Ju.V. Kharchenko

LINK OF ACCIDENTAL AND NON-ACCIDENTAL IN MULTIVERSE OF IMAGINARY REALITIES

Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University; kharchenkojv@gmail.com

Abstract. It is described that the dominance of the "non-accidental" phenomenon in some conspiracy sense of the word demands its study in the scientific dimension. The main goal of the paper is to define the principle of interrelation of "accidental" and "non-accidental" in multiverse of imaginary realities. The author conceptualizes "accidental" and "non-accidental", shows their history in terms of semantic and hermeneutic approaches and states their derivation from the philosophical categories of "necessary" and "accidental". Being universal the categories of "necessary" and "accidental" represent different characteristics of the causal relationships in the ontological, epistemological and phenomenological contexts. Ontological, epistemological and phenomenological approaches reveal the deeper levels of interaction between natural and social processes. While describing accidental the author applied probability, stochastic principles. The probability is depicted as structure-mediator (conciliator, pointing to the practical scope of the intersection of accidental and non-accidental events), which provides conditional balance between their manifestations. Therefore, non-accidental is the opposite to accidental, unavoidable event; it depends on the will of the person (people), some higher-order forces. They develop mechanisms producing social life and life of the entire universe. "Accidental" is opposite to "non-accidental", it does not depend on any will.

Keywords: accidental, non-accidental, necessity, probable, multiverse, imaginary realities.

Introduction

In today's academic and political discourse such concepts as "post-human", "post-truth", "Hyper-reality", "multiverse", "Internet Galaxy" "game world" are appearing. Thus, on the one hand, the trends of the emergence of new phenomena, natural for a changing world are fixed. On the other hand, the mechanisms to simulate imaginary artificial realities as qualitatively new conditions of life, in which there must be a post human, are being developed.

In the global geopolitical space on civilization level different lifestyles, moral imperatives, cultural values and political traditions are facing. And those who impose their value systems have quite narrow and shallow views of the image and the meaning of life of the representatives of other civilizations.

Similar effects on consciousness, as well as behavioral patterns are copied by people in everyday ordinary life. Controversy "yours' – strangers'" loses its direct meaning, because it is impossible to understand who's who, when not only strangers are constantly fooling everyone, but you're (in the family, in the circle of friends, in business, in services, in the Internet). This raises fair questions: whether these circumstances are accidental, or they are for someone's benefit? What is accidental, and what is non-accidental? Can we believe everything the Mass Media say, without analyzing preliminary history of current events? What are the consequences of deliberate lies? Do we live in the real world or it is an imaginary reality?

The aim and the tasks

The phenomenon of "non-accidental" becomes rather dominant in some sense of conspiracy theories what demands its study in the scientific aspect. Therefore, the aim of the article is to define the principle of interrelation of accidental and non-accidental in multiverse of imaginary realities. The key task of the paper is to conceptualize "accidental" and "non-accidental" in the scales of typology of fundamental and social interactions.

Research methods

Of course, the notions of "non-accidental" and "accidental" have a long history in terms of semantic and hermeneutic approaches. They are derived from the philosophical categories of "necessity" and "accidental". The categories of "necessity" and "accidental" are universal, they represent different characteristics of the causal relationships. That is, they need to be considered in the ontological, epistemological and phenomenological contexts. "Necessity" and "accidental" are philosophical categories reflecting the different types of relationships of objects and phenomena. "Necessity" is internal, a significant relationship arising from the indigenous features of phenomena that under certain conditions must occur (Андрущенко, 2006 : 595). Necessity is required, under certain circumstances; it is inevitable (Андрущенко, 2006 : 595). Understanding of category of "necessity" therefore implies the existence of fundamental knowledge about the nature of being. Ontological, epistemological and phenomenological approaches reveal the deeper levels of interaction between natural and social processes.

