

DOI: 10.18372/2412-2157.39.18427

UDC 316. 159 (045)

J. Kharchenko<sup>1</sup>,  
A. Kvasha<sup>2</sup>**PRINCIPLES OF INTERACTION IN THE TOPOLOGY OF ANTINOMIES (ONTOLOGICAL DECONSTRUCTION OF THE SOCIAL MATRIX)**<sup>1</sup>Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State University<sup>1</sup>e-mail: kharchenkojv@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5587-9743<sup>2</sup>Donbas State Engineering Academy, Kramatorsk–Ternopol, Ukraine<sup>2</sup>e-mail: kvashaalex@ukr.net; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9908-77057

**Abstract.** *The phenomenon of interaction: describes the configuration of the social matrix in its dynamics; fixes the continuous variability of reality; actualizes the need to maintain balance in nature, as well as to preserve the harmonious dualism of human bodily and spiritual constructs. Interaction is defined as an antinomic opposition, which can be considered in terms of symmetry and asymmetry. The phenomenon of interaction is considered in the philosophical-methodological, ontological and metaphysical aspects of deconstruction when analyzing the antinomian characteristics of interaction.*

**Keywords:** interaction, antinomy, social matrix, topology of society, deconstruction.

**Introduction**

The problem of interaction is a key question within the broader inquiry into being. It also defines the essence of the modern concept of the Universe. The phenomenon of interaction is multifaceted. Firstly, it reveals reality as the quintessence of its infinite incarnations. Furthermore, it describes the configuration of the social matrix in its dynamics; captures the continuous variability of reality. Finally, it actualizes the necessity of maintaining balance in nature, as well as preserving the harmonious dualism of human bodily and spiritual constructs. Interaction is an abstraction because it is difficult to provide its precise and complete interpretation. In our opinion, interaction can be understood as an antinomian opposition, manifesting both harmony and contradiction, balance and conflict; illustrating compatible and incompatible relations.

Interaction can be considered in terms of symmetry and asymmetry. On the one hand, symmetry reflects the existing order in nature, proportionality and commensurability between the elements of any system or object of nature, orderliness, balance of the system, stability. That is, it brings some element of harmony. Asymmetry, on the contrary, reflects disorder of the system, disturbs the equilibrium, which is associated with change, development of the system. Asymmetry contains the characteristics of the distribution of random variables. Thus, the developing dynamic system should be non-equilibrium and asymmetric. That is, interaction is supposed to be a constructive, active creative mechanism of the Universe.

On the other hand, symmetry is a rather important and obvious factor when forming a social matrix as a man-made environment. For example, in order to create certain infrastructural objects, it is necessary to take into account all the prescriptions of engineering science and mathematics.

Interaction contains antinomic characteristics, because its result can be "struggle", "contradiction", "conflict". Whenever two or more objects interact, they transform into something different. Thus, contradictions can endlessly generate new phenomena, and each phenomenon is unique in its own way. "Nature", "society", "human" are especially contradictory as the most complex constructions. At the same time, they include an infinite number of antinomian oppositions in their basis.

The concept of "antinomy" indeed has rich layers of meaning and historical depth. Originating from the Greek words *ἀντί* (anti, against) and *νόμος* (nomos, law), it initially denoted a contradiction in law or between laws. Over time, this notion has significantly evolved and expanded, especially in contemporary dialectical logic. Antinomies also have a special significance as semantic constructions generating new meanings and senses. They are close to the concept of a "logical paradox," which is an insoluble contradiction. Such antinomies have gone beyond formal logic, and play a special role in mathematical logic. In this case, an antinomy can be perceived as a paradox (or contradiction) arising from two judgments proved in a theory that exclude each other. Each judgment is convincingly deduced from the position of the given theory. In set theory, the following antinomies are notable: Russell's paradox, Barber's paradox, Cantor's paradox, and Richard's paradox.

Antinomy as a mode of interaction represents a real or imaginary contradiction arising in reality or in the language describing that reality. Capturing new dimensions in the topology of physical reality can sometimes be problematic, and explaining them through psychology or mathematical language can also be difficult. Antinomy, like paradox, is born when two alternative (mutually exclusive) statements about a given object can be equally logically proved or disproved. The truth or falsity of such statements cannot be substantiated within a given paradigm because they are relative.

In the social matrix, interaction is a reflection of all possible communications. That is, contradictions, if they arise, are rather translated as conflict. Conflict can be explained as a type of social interaction between individuals, groups, associations, which arises from their contradictory views, positions and interests. Conflict fulfills both destructive and constructive functions. Infinite variations of communications generate asymmetry in relations between individuals. Antinomy, on the contrary, has symmetry, it contains ambivalent but equal positions.

Antinomy encompasses broader horizons than conflict because conflict is merely one of its manifestations, a natural part of antinomy. However, within society, conflict cannot be perceived neutrally; instead, it is often regarded as a culmination or a measure of the quality of various systems of relationships between people. More often

conflict is perceived as an exclusively negative phenomenon from the point of view of its emotional perception or historical analysis.

At the same time, it is often the conflict that can bring the necessary basic transformations to the social matrix and completely affect the entire structure of social relations. The only question is whether the system will overcome all current contradictions and resolving the conflict change the system for the better or for the worse?

This question also contains an antinomic opposition. The way out of this contradiction could be the deconstruction of the image of interaction in the architectonics of the current social matrix. It is worth noting that Utopian philosophers and New Age social thinkers have attempted such deconstruction, believing that an ideal social structure could ensure satisfactory existence for every individual. They actualized the thesis about the possibility of eternal peace, goodness and justice, as well as the prosperous existence of all peoples in the future, formulated later by I. Kant, and also more clearly showed the great importance of the antinomy "past-future". By reconstructing the past, the idea of the future is modeled.

