

*Kateryna
Pryazhentseva*

THE HIERARCHY OF REALITIES IN THE ONTOLOGY OF CONFLICT (to the philosophical analysis of Russian-Ukrainian conflict)

«The waking have one common world (koinos kosmos), but the sleeping turn aside each into a world of his own (idios kosmos)» (Heraclitus of Ephesus). But what to do when the population of one of the world largest country turns away into their own idios kosmos, and, what is more important, in this own world they are able to find the ground for extremely high degree of social consensus and, moreover, they believe that the rest of the world is in captivity of illusion. How to find out in this «confrontation of realities» who we really are — a butterfly or Chuang Tzu?

The address of Russia's President to the Council of Federation on March'1 2013 for permission to use the military forces outside the state was a mind-blowing experience for the overwhelming majority of Ukrainians (and not only Ukrainians). The next step of this shocking experience was a kind of *Consensus Patri* — the letter of Russia's cultural authorities to support the position of the President. Finally the stunning ratings of the Russian President (showing the extremely high degree of consensus in Russian society) have completed the process of deconstruction of reality (picture of the world) in context of which the Russia's aggression against Ukraine was very improbable. In such a way the aggression which seemed to be at the first time something absolutely unreal has gradually turned into opinion of one powerful man, then it was supported by the large part of Russia's cultural and political authorities

and finally it became a new reality in a sense of shared by the most part of the Russian society picture of the world. As a matter of fact, that's when the Russian world (the miserable fake of which now is one of the main ideological element of Russian expansion) was really collapsing.

In the prominent book of Samuel P. Huntington «The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking of the World Order» the conflict between Russia and Ukraine was recognized as a very improbable one. This improbability was evidently refuted by the recent events, but this refutation is not as trivial as it may seem at first sight. There are at least two options for the Huntington's point refutation. In accordance with one option the civilizational unity of Russia and Ukraine was illusory and the present conflict has made the illusion of this unity evident. Or, in accordance with the other option, Russia and Ukraine did belong to the same civilization (in terms of Huntington) or to the same Lifeworld (in terms of Husserl) and the conflict by its essence is not a clash of civilizations, but something quite the opposite. What is the most distinctive feature of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict? Is it a clash of political elites, nationalities, civilizations, political regimes or something else? The point is that the essence of the present conflict is not determined by its sides. What is important for the present conflict definition is that it is not a clash, but a split of the previously common socio-cultural world. Even if the unity of this symbolic world was superficial, then nevertheless, this unity was enough in order to ensure the unproblematic dialogue, the predictable everyday life and the stable frameworks for the common sense.

To grate extant this radical overturn in the Russia's citizen's mass consciousness was inspired by the political authorities by means of mass media and the offensive propaganda. But it's namely Russian civil society has turned this artificial image of enemy into the real one. In general, in the case of international conflict it is possible to speak about civil society as the only ontological foundation which allows us to explain the conflict's reasons, its dynamics as well as the possible ways out of the crisis. The core of the conflict is not determined by the personal qualities of power authorities or by the secret coalitions and pacts; the substantive core of the conflict is determined by the civil societies of the conflict's sides which create the possibility conditions for such or another scenarios of the conflict (in spite of the author of these scenarios — whether it could be the senseless chance, the intrigues of the power authorities, or Hegel's «cunning of the reason»). It is hard to imagine that the Russian-Ukrainian conflict would be possible if the civil society of Ukraine had not found enough courage to challenge the decision of the Ukrainian government announced at the EU Vilnius summit; it is hard to imagine this conflict would be possible if Russian civil society had found the courage not to support the position of Russia's President, and it is difficult to imagine the conflict could take such a protracted character if the Europe's civil society had not shared the passivity of the EU political leadership concerning the «Ukrainian crisis». Moreover, the dynamics of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict allows us to diagnose indirectly the state of civil societies in Ukraine, Russia and Europe. Ukraine's civil society

tempered by two Maidans is extremely strong and it continues to realize itself through the victories and defeats, through the self-confidence and doubt. Russian civil society is an immature and inclinable to the authoritarianism society, which needs both the Grand Inquisitor and the external enemy in order to feel itself without self-awareness. The diagnosis of the European civil society is also very disappointing one. As Etienne Balibar says: "...if the European people do not exist, if there is no people of new certain type, then there is no European public sphere or the European state which stands behind the technocratic apparatus"[Balibar, 2003: p. 12]. The very Ukrainian crisis is going to be fateful not only for Ukraine, but for Europe as well since such borderlands' crises are «the melting pot for the formation of a people (demos), without which there is no citizenship (politeia)» [Balibar, 2003: p. 12].