"Accidental" is a link that is external to the phenomenon in nature and due to adverse factors unrelated to the essence of this phenomenon. This is what in the circumstances can occur or cannot occur. "Accidental" appears unexpectedly and it happens only sometimes, occasionally (Андрущенко, 2006 : 595). When describing randomness we applied probability, stochastic principles.

"Probability" is a quantitative measure of the potential appearance of some events in certain conditions (Ивин, 1997 : 50). There are several interpretations of the notion of "probability". The classical concept of probability considers the probability as a ratio of the number of favorable cases to the total number of all possibilities. However, in actual practice, opportunities are not always equal. The statistical concept of probability, which is based on the real appearance of some events during the lengthy observations at fixed terms, takes into account precisely this fact. Therefore, the statistical concept of probability rests on the notion of relative frequency of occurrence of the event that we are interested in, which is defined by the experience (Ивин, 1997 : 50-51). The probability is structure-mediator (conciliator, pointing to the practical scope of the intersection of accidental and non-accidental events), which provides conditional balance between their manifestations.

In social philosophy and sociology methodological approaches of T. Parsons that reflect the system of

interaction as effective mechanism for reducing uncertainties in the process of social interaction are the most significant, but it is impossible in principle to complete elimination of such vaguely uncertainties. G. Mead and G. Blumer viewed the interaction as a process of communication, mutual acceptance of roles of interacting partners. G. Homans understood the communication process as a single thread, in which a personality and a social system are inseparably connected. G. Parsons believed that acts of individuals would not reveal individual and discrete, they are organized in a system that is in the process of interaction is folded a certain structure of disposition types of the participating partners. The more participants, the more interaction uncertainties occur in their relationship.

Research results

Therefore, non-accidental is the opposite of accidental, unavoidable event. It depends on the will of the person (or people), and may also depend upon the will of some forces of higher-order. They develop mechanisms producing social life and life of the entire universe. "Accidental" is opposite to "non-accidental", it does not depend on any will.

In the historical-philosophical tradition "non-accidental" is connected with the principle of causality. The basic idea of ancient philosophers was that everything has its reason; all is predetermined by someone. As a consequence, such approaches as determinism and indeterminism have emerged.

Non-accidental or necessary dominated in the minds of our predecessors, to be identified with fate, and the eschatological principle of development of human history. Deep sense of being cognized by defining a clear order of things established by absolute logic. Thus, the concepts whereby higher powers – Mind, Brahman, Tao, God ruled the world – were formed. Higher-order forces ensured synchronization of accidental and non-accidental events, tied them into a whole past, present and future. Synchrony of temporary and timeless incarnates in human – in body and spirit, and in the social – in moral-ethical and utilitarian-practical measurements and in ontological structures of the ideal and material.

Such representatives of New time philosophy as J. Berkeley, as well as German classics I. Kant, Hegel, drew attention to the phenomenon of "non-accidental" and looked at it in the context of interaction between thinking and being as categories that reflect their subjective-idealistic approaches.

J. Berkeley stated that each individual final stretch, which can serve as the subject of our thinking is the idea existing only in the mind, and therefore any of its part should be perceived. If so I can't perceive an infinite number of parts in any destination before me over, then there is no doubt that they are not contained in it; but it is obvious that I am not able to discern an infinite number of parts in a separate line, surface or body, see I in a sense or imagine in my mind of what to conclude that they are not there. Nothing could be clearer to me that stretch covered over the essence of nothing but my own ideas; and it is equally clear that I can't decompose any of ideas on an infinite number of other ideas that is they are indivisible to infinity. If the

end stretching means something different from ultimate ideas, I declare that I do not know what it is, and therefore can neither affirm nor deny anything about it (Беркли, 1978 : 231). It follows that it is only possible to cognize that you can perceive, but since human perception is limited, the human mind is able to extract knowledge, relying only on the amount, which is natural, which means necessary.