**The aim** of this study is the conceptualization of the phenomenon of interaction in the topology of antinomies. The key **task** was the ontological deconstruction of the social matrix under the condition of the influence of antinomy on the interaction process.

#### **Research methods.**

Deconstruction, derived from 'de' and the Latin 'constructio' meaning construction or assembly, refers to an intellectual movement that emerged in European culture in the late 1960s. It arose in the context of a profound reassessment of metaphysics, critiquing it as an outdated line of the Western philosophical tradition (Derrida 1983, 307–330).

Today the following variations of deconstruction are distinguished: philosophical, methodological, epistemological, literary, critical, linguistic, political, sociological, economic, cultural, educational and others. In our study we propose to focus on the philosophical-methodological, ontological and metaphysical aspects of deconstruction when analyzing the antinomian characteristics of interaction.

Deconstruction, in its essence, cannot be categorized purely as a method. It is not a technique for interpreting literary texts, nor is it a theory of literary criticism, thus distinguishing it from hermeneutics and linguistics. Instead, it complements them. It is perceived as a methodology for understanding reality without taking external influences into account.

The methodology of "new understanding of the text" or "the world as text" was developed by R. Barthes, J. Bataille, H.-G. Gadamer, P.-F. Guattari, J. Deleuze, J. Derrida, J. Callier, R. Rorty, M.-P. Foucault, J. Kristeva. Thus, deconstruction is used precisely as a methodology in the context of fundamental ontology, logic, semiotics, semantics, grammatology, content analysis, psychoanalysis, pathopsychology, aesthetics, and poetics (Derrida 1992, 55; Culler 1981, 188–209; Culler 1975, 113–160).

The principle of deconstruction has become a fundamental concept in contemporary philosophy of art. It is defined as "understanding" achieved through the destruction of a stereotype or inclusion in a new context and which fulfills a methodological function. The basic idea proceeds from the premise that meaning is constructed in the process of reading, and that habitual representation is either deprived of depth or imposed by the author's repressive position (Derrida 1984, 105–113). This approach should be taken with caution, as doubts arise about the eternity of art, spiritual values of culture, family. One might also question whether concepts such as the classics, tradition, canon, law, and state are merely stereotypes. If yes, then the antinomy itself is not essential, because it supports human aspirations to eternity, truth, and absolute. Then interaction can be reduced to the level of technical and technological operations.

In our opinion, deconstruction, if it is used as a tool to fight stereotypes, moral and ethical principles of society, it generates a "simulacrum" of antinomy. This results in an artificial conflict between physics and metaphysics. The deconstruction strategy is aimed not only at cardinal rethinking and often negation of the metaphysical tradition of Plato, Aristotle, R. Descartes, I. Kant, G. Hegel, but it also aims at transforming classical culture as a whole.

The rejection of classical literature, for example, generates historical oblivion, so that a person is no longer a part of society, a part of the past; he/she also turns into a simulacrum, becomes a participant in interaction in a purely technical way. This means that he/she can be easily excluded from any event, activity, and text.

The methodology of "new understanding" reflects the objective complexity and ambiguity of the perception of the text in its traditional form and meaning. It ultimately neutralizes the understanding of the world as a coherent entity, turning it into a set of signs. It unwittingly imposes the willfulness of the sign, the imaginary freedom of perception of nature, society and the human being. However, all this excludes constructive interaction of individuals in society, united not by a common deep idea, traditions, historical memory, but by a new order of things. In this case, the order of things is no longer natural, it can be interpreted, clarified, changed at the discretion of "hidden authors" (Julia Kharchenko).

The social matrix of the global world can be constructed with the help of computer technologies; therefore, there must be an author or a group of authors. In this case, such a control mechanism is used, which hyperbolizes the role of a hidden author-puppeteer, and the society is turned into a "game board" with a certain number of players "programmed" for certain actions. On the one hand, the problem is that reality is created as a text, but the reader is unable to understand the story due to the encoding of key narratives.

On the other hand, the principle of deconstruction, on the contrary, is designed to downplay the role of the author when it comes to literature, music, and painting. The interaction between "author" and "reader" is destroyed by the disavowal of the author's role and the actualization of the reader's role. The antinomy "author – reader" disappears, which means that the reader gets infinite freedom to perceive the meaning of the text, its context and the possibility to change any of its

components, and even the images of the protagonists themselves. But then the God-human dialog as the highest manifestation of metaphysical antinomy and as the quintessence of spiritual interaction is also impossible. It is not that God is "hidden," but that human beings can do anything, and even become a god. Deconstruction does not completely abandon the metaphysical antinomy, but with its help it is possible to transform classical culture into a kind of global postculture, where it is not meanings, but necessities that reign.

According to H.-G. Gadamer, the connection "text – meaning" depends on the author's intentions, so it has an accidental character, mediated by language, society, and culture. Attempts to unambiguously interpret the main meaning of the text are destined to failure (Gadamer 1984, 54–65). Thus, the philosophy of deconstruction forms an intellectual practice capable of creatively reproducing arbitrary social actions at the level of verbal and non-verbal signs and means of communication that convey any meaning. The principle of deconstruction is also used in cyberspace as a tool for updating computer systems and languages. As a consequence, the foundations of the social matrix are being transformed more and more intensively, disrupting the natural order of things, generating momentarity, variability, instability, and portability.