So, if to sum up, when we are talking about ontology of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, we have in mind the deconstruction (split) of the previously common world (intersubjectively shared image of reality). Now it is time for theory (philosophy) to explain how this experience (reality) has been made possible as soon as: «the only proper aim of philosophy is to produce the tools which can help us to understand the World better» [Bard, 2012]. The resolution of Russian-Ukrainian conflict will start not with the supply of lethal weapons to Ukraine or with the diplomatic negotiations in Minsk, Norman or any other formats; it will not start even with the direct dialogue of Russia's and Ukraine's political elites. The resolution of the conflict will start with its deep comprehension. This comprehension could reveal the latent foundations and reasons of the intersubjectively shared by Russian society at the present time vision of reality. Today this vision of reality is the most effective Kremlin's weapon, the most insuperable border separating Russia from the rest of the world, and the deepest reason which blocks the resolution of Russian-Ukrainian conflict. The necessity of such analysis challenges foremost philosophy as a quintessence of the intellectual tradition. Today we are faced with the unexpected and mind-blowing reality of international conflict in the center of Europe. Does the contemporary philosophy have a proper language in order to at least speak about this reality?

Contemporary philosophy is the tradition which is based on the new interpretation of rationality. This new interpretation of rationality can be called the «paradigm of intersubjectivity», the most crucial points of which are the following: the critique of pure rationality illusion, the idea of language as a universal context of rationality and the interpretation of rationality as a communicative action. The paradigm of intersubjectivity was gradually formed by the successive steps of the philosophical tradition. The «methodological castling» presented by Edmund Husserl was one of such most important steps. It means that contemporary philosophy has put «out of brackets» the problem of reality, but at the same time it still needs some kind of ontological markers. Thus, the question about ontological grounds was turned into the question about the conditions of phenomenon's possibilities. Not less important than the question about the conditions of possibility

is the question about the conditions of phenomenon's impossibility. This theoretical perspective let us examine conflict in the context of negative ontology. This mode of investigation could be very perspective one since as it was proved by Nassim Taleb in his book «The Black Swan» negative phenomenon as a rule is much easier to grasp for theoretical analysis and the results of this analysis could be much more exact and informative. Linguistic turn is another important foundation of contemporary philosophy. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus" of Ludwig Wittgenstein, the Quine-Davidson principle of ontological relativity and the hypothesis of linguistic relativity (known as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis) — these are the extreme points of theoretical reconceptualization of the relationships between language and the world in the XX century. According to the principle of ontological relativity formulated by Willard Quine with respect to the formalized languages and applied by Donald Davidson to the natural languages, the existence of a universal assumption-free ontology is impossible. Ontology is relative to the language and not vice versa, which means that there is no irrelative point of reference not connected to some system of communication. The preference of one or another ontological system is based on the purely pragmatic reasons. The further development of the impulse which philosophy has received after linguistic turn is marked by the interest to language in the aspect of its use: "...there is no pure reason which later put on itself the language clothing"[Habermas, 1987: p. 374] as it was pointed out by Jurgen Habermas, the author of the communicative action theory. So, after linguistic turn the methodological accents in contemporary philosophy were shifted. Due to this shift the situation of international conflict is being interpreted as a phenomenon of primarily symbolic, or, more precisely, communicative level. At the same time the absence of an independent on the communicative systems ontology releases us from the illusion of possibility of solving the conflict through the appeals to «reality» as the arbitrator which may decide who is right and who is not and in such a way to find a way out of the crisis. There is no longer the «Supreme Court of Reality» and it means that the mechanism of social consensus is working without the external ontological landmarks and points of reference. Thus, within the context of the intersubjectivity paradigm the «gravity center» is being shifted inside the system of communication and the people's ability to come to agreement.