In turn, I. Kant created a logical proof of the existence of non-accidental events. He argued that something is subordinate to the natural order, as its existence or its modification has reasonable grounds for the forces of nature. This requires, first, that the force of nature was his producing cause; secondly, the manner in which this power is aimed at the emergence of the activity itself would be sufficient justification in a rule of laws, acts of nature. Such events are called simply natural events in the world. On the contrary, there's the case, that does not subordinate to such a base, there is something supernatural, and it takes place or when the nearest valid reason lies outside nature, that is, when these events are generated directly by Divine force, or, secondly, when just the manner in which the forces of nature were converted to this case, is not included in the rule of nature actions (Кант, 1963 : 438). The thinker points to the fact that reality is more complex and multifaceted than may seem to a person, on one hand. On the other hand, he said about the conflict between possible and actual.

I. Kant concludes that all the grounds for evidence of the existence of God can be borrowed or of abstract notions of possible, or of the acquired experience of existing concepts. In the first case, we enter into or from possible as grounds to being God as a consequence of or from possible as a consequence of the divine existence as the base (Кант, 1963 : 499-500). In his understanding, "possible" is more constructive than "valid" (possible is more multifaceted, and valid is more one-sided).

On this basis, I. Kant considered the notion of "link" as such, which in addition to the notion of "diverse" and its synthesis refers to the concept of "unity of diverse". "Link" has an idea of the synthetic unity of diverse. Consequently, the idea of this unity could not arise from the link, on the contrary, it makes possible the concept of link, above all due to the fact that the diverse joins to it (Кант, 2003 : 94-95). That is "possibility" is a plenitude of ideas of diversity, and "valid" is the sense and perception of diversity of physical processes and phenomena.

G. Hegel argued that "necessary" is in itself *an absolute attitude*, that is, the process in which attitude also relieves itself and translates into an *absolute identity*.

In its direct form it is the ratio of *substantiality* and *accidentality*. The absolute identity of this relationship with itself is a substance as such, which is the need to have negativity on this form of domestic existence and, therefore, considers itself as *reality*. However, it also has the *negativity* of that external existence, according to which reality as directly is only something *accidental*, thanks to the mere possibility breaking into some other reality. This *transition* is the foundation of identity as an *activity form* (Гегель, 1975 : 328). G. Hegel showed that categories of "random" and "necessity" related to

the ascent of the human intellect to the highest beginnings of Absolute Idea. Matter and spirit as an absolute identity enrich each other, turning continuously on an all-new level of development, and converting its deep content.

Discussion

We define "non-accidental" as an imaginary predetermination or as seemingly randomly event, but in reality are somebody's thoughtful actions, veiled plan. "Accidental" is an event which is not expected, as well as we understand it as an unwelcome event. We can perceive it as neutral if it does not influence directly on someone's specific fate or fundamentally does not change people's lives for the worse.

It is impossible to determine the percentage of random and non-random events; they are presented as diversity of variables. In this sense, not only the events themselves have become relevant, but people's attitudes to them or people's understanding of their *true existential value* is important. B. Russell defined *truth* as a property of expressions, and then sentences. Some views may be "expressed" by the proposals that do not contain variables. The view beyond the experience of owner's opinion, always in its expression contains variables (Рассел, 1999 : 265). We can conclude that randomness and non-randomness always appeal to the *truth*.

And only by the truth, they become "pure randomness" and "pure non-randomness". However, objective truth is different from subjective truth. If objective truth brings us closer to reality as such, then subjective truth often gravitates toward an imaginary reality, coming from a variety of standpoints, judgments, and interpretations.

The concept of "imaginary" is interpreted as: a) imaginary, seeming (imaginary danger, perceived benefits); b) feigned, lie, fictitious, false (imaginary invalid, imaginary compassion, imaginary knowledge, imaginary death); c) obtained by extracting the square root of negative values (in mathematics, imaginary unit, imaginary number) (Ушаков, 1938 : 232). Hence, in our view, "imaginary realities" is apparent or feigned reality. Truth presupposes an understanding of the world as a unity to the diversity of spiritual and material processes, phenomena, events in their entirety and co-dependence. The role of cognition in this model of multiverse is the quintessence of human spiritual life.

