продолжается 2. Социологическое обозрение. 2003. Том 3. № 3. С. 56-60.
23. Луман Н. Дифференциация. Москва: Логос, 2006. 320 с.
24. Делёз Ж., Гваттари Ф. Тысяча плато. Капитализм и шизофрения. Москва: Астрель, 2010. 895 с.
25. Лукач Д. История и классовое сознание. Исследования по марксистской диалектике. М.: Логос-Альтера, 2003. 416 с.
26. Делёз Ж. Логика смысла. Москва: Академический Проект, 2011. 472 с.
27. Вирильо П. Машина зрения. Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 2004. 144 с.
28. Голиков А. С. Укорененность социального в знании: пределы прозрачности и угрозы опосредования // Вісник Одеського національного університету. Сер.: Соціологія і політичні науки. 2013. Т. 18, Вип. 3. С. 46-52.
29. Липовецки Ж. Эра пустоты. Эссе о современном индивидуализме. Санкт-Петербург : Владимир Даль, 2001. 336 с.

## References

1. Goffman, I. (2004) Frame Analysis: an Essay on the Organization of Experience. Moscow: Institute of Sociology RAS Pp. 3-12 [in Russian]
2. Waldenfels, B. (1991) Everyday Life as a Crucible of Rationality. Moscow: Progress [in Russian]
3. Volkov, V. V. and Kharkhordin, O. V. (2008) Practice Theory. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the European University in St. Petersburg [in Russian]
4. Lefebvre, A. (2015) The Production of Space. Moscow: Strelka Press [in Russian]
5. Filippov, A. F. (2008) Sociology of Space. Saint Petersburg: Vladimir Dal [in Russian]
6. Bourdieu, P. (2005) Social Space: Fields And Practices. St. Petersburg: Aleteya; Moscow: Institute of Experimental Sociology [in Russian]
7. Althusser, L. (2011) "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus (Notes Towards an Investigation)" Neprikosnovenny Zapas. 3 (77). Pp. 159-175.
8. Golikov, A. and Tyaglo, V. (2021) "Intangible Work as a Phenomenon and Concept: Status in a World of Insecurity and Research Possibilities" «SOCIOPROSTIR: The Interdisciplinary Online Collection of Scientific Works on Sociology and Social Work. No. 10. Pp. 7-20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2470-2020-10-01>
9. Zuboff, Sh. (2019) The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs
10. Wills, J. (2017) Tug of War: Surveillance Capitalism, Military Contracting, and the Rise of the Security State. McGill-Queen's University Press DOI: [10.1017/eso.2019.75](https://doi.org/10.1017/eso.2019.75)
11. Hill, D. W. (2015) The Pathology of Communicative Capitalism. Palgrave Macmillan UK DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137394781>
12. Bueno, C. C. (2017) The Attention Economy: Labor, Time and Power in Cognitive Capitalism. Rowman & Littlefield International
13. Certeau, M. de. (2013) The Practice of Everyday Life. 1. The art of doing. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the European University in St. Petersburg [in Russian]
14. Derrida, J. (2000) Of Grammatology. Moscow: Ad Marginem [in Russian]
15. Bourdieu, P. (2002) "Experience of reflective sociology" Theoretical Sociology: Anthology. In 2 parts. Part 2. Moscow: KD «University» Pp. 160-185 [in Russian]
16. Barthes, R. (1994) "Literature and Metalanguage" Barthes R. Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics. Moscow Pp. 131-132 [in Russian]
17. Derrida, J. (1992) "Letter to a Japanese friend" Questions of Philosophy. No. 4. p. 53-57 [in Russian]
18. Weberman, D. (2007) "The Matrix Simulation and Postmodern Age" Matrix as Philosophy. Yekaterinburg: U-Factoria [in Russian]
19. Deleuze, J. (1998) Difference and Repetition. St. Petersburg: Petropolis [in Russian]
20. Golikov, O. S. (2018) Fabrication of Order. Knowledge in the Constitution of the Social. Kharkiv: KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina [in Ukrainian]
21. Ilyin, I. (2016) Brand Phenomenon as a Subject of Social and Spatial Interpretation. Saarbrücken: LAP [in Russian]
22. Filippov, A. F. (2003) "Systems Theory. Autopoiesis Continues 2" Sociological Review. Volume 3. No. 3. Pp. 56-60 [in Russian]
23. Luhmann, N. (2006) Differentiation. Moscow: Logos [in Russian]
24. Deleuze, J. and Guattari, F. (2010) A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia. Moscow: Astrel [in Russian]
25. Lukacs, D. (2003) History and Class Consciousness. Studies in Marxist Dialectics. Moscow: Logos-Alterta [in Russian]



26. Deleuze, J. (2011) *The Logic of Sense*. Moscow: Academic Project [in Russian]
27. Virilio, P. (2004) *The Vision Machine*. St. Petersburg: Nauka [in Russian]
28. Golikov, A. S. (2013) "Rootedness of the Social in Knowledge: the Limits of Transparency and the Threats of Mediation"
- Odesa National University Herald. Sociology and Politics Vol. 18,(3). Pp. 46-52 [in Russian]
29. Lipovetsky, J. (2001) *The Era of Emptiness. Essays on Contemporary Individualism*. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal [in Russian]