It could be stated for the contemporary conflicts in general and for the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in particular that symbolic dimension of these conflicts is much more decisive than the material one. The demarcation line on the East of Ukraine signifies first of all the confrontation of the visions of reality. The symbolic dimension has priority for society as a whole as soon as society is not equal to the number of citizens which it consists of. This is namely the case when the whole is definitely more than the sum of its parts. Society is destined to lose and find its unity in the space and time, being reborn in the many of its citizens and a series of successive generations. In such a way society is engaged in the permanent process of its self-reproduction, that is to say, society produces discourse and the other way discourse constitutes society. The central notion which represents the unity of society is «con-

sensus» since the mechanism of re-finding unity by society is as a matter of fact the mechanism of renewal consensus; society exists as long as this mechanism is working. «...the objectivity of the world perception is determined by the agreement of the subjectivities which produces structures (sensus = consensus)» [Bourdieu, 2003: p. 89]. That is the most distinctive feature of the mainstream contemporary philosophy which shares the paradigm of intersubjectivity. Society exists as long as it is able to create its unity, to sacrifice this unity for the sake of changes and then to re-create it. The renewal consensus is provided by the process of dialogue within society, wherein consensus is the initial and the end point of the dialogue since consensus is the condition of possibility, and at the same time, it is the result of the dialogue. «Dialogue» is another key notion which has to be used as a background for the philosophical reconstruction of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. The conflict could be interpreted in the context of philosophy as an impossible dialogue since the conflict as a form of communication is opposite to the dialogue. It is better to outline the relationship of conflict and dialogue at the level of its conditions of possibility: the conflict's conditions of possibility are opposite to the dialogue's conditions of possibility. So, the dialogue is impossible under the conditions of conflict. This point is completely forgotten by the world policy authorities who constantly repeat that the only possible way out this conflict is a dialogue. There are situations when dialogue is absolutely impossible and it is necessary to create the conditions of the dialogue's possibility. By treating conflict as an «impossible dialogue» we can rewrite the reality of the conflict in terms of the paradigm of intersubjectivity and actualize the huge resources of the philosophy of language and philosophy of dialogue.

The question which is central for the current issue is the following: how it is made possible that Russia and Ukraine for the time being shared almost the same symbolic world bound by the ties of common faith, culture, history, language find themselves in the situation of «splited reality» when even within the same language (here it comes about language in both narrow and wide interpretations) all the mechanisms of dialogue between these two societies are completely destroyed, but the mechanisms of consensus within society, on the contrary, are enhanced. Thus the situation of international or even global conflict is such situation when the internal consensus is not just possible but even considerably reinforced and, at the same time, this internal consensus is absolutely closed and excludes the possibility of the dialogue with anybody beyond the border of the society. After all, the cases when the image of external enemy (the real or artificially created one) has contributed to the internal consolidation of the society are very widely spread ones. This brings us to the next concept which is very essential for understanding the nature of conflict in general and the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in particular. This is the notion of border which signifies the edge of understanding, consensus and dialogue; «border» is one of the basic notions for philosophical reconstructions of all situations of communicative action and the situation of conflict in particular. Without the notion of «border» it is impossible to conceptualize the mechanisms of intersubjectivity in societies which are the sides of the conflict. The example of philosophical

conceptualization of the notion of «border» is Gadamer's interpretation of the borrowed from Husserl term «horizon» as the border of understanding the meaning of the language; the border separating compatriot from the strangers; the border beyond which the misunderstanding and the impossibility of unmediated dialogue begins. But if inside the paradigm of intersubjectivity this border is explained as something «given for grasp», in the case of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict the border appears within the previously single Lifeworld and it could not be reduced to the «problem of translations». Despite the highly tragic events connected with the Russian-Ukrainian conflict the live experience of transformations in mass consciousness could be very useful for philosophical analysis. The analysis of this experience can provide the information about situation of ontological relativity inside the language and the ontologization of border within the same language. And then with almost the same elements of social and cultural experience — memes — the completely different visions of reality were made up. For example, the image of the opposite side of conflict in the mass consciousness of Russia's and Ukraine's citizens provokes the identical association connected with the most tragic experiences of XX century — the experience of fascism, but if for Russian society the Ukrainian nationalists are the reincarnation of fascists, for Ukrainians such reincarnation is represented by Russia political elite.