In terms of diversity of truth multiverse as a collection of imaginary realities is not a unifying space, but rather it separates individuals, destroys personality. The concept of "multiverse" (a combination of the Latin "multum" – many, and Latin "universum" – universe) is the universe as a whole; the totality of worlds, one of which is the universe (universume), in which we inhabited. The concept of multiverse derives from a number of the latest physical concepts (this includes quantum mechanics, the theory of Superstrings, the theory of Hyperspace, parallel universes). According to physicist H. Everett, every quantum point of evolution of universe is divided in two, as the road passing through the junction. One universe formed two, and so on ad infinitum. Every quantum jump – in any Star, Galaxy, anywhere in the universe – splits our world on myriad copies that differ only in the location of single particle (Тульчинский, Эпштейн, 2003 : 236). Thus, the sense of existence disappears, but rather raises a purely technical side of its formation and evolution.

S. Hawking stresses that our universe is one of many, and each of them has its own laws. This idea of a multiverse was not specifically invented to explain the miracle of fine-tuning of the physical laws. It, like many other theories of Modern Cosmology, arises from conditions of infinity. If so, it reduces the strong anthropic principle to the weak, using the exact configuration of the physical laws by one base with external factors of environment, because it means that the place of our existence in space – and now the whole universe – is seen as only one of many, just like our solar system is only one of many. This means that external environment factors for our solar system do not represent anything special because there are a myriad of similar systems, and fine-tuning of the laws of nature can be explained by the existence of many universes (Хокинг, 2012 : 187). However, in our opinion, such a model of multiverse impoverishes value of the individual, because then the existence of any person is unimportant and accidental. Randomness becomes the basic principle of life and development of the universe, excluding any manifestation of miracle.

Modern philosophical theories (modal realism, logic and possible worlds semantics) also imply a plurality of worlds, in particular, as a condition of meaningful judgments about our world as "one of many". Concept of multiverse combines the world's conceptualization in all imaginable modalities: existing and possible, accidental and necessary. In connection with the development of computer technology multiverse concept attains practical experience building many "virtual worlds" that are sensory indistinguishable from the "real world". The concept of "world" and the ratio of different worlds updated in computer games as images of "virtual world" constructions (Тульчинский, Эпштейн, 2003 : 236). In fact, these worlds are drastically different from each other and, if the person mixes real and virtual, he loses the ability to fully interact in society with others on the level of "live communications", as well as to build constructive relations in family.

Z. Bauman explains modernity as an allegory which has various interpretations, and its offensive and promotion can be tracked with the help of many and various markers. However, one feature of modern life as possible "differences that are defining the peculiar difference" stands out and flows as a key feature, from which all other features emerge. This feature is the changing relationship between space and time (Бауман, 2008 : 15). The reason for these changes is the speed factor as an artificial tool of influence on global space.

Z. Bauman stressed that the very idea of speed (and even more obvious is the idea of acceleration) in the context of the relationship between time and space implies their volatility (Бауман, 2008 : 15). Variable speed modernity generates uncertainty, where all events are random, because there is no time to trace them and explain.

In his work "The Transparency of Evil: Essays on Extreme Phenomena" J. Baudrillard warns that science foreshadowed a panic-stricken situation: the

disappearance of the respective positions of the subject and object in an experimental interface generates the final status of the uncertainty as to the reality of the object and objective reality of knowledge. It seems that science itself fell under the influence of the strange attractors. The same can be said about the economy, whose resurrection is associated with a complete unpredictability, reigning in it, and about the sudden expansion of information technology related to the uncertainty of current knowledge. Are all these technical means the receiving party of the real world? It is very doubtful. Objective of science and technology is to push us to entirely unrealistic world existing outside the principle of truth and reality (Бодрийяр, 2000 : 63-64). That is, people today turned out to be at the epicenter of the situations where they do no control themselves and they also unable to control their own life. Certain behavioral and communication framework created for them. It is prescribed the program of action, which would seem to preclude any randomness, but in this case and free personality, willing to act in accordance with the maxim of his will as the embodiment of morality, intellect and spirit, disappears.