Historically, the dictatorships of power, reason, truth, logic, rationality were presented as metaphysical absolutes precisely in European culture, which led to extremely negative consequences if these ideas were introduced into politics as forceful methods and applied to the individual (Derrida 1982, 207–271; Barthes 1972, 15–25). This is exactly what deconstructivist philosophers opposed. However, this approach distorts and impoverishes the meaning of metaphysics as such.

Deconstruction always exists in any text, which is impossible without it. J. Derrida argues that deconstruction encompasses both everything and nothing. It testifies, first of all, to the unstable, non-linear, temporal mode of existence of a text, in the process of which different semantic themes spontaneously come to the fore in the process of its formation (Derrida 1970, 247–265). Any text is a set of different, but always equal autonomous meanings that coexist. This equality of meanings disappears only after the text is comprehended in metaphysics, that is, after its forced reorganization according to the principles of metaphysics: one of the meanings is revolutionarily given a privileged status over others, relegating all alternative meanings to the periphery (Derrida 2016, 441; Rorty 1982, 66; Foucault 1980, 154). So a text is a living narrative, changing itself, manifesting itself in each of its new meanings. This also means that we can never discover its true meaning. Narrative transcends the bounds of ordinary text, contrary to common belief. Instead, everything becomes a narrative – be it the Universe, God, human beings, history, or society.

Although deconstruction methodology reveals a fundamental lack of boundaries between signifier and signified, meaning and content, reading and text creation, epistemological and ontological modalities of text, this ambivalent proceduralization of text as whole and part indicates that antinomy is the primary source of interaction.

## Research results

Human thinking itself is antinomian both in terms of reason (logic – absurd) and psyche (rational – irrational). This has influenced the way people think and act in historical retrospect. Thus in ancient Eastern philosophical treatises it was shown that being is the essence of infinite antinomies that keep the world in harmony. In ancient philosophy, antinomies are represented at the level of language and formal logic. In the pre-Socratic period semantic antinomies were formulated (the paradox of the "Liar"), Zeno's Aporias ("Achilles and the Tortoise", "Dichotomy", "Arrow"), which significantly influenced the further construction of social forms of life different in their quality.

Medieval philosophical theology creates a fundamental phenomenon – theological literature describing the divine universe as a kind of transcendental topology. Christian dogmas are presented as slender texts with an antinomian bias. However, the antinomies "discovered" in the dogmas are only imaginary, not real. The dogmas are divinely revealed doctrinal truths. Their totality forms the nucleus of the one, integral, true doctrine of the Church, since truth cannot contradict itself, otherwise it would not be truth. Nor can it be said that there may be any actual contradiction in the content of a particular Christian dogma or between two different dogmas. For example, the singularity and simultaneous trinity of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is an absurdity from the point of view of arithmetic. On the other hand, however, the singularity and trinity in God are not viewed and confessed in the same relation, but God is one in nature and trinity in Persons.

A. Prihodko rightly noted that in the process of development and creation of language and language system the main role belongs to the person, as he/she is the source of all changes and inventions in this difficult system. As the person has not only one point of view or only one direction of what to do he/she acts in many different ways. This function of the person finds its logical reflection in the inner questions of language and in the studying of the questions of antinomies, as one of the fundamental questions in linguistics, which show the double structure of the language. This question was raised long ago, and now not only philosophers but also linguists are interested in this question. The opposition of antinomies are wide spread in the language and have the stable character. The frequent usage of antinomies in language confirms its stable character. One of the main problems in the study of antinomies is to understand the notion of "opposition". It shows the essential differences in objects and events of objective world. They exist in the world, which is reflected by our consciousness as the diversity and can be represented by such words as antonyms. In the development of any language antonymic relations play the biggest role. They exist in our brain and notion about the world in pairs and one word leads to the usage of the other word. The study of such antinomies as "good – evil," "war – peace," "own – alien," "life – death" and others has a very important impact on the modern linguistics. Antinomies in language are the opposition of language units, facts, principles and relations (Prihodko 2014, 24–25).

In Modern times, I. Kant created a complete doctrine of antinomy in the context of reasoning about the

boundaries of scientific and philosophical cognition. The presence of antinomies testifies to the expediency of abandoning reasoning about the essence of the noumenal world in order to accept the idea of "absolute" and "infinite" exclusively as a regulative principle of cognition. R. Kukla underlined, that no experience could ever disconfirm the harmonious orderliness and graspability of the world. This transcendental move allows I. Kant to retain his constitutional epistemic optimism, while acknowledging a humbling contingency in our truth telling abilities that was invisible in the First Critique. This necessary humility and contingency will ultimately serve as a more fundamental challenge to Kant's critical philosophy and his quest for transcendental security (Kukla 2006, 203–231). I. Kant proved that antinomies are rooted in the very process of cognition and are a consequence of the futility of the attempts of "pure reason" to go beyond sensual experience into the realm of metaphysics and cognize the objective nature of "things-in-themselves".

In addition to the antinomies of "pure reason" I. Kant formulated a number of antinomies of moral, religious and aesthetic consciousness. By analogy, we can also distinguish the antinomy of society and nature, because in present conditions we can speak about the presence of contradiction and even conflict. The environment is one of the elements in the structure of the antinomy. It consists of physical environment (geographical, climatic, ecological, space and other factors) and social environment – certain social conditions in which the conflict develops.

Politics, economics, services and entertainment transform, in turn, the idea of democracy. It is about the loss of the antinomy of democracy.