To sum up all the above: the problem of Russian-Ukrainian conflict ontology in the context of contemporary philosophy could be placed into the frames of its possibility conditions. The analysis of this possibility conditions can help us to find the possible way out of the conflict. The Russian-Ukrainian conflict rewritten in the language of intersubjective paradigm is being interpreted within the context of the communication's systems; these systems reproduce the unity of society by the symbolic means. The conditions of intersubjectivity determine the possibility of dialogue inside society. Social consensus is the precondition and at the same time the result of the dialogue inside society; consensus is the foundation of the shared by society image of reality. In the case of international conflict conditions of intersubjectivity are such that the consensus within society is being reinforced considerably against the background of impossibility of consensus with anyone beyond the border of society. This phenomenon could be called the «paradox of intersubjectivity». Pierre Bourdieu stated that the initial point of the contemporary philosophy is the «ideal communicative situation» which is not overshadowed by the other forms of interaction. This tradition solves this paradox by the concept of Lifeworld's horizon; this border of communication is explained as something given, as a result of the clash of two different identities (civilizations, nations, cultures, etc.), while in the case of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict we can see the split of the earlier single Lifeworld. The conceptualization of this «border of dialogue» reveals the insufficiency of the idealistic tradition of the contemporary philosophy based on the «linguistic solipsism».

«If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but do not have love, I have become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal» from the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians.

By citing this quotation, I certainly do not mean that the extremely high level of Putin's support signifies that Russian society is full of love. By coincidence the ratings of dictators are usually through the roof, while democracy as a context of social consensus proves to be a «worst form» of the power organization. This phrase points out in a very elegant manner that language is a necessary but not sufficient condition for achieving the mutual understanding, whereas the «linguistic solipsism» or the «flaw of pure communication» is based on the conception of language as the only «incarnation of reason». The «flaw of pure communication» is a direct result of linguistic turn, because in this perspective language is not just the most general, but the only possible context of knowledge about world. Therefore all other interactions in society are ontologically secondary in respect to the language and can be reduced to it. «The limits of my language are the limits of my World» [Wittgenstein, 1922: p. 74]. This thesis of Ludwig Wittgenstein has opened the perspective of the linguistic turn in philosophy, but the very same thesis is «pregnant» with the problem of languages insufficiency, which nevertheless was quite a marginal line of argumentation against the background of enthusiasm concerning the epistemological potential of language in philosophy of XX century. We can't take a look on reality across the border of the language. The question is: how the knowledge about language borders is possible. The presence of these borders could be fixed within the context of language only. The borders of language manifest itself as a language's insufficiency. The mysterious seventh thesis of Wittgenstein's «Tractatus» alludes to language's insufficiency: «Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent» [Wittgenstein, 1922]. Wittgenstein did not answer the question: what language borders with and what language keeps silence about? But the very point of language's insufficiency is of high importance for the contemporary philosophy; moreover it could be transformed into the problem of intersubjectivity paradigm insufficiency. Within the concept of intersubjectivity which to some extent has functionally replaced the concept of objectivity the problem of reality was not resolved or even limited, it was just shifted in a different perspective. In this perspective however, «the ontological tension» in the system survived and the opposition of logos and pseudologos is steel preserved (in the writings of Maximus the Confessor there are very relevant notions for these different kinds of logos — «logos spermatikos» and «logos phantastikos»). The fact of international conflict which is determined not by the clash, but by the split of the previously single Lifeworld is the most distinct evidence of this opposition. This insufficiency of language is very evident in the case of Russian-Ukrainian conflict. No one intralingual mechanism can explain in which way the Russian and Ukrainian civil societies have made up from the same symbolic elements such different visions of reality. Neither experience nor language have the «necessary volume of selection» in order to create in the mass political consciousness the image of treacherous cannibal who came instead of the image of peaceful Ukrainian. Thus, it must be the reason which is not limited by the pure dimension of language and communicative action. «Contrary to all forms of «interactionists» error which reduce the power relations to the relations of