### ВИРОБНИЦТВО ПРОСТОРУ ТА ЕКСПЛУАТАЦІЯ УВАГИ: ПОГЛЯД (ІЗ) ПОСТСТРУКТУРАЛІЗМУ

**Олександр Голиков**

*доктор соціологічних наук, доцент кафедри соціології Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: [a.s.golikov@gmail.com](mailto:a.s.golikov@gmail.com) ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>*

**Владислав Тягло**

*студент магістратури соціологічного факультету Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: [marooceano@gmail.com](mailto:marooceano@gmail.com)*

У статті аналізуються можливості застосування в сучасній соціології методології постструктуралізму, зокрема відносно проблематики виробництва простору і експлуатації уваги. Досліджується евристичний потенціал постструктуралізму для соціології, де особливо вивчається методологія деконструкції. Аналізується проблема виробництва простору засобами експлуатації уваги в контексті концепції Жюльєн Дельоза. Підкреслюється, що центральне дельозіанське поняття відмінності в співвідношенні з рядом понять (зокрема, репрезентація та повторення) дає важливі інструменти для розуміння природи виробництва та відтворення простору, з одного боку, і процесуальності уваги як об'єкту експлуатації - з іншого. Соціологічно переосмислюються постструктуралістські метафори системності (дерево і ризом) не як взаємовиключні, а як типологічно сумісні. Аналізується дельозівське розрізнення номадичного і структурного способу сприйняття. Акцентується увага на феномені дивіда («поділеного») з точки зору виробництва актів сприйняття і актів уваги. Крім того, важливим аспектом є проблема виробництва хронологічного як структурно порівнюваного з просторовим. Виокремлені з дельозівської теоретичної різони прекоцепти автори застосовують по відношенню до проблематики масової культури в експлікаціях Жюльєн Липовецьки та Поля Вірільо. Увага досліджується як фундаментальний субстрат виробництва простору/-ів в суспільстві комунікативного / когнітивного капіталізму, що розкривається на прикладах проблематики візуального сприйняття, практик культурного споживання, мови тощо. Формулюється висновок про можливості та обмеження дослідження процесів виробництва простору і ролі в цьому процесі експлуатації уваги в соціології з позицій постструктуралістської теорії.

Ключові слова: *простір, виробництво, експлуатація, увага, постструктуралізм, відмінність, повторення, репрезентація, Дельоз, Вірільо, Липовецьки.*

### ПРОИЗВОДСТВО ПРОСТРАНСТВА И ЭКСПЛУАТАЦИЯ ВНИМАНИЯ: ВЗГЛЯД (ИЗ) ПОСТСТРУКТУРАЛИЗМА

**Александр Голиков**

*доктор социологических наук, доцент кафедры социологии Харьковского национального университета имени В. Н. Каразина, пл. Свободы, 4, Харьков, 61022, Украина, e-mail: [a.s.golikov@gmail.com](mailto:a.s.golikov@gmail.com) ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>*

**Владислав Тягло**

*студент магистратуры социологического факультета Харьковского национального университета имени В.Н. Каразина, пл. Свободы, 4, Харьков, 61022, Украина, e-mail: [marooceano@gmail.com](mailto:marooceano@gmail.com)*

В статье анализируются возможности применения в современной социологии методологии постструктурализма, в частности по отношению к проблематике производства пространства и эксплуатации внимания. Исследуется эвристический потенциал постструктурализма для социологии, где особо из-

учается методология деконструкции. Анализируется проблема производства пространства средствами эксплуатации внимания в контексте концепции Жюль Делёза. Подчёркивается, что центральное делёзианское понятие различия в соотношении с рядом понятий (в частности, репрезентация, повторение) даёт важные инструменты для понимания природы производства и воспроизводства пространства, с одной стороны, и процессуальности внимания как объекта эксплуатации – с другой. Социологически переосмысливаются постструктуралистские метафоры системности (дерево и ризома) не как взаимоисключающие, а как типологически совместимые. Анализируется делёзовское различие номадического и структурного способа восприятия. Акцентируется внимание на феномене дивида («делённого») с точки зрения производства актов восприятия и актов внимания. Кроме того, важным аспектом является проблема производства хронологического как структурно сопоставимого с пространственным. Вычлененные из делёзианской теоретической ризомы прекоцепты авторы применяют по отношению к проблематикам массовой культуры в экспликациях Жюль Липовецки и Поля Вирильо. Внимание исследуется как фундаментальный субстрат производства пространств(а) в обществе коммуникативного / когнитивного капитализма, что раскрывается на примерах проблематики визуального восприятия, практик культурного потребления, языка и др. Формулируется вывод о возможностях и ограничениях исследования процессов производства пространства и роли в этом процессе эксплуатации внимания в социологии с позиций постструктуралистской теории.

Ключевые слова: *пространство, производство, эксплуатация, внимание, постструктурализм, различие, повторение, репрезентация, Делёз, Вирильо, Липовецки.*