O. Hidalgo claims that the identified trade-offs concerning the antinomies of democracy confirm that it is mostly not possible to accomplish all beneficial political goals at the same time. But, metaphorically speaking, it must nevertheless be guaranteed that all governance and politics in democracy provide a permanent symbolic "presence" of these democratic values being occasionally and temporarily "absent." Even though this only offers a very preliminary perspective on how to balance the goods implicit in democracy's antinomies rather concretely, what has been achieved here in identifying value trade-offs as logical outcomes and requirements of the relevant theory in political practice might become helpful in order to fulfill this need in the future (Hidalgo 2019, 272). The classical antinomy loses its meaning as deconstruction reveals the substitution of the true metaphysical meaning of the role and purpose of the person who is spiritually transformed by the new physical thing concept of the person who is bodily transformed and surrounded by goods.

Modern philosophy understands antinomies not only as a regularity of cognitive activity, associated with the complexity, dialectic nature of the cognition process, but also as a principle of manifestation of different types of interaction in the physics of the Universe. C. V. Poland reaches the following conclusion: the universe of material things and forces represents a totality, yet it does not encompass the totality of all existence. He suggests that human freedom aligns entirely with the universality of natural law. Furthermore, the existence of an absolute being is in no way incompatible with the existence of other entities, of a finite character. Lastly, he proposes that the

sum total of material things and forces, alongside man and his actions, mind and its thoughts, and freedom with its rights and privileges, are interwoven, in accordance with a higher law that transcends all natural law. This integration forms a comprehensive, necessary, consistent, and perfect monistic scheme of existence (Poland 1915, 624–627). There is also conflict in the reality of the universe, but in a broader sense. This conflict is natural and necessary. Thus, in interaction each object (thing) strives to decrease the influence of the opposite object (another thing) while amplifying its own influence. It is necessary to keep in mind that the concepts of "object" or "participant of interaction" are not always identical. However, both are considered passive and neutral in this context.

The subject (a person), as an "active party" (interested party), is capable of creating a conflict situation and influencing the course of the conflict in accordance with his/her interests in society. Thus, a person influences the outside world consciously, thoughtfully, entering into interaction with other people only when it is necessary for him/her, based on the situation. Often the absence of any interaction becomes a necessity for this person. P. Carus emphasizes that necessity is neither a being, creature, individual, person, nor anything concrete. It is not a 'somebody' existing in a specific space or eternal in the sense of having a prolonged temporal existence. Necessity is a factor, a norm, and a regulative principle. It is supertemporal and superspatial. It possesses all the qualities which philosophical thought has attributed to God. It is the creator, for it is the formative principle of the world. It is the ruler and Lord of the universe, for it is the law, the totality of all natural laws, physical, psychical and moral. It is omnipresent; it is eternal; it is unailing; it is the standard of both truth and error, right and wrong. This conception of God is not personal, but superpersonal. It is the condition under and through which, in the course of evolution, the rational, i. e., human personality is produced. The antinomies of I. Kant have done their service. Religious people became convinced that the ideas of God, freedom and immortality had become untenable in the modern interpretation of dogmatic Christianity. And yet they felt that they contained great truths which could not be dispensed with. Thus, Kant's idea that these concepts were transcendent and beyond human understanding offered a welcome perspective. This view, suggesting that such truths were deeper than human comprehension, found a seemingly rational foundation in the theory of the four antinomies (Carus 1915, 627–632). As far as the person is concerned, the perfection of God's law is reflected in the fact that strict observance of its requirements guarantees the maximum moral benefit to the doer. However, the essence of faith is the antinomianism of moral choice (good or evil). At the same time, the perfection of God's law is expressed in the consistency of all its provisions among themselves, in the absence of internal contradictions.

## Discussion

Previous epochs, if we mention their moral heritage, contained in their ontological basis natural antinomic pairs, allowing us to consider the entire depth of human nature as an integral part of social life, which is the catharsis of society. These pairs include the conflict between being and

non-being; soul and body; mind and spirit; good and evil; love and hate; and war and peace. Within these antinomian conflicts, there is a release of emotions, a resolution of internal contradictions, and a process of moral elevation.

The modern digital age is the embodiment of everything artificial, while antinomy, as we have already pointed out above, is "embedded" in the nature of the universe and in the spiritual construction of the human being. Th. A. Laughlin has shown that the social matrix breaks down with the discovery and codification of a brand new sensorium of bodily ups and downs characteristic of historical experience (Laughlin 2019, 161–177). That is, the social body, as an artificial entity, still gravitates towards the natural universal canons of goodness, justice, and balance. In this way it can constructively develop.

The new reading of reality as cyberreality and society as a digital matrix gives rise to new antinomic pairs: the conflict between the universe and the multiverse; reality and the virtual; humans and robots.

We try to define a new state of society: firstly, *virtuum* is the sum of all possible alternative worlds that human imagination creates. The *virtuum* is a combination of natural experience (direct and mediated) and various extra-experiential states. Secondly, *virtuum* is society as an ontic-ontological environment created by a human being, who constructs deep or ersatz meanings. It is a simulacrum environment, a spiritual-transcendental world. Thirdly, *virtuum* is both "reality" and "imaginary reality", a rational-irrational construct. Fourth, the new model of society as a social *virtuum* implies the expansion of human knowledge and communication; improvement of human health and physical abilities; increase in the effectiveness of collective activity; modernization of national security instruments; and union of science and education. Fifth, *virtuum* is a new state of social ontos that begins to exist in technological and innovative contexts (Julia Kharchenko 2023, 18–23). Here we could find the antinomy "natural – artificial", which earlier appealed to the dialog of nature and art, but the plastic body of the robot and the shapeless web of wires become dominant and exclude the metaphysical and ontological value of such an antinomy.