communication, it's not enough to note that relations of communication are always at the same time power relations whose form and content depends on the material or symbolic power» [Bourdieu 2007: p. 93]. The fact that a certain idea can unite the mass of people and at the same time the very same idea (the vision of reality) can be a reason for conflict with another mass of people (and the differences in the visions of reality cannot be fully explained by the civilizational, cultural, religious or any other reason) indicates the existence of such mechanism, which cannot be reduced to the pure communication. In such a way the problem of language's insufficiency has initiated the absolutely new perspective in philosophy which deals with language as a form of reality manifestation, but within this perspective the very language is being interpreted in the context of other forms of interactions. This perspective is represented in contemporary philosophy, for example, by Pierre Bourdieu and by such neophenomenologists as Niklas Luhmann and Peter Berger. According to Luhmann, «the choice between «yes» and «no» cannot be controlled by means of language only since the latter contains both possibilities... That's why every society has formed in addition to the language the additional institutions which provide the required level of selection» [Luhmann, 2001: p. 24]. So, the point which enables to modalize the opposition inside language should be given out of the language's dimension. In other words, it is what language keeps silence about. The short answer to the question «what language is keeping silence about» is as follows: language does not speak about reality; it keeps silent about reality expressing it by the form. Language creates the symbolic space of possibilities. Power within this symbolic space creates the hierarchy of senses and actualizes such or another picture of reality.

The Russian-Ukrainian conflict is not determined by the personal hysteric reaction of Russia's President. It is not also fully determined by the ancient cultural differences between Russia and Ukraine. The conflict in general is a natural crisis (the sign of growth) within the circle of symbolic reproduction of society. This crisis makes possible the transformation of the symbolic reproduction circle and therefore the development of society. New ways of communication between civilizations are possible only through the overcoming of conflicts and creating the conditions for dialogue. While the essence of Russian-Ukrainian conflict, as it is stated in the article, is not determined by the clash of two identities, when the problems of dialogue are caused by the «problem of translation», it is rather the development of Ukraine's and Russia's independent identities on the background of common Soviet past. This situation is called in the terminology of A. Zubov the «Belavezha syndrome». The conflicts determined by the struggle for de facto independence from the Soviet Union and Russia as its personification took place in Moldova and Georgia and, most likely, Ukraine is not going to be the last one in this line. Probably the hardest struggle for independence from the Soviet Union will be Russia's struggle. It is highly symptomatic that the Russian-Ukrainian conflict has being instantly indexed as global one. The conflict in the heart of Europe is a self-manifested reality that challenges the international community and re-

quires global solidarity. This reality demonstrates the irreversible changes which happened with the world as a result of globalization. The process of globalization has already resulted in the transformation of the conflict's nature and it steel continues to transform the nature of power making it global. The resolution of the conflict by dialogue could be possible only when in the context of global power the conditions for such dialogue will be created. «We are not longer «individuals», we are «dividuals» in the sense that our existence is not an independent, but shared being» [Bard, 2012].

REFERENCES / ДЖЕРЕЛА

- Balibar, E. (2003). *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton University Press, 304 pp.
- Bard, A. (2012). *The Internet Revolution*. The lecture on the conference Berlin'2012 NEXT; Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGGBWssRAhI>
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Sociology of the social space*. [In Russian]. St. Petersburg: Aleteya, pp. 87-96. [= Бурдьє 2007]
- Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The Grand Chessboard*. NewYork: Basic Books, 224 p.
- Luhmann, N. (2001). *Power*. [In Russian]. Moscow: Praxis, 256 p. [= Луман 2001]
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Twelve Lectures. MIT Press, 430 p.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations*. NewYork: Simon&Schuster, 246 p.
- Taleb, N. (2007). *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. New York: Random House, 400 p.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*. Retrieved from <http://people.umass.edu/klement/tlp/>