M. Castells calls such multiversume "Internet Galaxy", which is a new communicative space, because communication is the essence of human activity, and the pervasive use of the Internet changes all areas of social life. New social form – networked society – becomes planetary, although it is significantly different from natural environment by concrete manifestations of their influence on people's lives, in terms of history, culture and institutions (Castells, 2003 : 275). However, communicating in social networks denies the very essence of communication, thus reducing natural communication as such.

N. Catherine Hales emphasizes that in addition to the special importance that is assigned to a higher-level structures of coding, in the design of post human deep role belongs to issue frames/borders, especially when they are redoing changes and localization of "I" / "self" (Хейлз, 2013 : 363). This author understands multiversume as space in which post human lives. We cannot say with certainty that the preconditions for the formation of such kind of post human are already created, although modern Cybernetics quite deeply penetrates into the realm of "artificial intelligence".

Conclusion

Increasingly, modern man confronted with situations when clear at first glance events actually have very different connotations, contain hidden meanings. There are also many interpretations of these events and on the surface are the versions that do not involve deep verification, because the public sphere for a long time turned into entertainment or theater. The real problems become imaginary events.

One will notice that the eyewitnesses of these events are getting bigger, and versions of their interpretations are extremely contradictory. The views are copied and multiplied by the media. In such circumstances, people finally get entangled and eventually fall into an information network where their consciousness is being manipulated, repelling further from reality. On the one hand, it creates distrust, dissociation, opposition, hostility. On the other hand, most people are accustomed to live in a world of illusion, untruth or half-truths.

All these imaginary realities engender different illusions, affecting the individual and collective unconscious. Reality, seeming fair and comfortable, also reflects very different qualities.

It may be noted that, if the processes occur naturally, they increasingly seem to be random (nothing shall affect the freedom of their manifestations). If we create a kind of artificial environment, the events are rather non-random. Processes, phenomena, events at the systemic and structural levels are considered differently (they can be accidental and non-accidental from the point of view of the person).

We assume that any social action at the same time has no coincidence, if it is committed by an individual and is measured by his or her personal freedom in relation to himself or another person, as well as randomly for him on the basis of the free will of every other person towards him.

Literature

1. Бауман З. Текучая современность / З. Бауман ; пер. с англ. ; под ред. Ю. В. Асочакова. – СПб. : Питер, 2008. – 240 с.

2. Беркли Дж. Сочинения / сост., общ. ред. и вступ. ст. И. С. Нарского. – М. : Мысль, 1978. – 556 с.

3. Бодрийяр Ж. Прозрачность зла / Ж. Бодрийяр. – М. : Добросвет, 2000. – 258 с.

4. Гегель Г. В. Ф. Энциклопедия философских наук / Г. В. Ф. Гегель. – М. : Мысль, 1975. – Т. 1 : Наука логики. – 452 с.

5. Ивин А. А. Словарь по логике / А. А. Ивин, А. Л. Никифоров. – М. : ВЛАДОС, 1997. – 384 с.

6. Кант И. Критика чистого разума / И. Кант. – Симферополь : Реноме, 2003. – 464 с.

7. Кант И. Сочинения : в 6 т. / под общ. ред. В. Ф. Асмуса, А. В. Гулыги, Т. И. Ойзермана. – М. : Мысль. 1963. – Т. 1. – 543 с.

8. Проективный философский словарь. Новые термины и понятия / под ред. Г. Л. Тульчинского, М. Н. Эпштейна. – СПб. : Алетейя, 2003. – 512 с.

9. Рассел Б. Исследование значения истины / Б. Рассел ; пер. с англ. Е. Е. Ледникова, А. Л. Никифорова. – М. : Идея-Пресс ; Дом интеллект. кн., 1999. – 400 с.