Spiritual *virtuum* is an idea, fantasy, the natural language of culture and art. Computer *virtuum* is a machine body, a program, an artificial language as a set of codes and their combinations. We think that spiritual *virtuum* arises in the process of copying real objects or events by a person and turning them into attributes of art, or into virtual simulacra using a computer. The connection between the Finite and the Infinite in the spiritual *virtuum* is of a twofold nature: firstly, any finite virtual object is not connected with an infinite variety of other possible virtual objects "outside itself", it is invariant, hard-coded; secondly, the infinite represents the variability of various characteristics of virtual objects, or images of possible virtual realities through fantasy and imagination. Consequently, when modeling any virtual object, the unity of the Finite and the Infinite are not found, however, this unity is conditional (Julia Kharchenko 2022, 30–36). The finite – infinite antinomy is also unable to exist in the virtual world, because everything is finite there. As long as the computer's power system is connected, simulacrum reality exists. Infinite reincarnations of the *virtuum*, as we have already emphasized, are related to the subject's fantasy and they are possible only if the person is present in the network.

The social matrix is transforming at an inevitable speed due to the often uncontrolled flow of information, and the content used does not always correlate with legal norms and codes. S. Kharchenko states that the foundations of legal discourse are inevitably transformed, developed, violated, taking into account the peculiarities of social development. This is reflected most expressively in the language of law. An essential feature of bifurcation processes in the field of law and legal institutions is that the variety of legal systems (effective and ineffective) leading to an increase in the variability of the directions of their development. In this state of legal systems, the legal choice is implemented as a gradual formalization and consolidation of a new order. The reformatting of the legal system is due to the infinitely complex combination of the influence of the subjects of law on it and the quality of their legal actions. Illegal actions can accelerate the emergence of cascades of bifurcations, which will negatively affect the balance of legal systems (Serhii Kharchenko & Julia Kharchenko 2021, 36–40). New antinomian oppositions effective and ineffective legal systems, legal and non-legal actions, which are enshrined as semantic antinomies in legal discourse, emerge.

O. Sidorkina also draws attention to the semantic meaning of antinomies. In her opinion, the modern stage of development of the socio-communicative sphere is characterized by an active change in the role and significance of its linguistic context as the main means of communication. In this regard, the relevance of forming a complimentary model of linguistic-communicative social ties (with the properties of stability and harmony), which would provide further constructive development of the entire cultural-semantic system of socially significant information transmission, has increased (Сідоркіна 2023, 37–42). In the topology of a society, participants and actors can continuously change their statuses. It is also necessary to distinguish between direct and indirect participants of social action. That is, society is inherently filled with antinomies. However, on the one hand, actors represent certain forces pursuing their personal interests in the assumed or real process of interaction. At the same time, their communication is rather a continuous deconstruction, since everyone's opinion at the level of communication or defending personal truth is always more important under certain established rules of social life (for example, if its dominant features are individualism, radical competition, active and irreconcilable struggle for position or status).

On the other hand, antinomy appeals to a deep reflection on events, to truth by reconstructing the past and critically analyzing the current reality to effectively assess the prospects for future life. M. Predeina confirms our position by saying that the concept of antinomy is actualized in our current time, and antinomies themselves exist in life (and only then in "pure reason"). Antinomy combines the negative and the positive (Предеїна 2018, 76–79). The author talks about the need to reconstruct the antinomy. In her opinion, it is time to summarize the intermediate results. Antinomy is described as a fluid contradiction, existing in a state of "is and is not," "here and not here." The term "antinomy" emphasizes the equality of the parties, indicates that the parties transcend, limit, mutually condition each other, support the existence of the phenomenon of something as a given something (and not other). Antinomy does not imply "withdrawal." If

"withdrawal" occurs, then we have called antinomy the thesis and antithesis of Hegel's triad. Antinomy exists, so, having passed into theory, it serves as a means of describing reality (Предеїна 2018, 76–79). The reconstruction of the antinomy reveals its key idea that by maintaining balance in the surrounding world, a person gains freedom. However, there is no absolute freedom in the literal sense of the word, everything happens according to the laws of causality or according to the rules of social life established by other people.

The value of this Kantian antinomy lies in the fact that, as noted by Yu. Brodetska, freedom is the responsibility of life, which implies finding, revealing one's own uniqueness, and value in the space of relations with similarly unique Others. This spiritual phenomenon reveals its potential in the desire to love, to cognize the reality that surrounds a person. In other words, freedom is an aspiration to cognition, unity, belonging, i.e. co-existence. As a vital, productive state of a person, freedom is always oriented to the preservation of social ties, belonging to the world, and, therefore, forms in the consciousness of an individual a value model of harmonious relations with others, awareness of the need for unity in human life. And this does not mean his unfreedom. It is in the realization of the value of harmonious social relations, connections, that real freedom is found (Бродецька 2016, 214–221). Thus, harmonious interaction is possible only if the quality of social relations is changed and improved.

### Conclusions

Antinomy is the primary source of interaction. When used unilaterally, deconstruction is an instrument of confronting conventionality, society's dependence on the norms of language, way of thinking, life principles, established interests, the desire to provide a family and have children, traditional moral intentions. As a consequence, the natural metaphysical basis of the state is undermined. The antinomies-oppositions: "cause – effect", "truth – false", "sanity – madness", "man – woman", "war-peace", "logicality – alogicality", "rationality – irrationality", "soul – body", "good – evil", "presence – absence", "decency – lowliness", "beauty – ugliness" lose their meaning and become unnecessary.