Received / Статтю одержано 10.05.2017

Kateryna Pryazhentseva

THE HIERARCHY OF REALITIES IN THE ONTOLOGY OF CONFLICT (to the philosophical analysis of Russian-Ukrainian conflict)

The paper presents an attempt to outline the methodological basis for current Russian-Ukrainian conflict analysis. The conflict is been analyzed within the frame of the contemporary philosophy which is based on phenomenological method of Edmund Husserl from one side and the perspective of linguistic turn initiated by Ludwig Wittgenstein from other side. Such approach presupposes that the international conflict is treated as a specific communicative situation, when social consensus and dissensus are the basic constituting elements of the process. In this context conflict could be rewritten in terms of contemporary philosophy as a bilateral process of creating discourse by society and constituting society by discourse.

The analysis of Russian-Ukrainian conflict in the context of contemporary philosophy is highly fruitful also for philosophy itself as soon as such a «clash» with reality is a test for its epistemological potential. As it was shown, the present analysis let us conclude the insufficiency of intersubjectivity paradigm and limitations of the concept of language as an ontological ground which can explain the dialectics of consensus and dissensus within the structure of international conflict.

It is suggested that the problem of insufficiency of intersubjectivity paradigm could be solved by means of extralinguistic (i.e. laying beyond the border of the language) elements

only, in particular, by means of the concept of power as a metalanguage which complete the concept of intersubjectivity and provides the sufficient ground for the explanation of international conflict architectonic.

Keywords: consensus, dialogue, conflict, civil society, the paradox of intersubjectivity, linguistic solipsism, the code of power

Катерина Пряженцева

ІЄРАРХІЯ РЕАЛЬНОСТЕЙ В ОНТОЛОГІЇ КОНФЛІКТУ (ФІЛОСОФСЬКИЙ АНАЛІЗ РОСІЙСЬКО-УКРАЇНСЬКОГО КОНФЛІКТУ)

У статті зроблено спробу окреслити методологічну базу для аналізу російсько-українського конфлікту. Конфлікт аналізується у контексті сучасної філософії, ґрунтованої на феноменологічному методі Едмунда Гусерля, з одного боку, і перспективі лінгвістичного повороту, ініційованого Людвігом Вітгенштайном, з іншого боку. Такий підхід передбачає розгляд міжнародного конфлікту як особливої комунікативної ситуації, головними конституювальними елементами якої є суспільний консенсус і диссенсус. В цьому контексті конфлікт може бути переписаний мовою сучасної філософії як двосторонній процес створення суспільством дискурсу і конституювання суспільства дискурсом.

Аналіз російсько-українського конфлікту в контексті сучасної філософії є плідним і для самої філософії підходом, оскільки таке «зіткнення» з реальністю є перевіркою її епістемологічного потенціалу. Як виявилось в пропонованому дослідженні, цей аналіз дає підстави для висновку про недостатність парадигми інтерсуб'єктивності як контексту аналізу міжнародного конфлікту та обмеження концепту мови як достатнього онтологічного підґрунтя, що дає змогу пояснити діалектику консенсусу і диссенсусу у структурі міжнародного конфлікту.

У статті висловлено думку, що проблема недостатності концепту інтерсуб'єктивності може бути розв'язана лише за допомоги екстралінгвістичних (тобто таких, що перебувають поза межами мови) елементів. Зокрема, як такий елемент було запропоновано концепцію влади як метамови, що забезпечує достатню основу для дослідження архітектоніки міжнародного конфлікту.

Ключові слова: консенсус, діалог, конфлікт, громадянське суспільство, парадокс інтерсуб'єктивності, лінгвістичний соліпсизм, код влади

Pryazhentseva, Kateryna — Ph.D. in philosophy, Center of Humanitarian Education, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Sphere of scientific interests: philosophy of politics, phenomenology, philosophy of language.

Пряженцева, Катерина — кандидат філософських наук, Центр гуманітарної освіти, Національна академія наук України. Царина наукових інтересів — філософія політики, феноменологія, філософія мови.