10. Толковый словарь русского языка : в 4 т. / под ред. Д. Н. Ушакова. – М. : Гос. изд-во иностр. и нац. слов, 1938. – Т. 2. – 1040 с.

11. Андрущенко И. В. Философский словарь / И. В. Андрущенко, О. А. Вусатюк, С. В. Линецкий, А. В. Шуба. – Киев : А.С.К., 2006. – 1056 с.

12. Хейлз К. Як ми стали постлюдством: віртуальні тіла в кібернетиці, літературі та інформатиці / К. Хейлз. – 2-ге вид. виправл. ; пер. з англ. – Київ : Ніка-Центр, 2013. – 426 с.

13. Хокинг С. Высший замысел / С. Хокинг, Л. Млодинов ; пер с англ. М. Кононова ; под ред. Г. Бурбы. – СПб. : Амфор, 2012. – 208 с.

14. Castells M. The Internet Galaxy. Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society Clarendon Lectures in Management Studies) / M. Castells. – 1 edition. – Oxford : UP, 2003 – 304 p.

References

1. Bauman, Z. 2008. *Tekuchaia sovremennost [Flowing modernity]*. Yu.V. Asochakov (Ed.). SPb.: Piter [in Russian].

2. Berkli, Dj. 1978. *Sochineniia [Writings]*. I.S. Narskii (Eds). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].

3. Bodriiyar, J. 2000. *Prozrachnost zla [Evil Transparency]*. Moscow: Dobrosvet [in Russian].

4. Gegel, G.V.F. 1975. *Enciklopediia filosofskih nauk [Encyclopedia of Philosophy]*. (Vols. 1). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].

5. Ivnin, A.A., & Nikiforov, A.L. 1997. *Slovar po logike [Dictionary of Logic]*. Moscow: VLADOS [in Russian].

6. Kant, I. 2003. *Kritika chistogo razuma [Criticism of pure reason]*. Simferopol: Renome [in Russian].

7. Kant, I. 1965. *Sochineniia [Writings]*. (Vols. 1-6). V.F. Asmus, A.V. Gulyga, & T.I. Oizerman (Eds). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].

8. Tulchinskii, G.L., & Epshtein, M.N. (Eds.). 2003. *Proektivnyi filosofskii slovar. Novye terminy i poniatiia [Projective philosophical dictionary. New terms and concepts]*. SPb.: Alteiia [in Russian].

9. Rassel, B. 1999. *Issledovanie znacheniia istiny [Investigation of the truth]*. (E.E. Lednikov, A.L. Nikiforov, Trans). Moscow: Ideia-Press; Dom intellekt. kn. [in Russian].

10. Ushakov, D.N. (Ed.). 1938. *Tolkovyi slovar russkogo yazyka [Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language]*. (Vols. 1-4). Moscow: Gos. izd-vo inostr. i nac. slov [in Russian].

11. Andruscenko, I.V., Vusatiuk, O.A., Lineckii, S.V., & Shuba, A.V. 2006. *Filosofskii slovar [Philosophical Dictionary]*. Kiev: A.S.K. [in Russian].

12. Kheilz, K. 2013. *Yak my staly postliudstvom: virtualni tila v kibernetytsi, literaturi ta informatytsi [As we became humanity: virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature and computer science]* (2nd ed., rev.). Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr [in Ukrainian].

13. Hoking, S., & Mlodinov, L. 2012. *Vysshii zamysel [Supreme intention]*. (M. Kononov, Trans). G. Burba (Ed.). SPb.: Amfor [in Russian].

14. Castells, M. 2003. *The Internet Galaxy. Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society Clarendon Lectures in Management Studies)* (1st ed.). Oxford: UP [in Russian].