Metaphysical antinomy promotes balance, stability. Although antinomy involves polarities, it allows each of them to be encompassed separately and treated as a separate dimension. When interacting, they generate a topology of spiritual meanings and physical space – time forms, for example, nature – society, life – death, body – soul, and reality – virtuality.

Symmetry in the structure of a social matrix is possible if hierarchy, canon, rules, laws are introduced, which ensures its stability and viability. The stability of a material structure is also ensured when it adheres to specific geometrical antinomies and spatial parameters, such as "top – bottom," "left side – right side," and "straight – curve," described here in a purely schematic manner.

In our opinion, the use of the deconstruction principle is effective if we take into account the ontological value of the categories "reason", "sense", "rationality", which pass into their antinomian opposite "madness", "nonsense", "irrationality". They are also inherent to being, equal and essentially complement

our understanding of being in its true metaphysical hypostasis.

As we have shown earlier, it is not possible to deconstruct the social matrix in the literal sense of the word, because it destroys the hierarchical oppositions-antinomies on which it is based. Such deconstruction would devalue all possible variations of interaction.

The deconstructionist strategy is itself antinomian, as it involves the superimposition of two opposing processes – the process of constructing the image of the social matrix (narrative) and the process of its transformation (reading). This can be perceived as an element of creative interaction – initial reading and reproduction.

### Literature

1. Barthes R. *Mythologies*. London : Cape, 1972. 164 p.
2. Carus P. Kant's antinomies and their solution. *The Monist*. 1915. Vol. 25, No. 4. P. 627–632. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27900563>.
3. Culler J. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975. 320 p.
4. Culler J. *The Turns of Metaphor. The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. P. 188–209.
5. Derrida J. *Acts of Literature*. New York : Routledge, 1992. 55 p.
6. Derrida, J. Deconstruction and the Other: An Interview with Jacques Derrida. *Dialogue with Contemporary Continental Thinkers* / ed. by R. Kearney. Manchester : Manchester University Press, 1984. P. 105–113. URL: <http://surl.li/rlnzi>.
7. Derrida J. *Of Grammatology*. JHU Press, 2016. 441 p. URL: <http://surl.li/rlnzm>.
8. Derrida J. Signature, Event Context. *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1983. P. 307–330.
9. Derrida J. Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences. *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man* / eds. by R. Macksey, E. Donato Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970. P. 247–65.
10. Derrida J. White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy. *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982. P. 207–271.
11. Foucault M. *The History of Sexuality*. New York : Pantheon, 1980. Vol. 1. 154 p.
12. Gadamer H.-G. *The Hermeneutics of Suspicion. Hermeneutics: Questions and Prospects* / eds. by G. Shapiro, Sica A. Amherst : University of Massachusetts Press, 1984. P. 54–65.
13. Hidalgo O. The Theory of Democratic Antinomies and the Identification of Value Trade-Offs in Political Practice. *Politics and Governance*. 2019. Vol 7, No. 4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v7i4.2243>.
14. Kharchenko J. Spiritual virtuum: the interaction of the finite and the infinite. *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2022. № 2 (36). С. 30–36. (Серія «Філософія. Культурологія»). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.36.16967>.
15. Kharchenko J. "Virtuum" as an Innovative Sphere in the "Digital Civilisation" (Philosophical, Epistemological and Ontological Aspects). *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2023. № 2 (38). С. 18–23. (Серія «Філософія. Культурологія»). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.2.18105>.
16. Kharchenko S., Kharchenko J. Reasons for bifurcation of the legal discourse basis (synergetic and philosophical-linguistic approaches). *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2021. № 1 (33). С. 36–40. (Серія «Філософія. Культурологія»). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.33.15639>.
17. Kukla R. The Antinomies of Impure Reason: Rousseau and Kant on the Metaphysics of Truth Telling. *An Interdisciplinary*

*Journal of Philosophy*. 2005. Vol. 48, Issue 3. P. 203-231. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201750510022790>.

18. Laughlin Th. A. Crisis and Clarity: Fredric Jameson's The Antinomies of Realism, Affect, and the Problem of Representing Totality Today. *Mediations. Journal of the Marxist Literary Group*. 2019. Vol. 32, No. 2 (Spring). P. 161–177. (Historiography).

19. Poland C. V. Monism and the antinomies. *The Monist*. 1915. Vol. 25, No. 4 (OCTOBER). P. 624-627. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27900562>.

20. Prihodko A. A. The Role of Antinomies in Language. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*. 2014, Vol. II(6), Issue: 29, P. 24-25. [www.seanewdim.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/phil\\_ii\\_6\\_issue\\_29\\_2014.pdf](http://www.seanewdim.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/phil_ii_6_issue_29_2014.pdf).

21. Rorty R. *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press, 1982. 66 p.

22. Бродецька Ю. Ю. Антиномії тотальності: залежність vs свободи. *Філософія і політологія в контексті сучасної культури*. 2016. Вип. 2. С. 214–221. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/filipol\\_2016\\_2\\_31](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/filipol_2016_2_31).

23. Предеїна М. Ю. До реконструкції антиномій. *Актуальні проблеми філософії та соціології: Науково-практичний журнал*. 2018. Вип. 21. С. 76–79. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/11300/11411>.

24. Сідоркіна О. Морально-етичні виміри соціальних комунікацій (мовний контекст). *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2023. № 2 (38). С. 37–42. (Серія «Філософія. Культурологія»). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.2.18109>.

## References

- Barthes, Roland. 1972. *Mythologies*. London: Cape.
- Carus, Paul. 1915. "Kant's Antinomies and Their Solution." *The Monist*, Vol. 25(4) : 627–632. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27900563>.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1981. "The Turns of Metaphor." In *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, 188–209. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1992. *Acts of Literature*. New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1984. "Deconstruction and the Other: An Interview with Jacques Derrida." In *Dialogue with Contemporary Continental Thinkers*, ed. by R. Kearney, 105–113. Manchester University Press. <http://surl.li/rlnzi>
- Derrida, Jacques. 2016. *Of Grammatology*. JHU Press. <http://surl.li/rlnzm>
- Derrida, Jacques. 1983. "Signature, Event, Context." In *Margins of Philosophy*, 307–330. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1970. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." In *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*, edited by R. Macksey & E. Donato, 247–265. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." In *Margins of Philosophy*, 207–271. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

11. Foucault, Michel. 1980. *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. I. New York: Pantheon.

12. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1984. "The Hermeneutics of Suspicion." In *Hermeneutics: Questions and Prospects*, edited by G. Shapiro & A. Sica, 54–65. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

13. Hidalgo, Oliver. 2019. "The Theory of Democratic Antinomies and the Identification of Value Trade-Offs in Political Practice." *Politics and Governance*, 25 November, Vol. 7, No. 4. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v7i4.2243>.

14. Kharchenko, Julia. 2022. "Spiritual Virtuum: The Interaction of the Finite and the Infinite." *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Serii: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 2 (36): 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.36.16967>.

15. Kharchenko, Julia. 2023. "'Virtuum' as an Innovative Sphere in the 'Digital Civilization' (Philosophical, Epistemological and Ontological Aspects)." *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Serii: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 2 (38): 18-23. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.2.18105>.

16. Kharchenko, Serhii, and Julia Kharchenko. 2021. "Reasons for Bifurcation of the Legal Discourse Basis (Synergetic and Philosophical-Linguistic Approaches)." *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Serii: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 1 (33): 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.33.15639>.

17. Kukla, Rebecca. 2005. "The Antinomies of Impure Reason: Rousseau and Kant on the Metaphysics of Truth-Telling." *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 48(3): 203–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201750510022790>.

18. Laughlin, Thomas. A. 2019. "Crisis and Clarity: Fredric Jameson's The Antinomies of Realism, Affect, and the Problem of Representing Totality Today." *Mediations. Journal of the Marxist Literary Group* 32(2): 161–177.

19. Poland, Carl V. 1915. "Monism and the Antinomies." *The Monist* 25(4): 624–627. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27900562>.

20. Prihodko, A. A. 2014. "The Role of Antinomies in Language." *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, II (6), Issue: 29, pp. 24-25. <https://surl.li/rwuqf>

21. Rorty, Richard. 1982. *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

22. Brodeckaya, Yuliia. 2016. "Antinomii totalnosti: zavisimost vs svobody" ["Antinomies of totality: dependence vs freedom"]. *Filosofiia i politologiya v konteksti suchasnoyi kulturi, Philosophy and Political Science in the Context of Modern Culture* 2: 214–221. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/filipol\\_2016\\_2\\_31](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/filipol_2016_2_31).

23. Predeina, M. Yu. 2018. "K Rekonstrukcii Antinomij." ["To the Reconstruction of antinomies"]. *Aktualni Problemi Filosofiiji ta Sociologiji*, Vip. 21: 76-79. <http://hdl.handle.net/11300/11411>.

24. Sidorkina, Olena. 2023. "Moralno-Etichni Vimiri Socialnih Komunikacij (Movnij Kontekst)" ["Moral and Ethical Dimensions of Social Communications (Linguistic Context)"]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Serii: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 2 (38): 37-42. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.2.18109>.

Ю.В. Харченко, О.П. Кваша

## ПРИНЦИПИ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ В ТОПОЛОГІЇ АНТИНОМІЙ (ОНТОЛОГІЧНА ДЕКОНСТРУКЦІЯ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ МАТРИЦІ)

**Вступ.** Розглядається проблема взаємодії як ключове питання про буття. Феномен взаємодії описує конфігурацію соціальної матриці в її динаміці, фіксує безперервну мінливість дійсності, актуалізує необхідність підтримання балансу в природі, а також збереження гармонійного дуалізму тілесних і духовних конструктів людини. Взаємодію визначено як антиномічну опозицію, яку можна розглядати з погляду симетрії та асиметрії. Симетрія відображає наявний у природі порядок, пропорційність і співмірність між елементами будь-якої системи або об'єкта природи. Асиметрія відображає розпорядкування системи, порушення рівноваги. **Мета і завдання.** Основною метою цього дослідження є концептуалізація феномену взаємодії в топології антиномій, а ключовим завданням стала онтологічна деконструкція соціальної матриці за умови впливу антиномії на процес взаємодії. **Методологія дослідження.** Феномен взаємодії розглянуто у філософсько-методологічному, онтологічному та метафізичному аспектах деконструкції при аналізі антиномічних характеристик взаємодії. Підтверджено, що філософія деконструкції формує інтелектуальну практику, здатну творчо відтворювати довільні соціальні дії на рівні вербальних і невербальних знаків і засобів комунікації, що передають будь-який сенс. Принцип деконструкції використовується також у кіберпросторі як інструмент оновлення комп'ютерних систем і мов. **Результати дослідження.** Показано, що антиномія може переходити в стан конфлікту. У реальності Всесвіту конфлікт є природним і необхідним. Під