Ю.В. Харченко

ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ СЛУЧАЙНОГО И НЕСЛУЧАЙНОГО В МУЛЬТИВЕРСУМЕ МНИМЫХ РЕАЛЬНОСТЕЙ

В статье в научной плоскости рассматривается явление «неслучайного», становящееся доминирующим в некотором конспирологическом смысле слова. Определяется принцип взаимосвязи случайного и неслучайного в мультиверсуме мнимых реальностей, проводится концептуализация случайного и неслучайного в шкалах типологии фундаментального и социального взаимодействий. Автор представляет историю понятий «неслучайное» и «случайное» с точки зрения семантического и герменевтического подходов, акцентирует внимание на их производности от философских категорий «необходимое» и «случайное». Универсальность категорий «необходимость» и «случайность», репрезентирующих различные характеристики причинно-следственных связей, обуславливает необходимость их рассмотрения в онтологическом, гносеологическом и феноменологическом контекстах. Онтологический, гносеологический и феноменологический подходы позволяют выявить глубинные уровни взаимодействия природных и социальных процессов. При описании случайности автор применяет вероятностный принцип. Вероятность определена как структур-медиатор (посредник), указывающий на практическую сферу пересечения случайных и неслучайных событий и обеспечивающий условный баланс между их проявлениями. Следовательно, неслучайное определено как нечто противоположное случайному, как неизбежное событие, зависящее от воли человека (людей), некоторых сил высшего порядка, которые вырабатывают механизмы, обеспечивающие развитие социальной жизни и Вселенной в целом. Случайное – противоположно неслучайному, оно не зависит от чьей бы то ни было воли.

Ключевые слова: случайное, неслучайное, вероятное, необходимое, мультиверсум, мнимые реальности.

Ю.В. Харченко

ЗВ'ЯЗОК ВИПАДКОВОГО ТА НЕВИПАДКОВОГО В МУЛЬТИВЕРСУМІ УЯВНИХ РЕАЛЬНОСТЕЙ

Вступ. У статті обговорюється явище «невипадкового», яке, більш за все, стає домінуючим у певному конспірологічному сенсі цього слова. Звідси, його необхідно було розглянути у науковій площині і поставити наступну **мету**, а саме – визначити принцип взаємозв'язку випадкового і невипадкового в мультиверсумі уявних реальностей. Мета обумовлює головне **завдання**: концептуалізувати «випадкове» і «невипадкове» у шкалах типології фундаментальної та соціальної взаємодій. **Результати дослідження.** Автор показав, що поняття «випадкове» і «невипадкове» мають довгу історію з точки зору семантичного та герменевтичного підходів. Вони є похідними від філософських категорій «необхідність» і «випадковість». Категорії «необхідність» і «випадковість» є універсальними, вони репрезентують різні характеристики причинно-наслідкових зв'язків. Тобто, їх потрібно було розглянути і в онтологічному, і в епістемологічному, і в феноменологічному контекстах. «Необхідність» і «випадковість» показані як філософські категорії, що відображають різні типи зв'язків об'єктів і явищ. Тому розуміння категорії «необхідності» передбачає наявність фундаментальних знань про природу буття. Онтологічний, епістемологічний, та феноменологічний підходи дозволили виявити глибинні рівні взаємодії між природними і соціальними процесами. **Обговорення.** Ж. Бодріяр попереджає, що наука і техніка зіштовхують людину з нереальним світом поза істиною. М. Кастельс називає його новим комунікативним простором – Інтернет-галактикою. Н. Кетрін Хейлз вказує на процеси кодування та конструювання постлюдського. **Висновки.** При описі випадковості автор застосував ймовірнісний, стохастичний принцип. Імовірність визначається як структур-медіатор (посередник, що вказує на практичну сферу перетину випадкових та невипадкових подій), який забезпечує умовний баланс між їхніми проявами. Отже, невипадкове визначається як те, що є відмінним від випадкового, як неминуча подія. Воно залежить від волі людини (або людей) а також може залежати від волі деяких сил вищого порядку. Останні виробляють механізми, що забезпечують розвиток суспільного життя і цілого Всесвіту. Випадкове – протилежне невипадковому, воно не залежить від чиєїсь волі.

Ключові слова: випадкове, невипадкове, імовірне, необхідне, мультиверсум, уявні реальності.