час взаємодії кожен об'єкт (річ) прагне знизити вплив протилежного об'єкта (іншої речі) і підвищити власний вплив. При цьому поняття «об'єкт» або «учасник взаємодії» не завжди є тотожними, проте вони - пасивні й нейтральні. Суб'єкт (людина) як «активна сторона» (зацікавлена сторона), створює конфліктну ситуацію і впливає на перебіг конфлікту відповідно до своїх інтересів усвідомлено, продумано, вступаючи у взаємодію з іншими людьми, тільки коли це необхідно йому самому. **Обговорення.** Виявлено антиномію «природне-штучне», що раніше апелювала до діалогу природи та мистецтва, проте з'ясувалося, що мова кібернетики стає домінантною та унеможливорює метафізичну й онтологічну цінність такої антиномії. Духовний віртуум інтерпретований як фантазія, природна мова культури та мистецтва. Комп'ютерний віртуум представлений як тіло машини, програма, штучна мова як сукупність кодів та їхніх комбінацій. **Висновки.** Антиномія є першоджерелом взаємодії. Метафізична антиномія сприяє підтриманню балансу, стійкості. Попри те, що антиномія містить полярності, це дає змогу охопити кожну з них окремо, а також розглядати як окремий вимір. При взаємодії, вони породжують топологію духовних сенсів і фізичних просторово-часових форм.

**Ключові слова:** взаємодії, антиномія, соціальна матриця, топологія соціуму, деконструкція.

DOI: 10.18372/2412-2157.39.18442

УДК 167.1/168:7.01(045)

Л.О. Шашкова

## НАУКОВА КОМУНІКАЦІЯ В СКЛАДНИХ СОЦІАЛЬНИХ КОНТЕКСТАХ: ПІДХОДИ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ФІЛОСОФІЇ НАУКИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ЕПІСТЕМОЛОГІЇ

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2054-0405

**Анотація.** У статті досліджуються процеси зміни дисциплінарної структури науки та поворот до міждисциплінарної і трансдисциплінарної методології. У контексті останнього особливості наукової комунікації репрезентовано в межах підходів соціальної філософії науки і соціальної епістемології. Дослідницька увага сфокусована на виявленні дотичності методологічних та епістемічних практик наукової комунікації. Наведені приклади ситуацій прояву епістемічної рівності/нерівності, згоди/незгоди, довіри/недовіри з метою виявлення механізмів і процедур прийняття колективних/групових рішень. Обґрунтовано, що спільним у підходах соціальної філософії науки та соціальної епістемології є орієнтація на дослідження проблем, характерних для складних соціальних контекстів, в яких епістемічні суб'єкти взаємодіють щодо вироблення колективних практик прийняття узгоджених рішень і подолання комунікативної розрізненості.

**Ключові слова:** наукова комунікація, соціальна філософія науки, соціальна епістемологія, контекст, довіра, епістемічний агент, колективне переконання, міждисциплінарність, трансдисциплінарність.

### Вступ

У житті сучасної людини роль і місце науки важко перебільшити, водночас розуміння такої ролі є доволі складним процесом, який ще далеко не завершений. Наука є багатомірним феноменом, багатоаспектним у своєму визначенні, тому науку характеризують і як систему знань, і як наукову діяльність, і як соціальний інститут. Безперечно, що наука є такою галуззю діяльності, яка спрямована на вироблення і систематизацію об'єктивних знань про дійсність, а критичне наукове мислення є, по суті, запереченням того, що на перший погляд здається очевидним. Водночас, наука є важливим соціальним інститутом, який не лише забезпечує форми функціонування та використання знання, але й комунікацію вчених і наукових спільнот.

У сучасному контексті доволі інтенсивно змінюються форми колективної діяльності вчених, ставлення суспільства до науки, структура науки як соціального інституту. І такі зміни мають свої проєкції на процеси трансформації наукової комунікації. У свою чергу, виникає необхідність розробки нових форм спілкування як усередині наукової спільноти (дисциплінарних і міждисциплінарних), так і комунікативної взаємодії із соціокультурним середовищем (трансдисциплінарних). У дослідженнях із філософії науки означене актуалізує філософсько-методологічні

та соціально-епістемологічні рефлексії проблематики наукового спілкування з метою виявлення механізмів подолання комунікативної розрізненості, розрізненості чи відстороненості, з одного боку, між природничиками і гуманітаріями всередині наукової спільноти, а з другого боку, між науковцями і представниками інших царин діяльності та просто пересічними людьми з життєво-практичними орієнтаціями. Питання особливостей і можливостей наукового спілкування, методологічних та епістемічних механізмів і процедур вироблення спільних узгоджених рішень перебувають в центрі уваги даної розвідки.

Довіра до науки і науковців у суспільстві протягом останнього століття традиційно залишається високою. Фактично, це засвідчують результати опитування міжнародної компанії Ipsos Group, присвячені визначенню Глобального індексу довіри (Global Trustworthiness Index) до професій. Протягом останніх шести років, коли були проведені опитування, вчені зберігають свої позиції найнадійніших професій у світі (після лікарів) з індексом довіри 57% (Clemence 2023). Такий високий індекс підтверджує стабільне соціальне схвалення досягнень науки і діяльності науковців у суспільстві, яке засвідчує існування спільного переконання в тому, що наука сприяє досягненню схвалених суспільством цілей. Зазначимо, що досягнення такого високого суспільно узгодженого